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(ABSTRACT)

The accountability movement in education has lead to performance based evaluations for teachers, principals, and district superintendents (Hanson, 1985). Although central office administrators serve a critical leadership role in the school system (Wimpleberg, 1987), little research has focused on this group of administrators. To be effective, an evaluation system must be supported by the total environment of the organization; without use of evaluation at the highest level of the school system, acceptance of its use at lower levels will be impeded (Bolton, 1980).

The purpose of this study was to examine board policies and administrative procedures used to evaluate the
"superintendent's cabinet"—central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent. Specifically, the study addressed 1) board policies and administrative procedures currently used, 2) differences among districts, and 3) procedures considered desirable in evaluation of the cabinet.

The population consisted of the 139 school districts that were members of either Mid-Urban Superintendents Association or National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts. Policies and procedures were examined via responses to a census questionnaire and through analysis of documents. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, cross tabulations, and chi-square tests.

Formal evaluation of central office administrators was mandated by the state or specified in board policy in more than two-thirds of the districts. The average superintendent's cabinet consisted of 7 members. Evaluation occurred annually, was used for multiple purposes, and was obtained through various methods. Few differences occurred among districts related to size of the district. Currently used procedures were rated as most desirable by the superintendents.
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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the accountability movement in education has lead to performance based evaluations for teachers, principals, and division superintendents (Hanson, 1985). Little is written about central office personnel (Bridges, 1982) and even fewer references are made regarding the evaluation of these people who provide such an integral link between the school and the superintendent.

The concept of central offices for public school systems evolved in the mid-nineteenth century with the appointment of the first superintendent of schools (Benham, Capehart, Nolley & Seawell, 1978). Initially the superintendent's primary duty was supervision of instruction while administrative duties were conducted by lay committees (Griffiths, 1966). From 1910-1945, the role of the superintendent expanded and was greatly influenced by proponents of "scientific management." As the superintendent gradually assumed the responsibilities of administering, in addition to the existing responsibilities, the need for assistance through the appointment of additional staff became evident (Morphet, Johns & Reller, 1967). The superintendent of schools was viewed as a
business person whose primary function was the efficient operation of the schools (Benham et al., 1978). As the United States shifted from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urban-suburban life style in the post World War II years, the central office staffs of local school systems continued to grow and assume greater responsibilities.

Federal legislation in the form of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 brought federal money and regulatory policies to education (Morphet, Johns & Reller, 1982). A byproduct of the regulations was a call for accountability to insure that taxpayers' money was properly spent. Increased expectations by the public for improved and additional services such as programs for preschool children, unemployed and underemployed, high school dropouts, senior citizens, and the handicapped, in addition to the civil-rights movement and desegregation, created even more demands upon public education. These demands had an enormous impact upon the growth and number of people employed as administrators in the central office. Superintendents had to rely on additional assistance of specialized staff members (Benham et al., 1978).

Central office administrators who perform a particular
function do not necessarily share the same titles (Knezevich, 1984). For instance, Franseth (1961) stated that the person employed to serve as head of the instructional staff may be given the title of director of instruction, director of curriculum development, curriculum coordinator, chief of instruction, or assistant superintendent in charge of instruction. McMaster (1966) stated that the term supervisor is frequently replaced with terms which reflect the nature of the work (e.g. coordinator, instructional leader, and consultant).

Educational Research Service, Inc. [ERS] reported that central office administrator job descriptions are revised more frequently than any other category of job descriptions in public schools (ERS, 1984).

An earlier ERS report (1970) expressed the need for a uniform set of administrative titles to be used in all local school systems claiming it is almost impossible to obtain comparative data given the wide range of titles and responsibilities in such positions as associate superintendent, assistant superintendent, coordinator, director, supervisor, and consultant.
**Purpose of the Study**

During the past two decades, public interest in the outcomes of the educational process and in the performance of educators and school officials has increased greatly. Attention has been given to performance of students, teachers, and principals. Recent studies have focused on the status of teacher evaluation policies and procedures (Moore, 1987) and principal evaluation policies and procedures (Born, 1988).

Even the superintendent's performance has been subjected to many studies (Redfern, 1980; Booth & Glaub, 1978; Carol, 1972). In addition, Educational Research Service, Inc. conducted a study in 1976 which summarized appropriate methods for evaluating the performance of superintendents.

Organizational structure points to the central office as having a critical leadership role in the school system (Wimpelberg, 1987), but relatively little has been written about the central office personnel. As Bridges (1982:14) noted, research concerning school administrators is generally conducted using principals and superintendents. While evaluation of middle-management administrators is at best "fog-shrouded" in most management fields, it is "dense" in educational management (American Association of School
Administrators [AASA], 1977:17). If all school personnel are to be held accountable, and evaluation is a tool of accountability (ERS, 1985), then all school personnel should be evaluated. A study conducted by ERS revealed that 27 (appendix D) states mandated formal evaluation of school administrators in 1984 while only nine states had such a mandate in 1974 (ERS, 1985). Bolton (1980) suggested that if an evaluation system is going to be effective it must be supported by the total environment of the organization. Without use of evaluation at the highest level of the school system, acceptance of its use at lower levels will be impeded. Thus, the purpose of this study was to determine the current status of evaluation of members of the superintendent's cabinet in selected school districts in the United States.

**Research Questions**

Board policies and administrative procedures used to evaluate central office administrators in school districts that are members of either Mid-Urban Superintendents Association or National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts were examined. Because the titles and duties of the central office administrators vary from district to district, this study focused only on those individuals who
report directly to the superintendent and are evaluated by the superintendent, regardless of title. For this study, these individuals were considered members of the superintendent's cabinet.

Specifically, answers to the following questions were sought:
1. What board policies and administrative procedures exist for evaluating members of the superintendent's cabinet?
2. Are there differences in board evaluation policies and administrative procedures among school districts of varying sizes?
3. How do current procedures in evaluation of the superintendent's cabinet compare to procedures the superintendents feel should be used?

Limitations of the Study

Board policies and administrative procedures for evaluating members of the superintendent's cabinet in school districts which are members of either the Mid-Urban Superintendents Association or the National Federation of Urban-Suburban School districts were examined in this study. Although these associations represent school districts from across the United States, care should be observed in generalizing beyond the characteristics of the population.

Chapter One
Definition of Terms

Superintendent's Cabinet: Central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent.

Administrator: In the context of this study, administrator meant central office administrator in contrast to school-based administrator.

Checklist: A list of traits or characteristics to be checked.

Critical Incidents: Systematic recording of actual instances of significantly good or poor performance.

Essay Evaluation/Narrative Description: A brief narrative statement listing strengths and weaknesses of an administrator.

Graphic Rating Scale: A line graph representing a rater's view of an administrator's performance; traits and management qualities are on one axis, numerical ratings are on the other.

Forced Choice/Pairs: A series of statements from which a rater chooses the one that best or least describes the performance of an administrator.

Performance Standards: Statements of predetermined performance standards based on job description; objectives must have measurable results.

Results Oriented/MBO Management-by-Objectives: A type of evaluation in which an administrator assumes responsibility for setting (in cooperation with the superintendent) and achieving specific objectives based on job responsibility and individual priorities.

Chapter One
Organization

This document consists of five chapters. The first chapter presented the introduction, purpose of the study, research questions, limitations of the study, definition of terms, and organization of the study. Selected literature related to evaluation of administrative personnel in school systems and of middle-to-high level executives in other sectors of employment is reviewed in Chapter Two. Chapter Three contains a description of the research method, population, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis procedures. Findings relative to the research questions are presented in Chapter Four. Summary and conclusions, findings, and recommendations for further study are presented in Chapter Five.
Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) has been a strong and continuing advocate of personnel evaluation (AASA, 1977). In 1977, the AASA delegate Assembly reinforced its position as noted in the quote below from a resolution adopted at that time:

AASA believes that evaluation of administrators should be encouraged. AASA urges boards of education to adopt systems of evaluation of administrators and to assume their responsibility for the evaluation of the superintendent of schools. AASA urges superintendents and other administrators to assume responsibility of all other administrators (AASA, 1977:iv).

Only through such a system can administrative personnel improve their role in leading and directing America's public schools. Strengths of individual administrators can be utilized and identified weaknesses can be jointly addressed by evaluatee and evaluator through participatory evaluation. According to AASA, positive supervisory support, motivation, and involvement in self development are afforded by such a system (AASA, 1977).
It has become increasingly necessary to systematically improve the performance of all employed in education including administrators. Generally and historically, the assumption has been that improvement takes place away from the job through course credits earned or degrees acquired. All professional fields now recognize that the acquisition of a degree merely assures that the holder is ready to learn. Performance appraisal or personnel evaluation should be dedicated to job growth. Improvement of performance should be the main purpose of evaluation (AASA, 1977).

**Accountability**

The call for accountability through evaluation is clear. Coats (1974:2) claimed: "Accountability and evaluation are inseparable." Featherstone and Romano said, "Evaluation is a necessary tool in determining accountability" (1977:413).

"The pressure for greater accountability in the delivery of educational services makes evaluation a critical component in the fulfillment of this thrust..." (Redfern, 1973:50). Keck and Hampton expressed similar sentiments: the "Public's demand in 1970's for greater program and system accountability has shifted in the 1980's to a demand for personnel performance accountability" (1987:16).
Pressure from state legislatures, boards of education, and civic and business leaders is mounting for:

...an evaluation system based on clear performance criteria which can be readily used to evaluate teachers and administrators and which can support either dismissal, retraining efforts, or differential compensation (Keck & Hampton, 1987:16).

According to Barbara Zakrajsek (1979) the lay person's concern for education has also increased the need for accountability through evaluation.

There was a time when the lay person depended on the educator and trusted him completely because the layman did not have the expertise to determine educational worth for himself. However, with the expansion of knowledge has come an acceptance by the lay person of control of his activities. With control comes concern for evaluation and accountability (p. 100).

In his 1970 headnote to Congress, Richard Nixon addressed the accountability of administrators:

School administrators and school teachers alike are responsible for their performance, and it is in their interest as well as in the interests of
their pupils that they be held accountable. Success should be measured not by some fixed national norm, but rather by the results achieved in relation to the actual situation of the particular school and the particular set of pupils (Nixon, 1970).

In a 1977 address to AASA, then United States Commissioner of Education, James E. Allen stressed the necessity of "strengthening the concept of accountability" in education. Allen also asserted that the public's lack of confidence in schools was "in large measure our inability to substantiate results" (Allen, 1977). Thus, in 1977 both the highest elected official in the land and the highest education official stressed accountability through "measurement" and "results".

Hostrop (1983) stated that what is needed to improve the condition of education is a shift away from administration and toward management. Administration is thusly defined as a reflex reaction to unforeseen events while management is future oriented, attempting to foresee events by planned action. Management, says Hostrop, can effectively respond to the public's call for educational accountability (Hostrop, 1983:4). According to Hostrop:
Evaluation is the crux of accountability. It is through the evaluation function that effectiveness of the system is determined and accountability achieved. In short, an evaluation system as an accountability system establishes the requirement that we do that which we said we would do (p. 25).

Phil N. Scheid (1965) in Charter of Accountability for Executives said "accountability says that people are held accountable 'to' someone 'by' someone for doing specific things according to specific plans, and against a certain timetable to accomplish tangible performance results (p. 91). Also, according to Scheid:

An accountable and responsible manager welcomes the opportunity to be evaluated and compensated on the same basis—or, in other words, to be compensated in terms of his actual performance on the job that he is qualified for and assigned to (p. 25).

**State Mandates**

Since 1967, states have begun to mandate evaluation of school personnel (Redfern, 1973). In 1974, nine states mandated formal evaluation of school administrators. By 1984, that number had increased to 27 according to
Educational Research Service (ERS) surveys conducted in respective years (ERS, 1985).

In 1972, the Virginia General Assembly enacted Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, 1972-74. Two provisions of this legislation addressed evaluation of school personnel. Planning and Standards, No. 8 specifically stated:

The superintendent and his staff shall provide for the cooperative evaluation of central office personnel and principals and shall provide assistance to principals in the cooperative evaluation of teachers and other school employees (Virginia Department of Education [VA DOE], 1972:i).

George B. Redfern (1973) called legally mandated evaluation good news if it meant that a critical look would be taken of procedures used to evaluate school personnel. Otherwise, Redfern felt that state statutes simply mandating evaluation left great latitude for the districts to design their own evaluation procedures. The Stull Act, passed in California in 1972, went a step further. Not only did it mandate evaluation of all certified personnel including the supervisors and administrators, but it was competency based with a strong emphasis on student learning outcomes.
Administrators were evaluated on their "ability to create and maintain suitable learning environment" for those who they direct (Redfern, 1973:46).

The 1985 ERS report, Evaluating Administrative Performance, summarized the statutes of 27 states requiring evaluation of administrators. Connecticut statutes required that the superintendent evaluate, or cause to be evaluated, all certified personnel. In Florida, state law specified that it is the superintendent's responsibility to establish evaluation procedures for all instructional, administrative and supervisory personnel. Statutes in New Jersey required local boards of education to adopt policy and implementation procedures for tenured chief school officers and all teaching staff where teaching staff meant both teachers and administrators (ERS, 1985).

Oregon required at least biennial evaluation of teachers where teachers meant any certified personnel other than the superintendent. Alaska, Hawaii, New Mexico, Nevada, and Ohio mandated annual evaluations of all administrators (ERS, 1985).

The North Carolina State Board of Education specified a four-point rating scale for evaluation of administrators based on performance standards. Virginia required each school division to maintain an up-to-date policy manual.
which must include procedures for personnel evaluation. The state of Washington specified that evaluation of administrators be based on administrative job description. Oklahoma law required local boards of education to establish written policy of evaluation for all administrators. South Carolina statutes required evaluation of principals but did not mention other administrators (ERS, 1985).

Need for Administrator/Executive Evaluation

A study conducted by Bridges (1982) revealed that nearly three-quarters of the research on the school administrator focused on the school principal and the superintendent. The high school principal was the most frequent target of research; the elementary principal was a close second with the junior high school principal studied far less than the other two. Much less research is focused on other administrators such as those at the central office level.

The superintendent as chief executive officer to the governing board must design, develop, and implement performance appraisal systems that are educationally sound, clear and precise, yet uncomplicated; effective in identifying productive and nonproductive personnel; legal; fair; and procedurally reliable (Ingram, 1986). Performance
appraisal or personnel evaluation should facilitate change in individual behavior leading to the achievement of personal and organizational goals, and should be focused on standards or goals with mutual development of expectations (Castetter, 1981).

"Educational management, especially at the top level, is demanding, complex, and filled with risk. Therefore planning and evaluation are keys to success" (Redfern, 1980:15). Effective executive leadership results from deliberately planned and carefully executed management programs and activities (Schick, 1980).

Performance appraisal is an important part of management (Wells, 1982) but few management tasks are conducted so poorly or viewed more negatively (Schneier, Geis & Wert, 1987). "When well designed and properly used, evaluation is essential to effective functioning of most organizations" (Locher & Teel, 1977). Much has been written about performance appraisal, evaluations or PEMS--performance evaluation monitoring systems (Finn & Fontaine, 1984; Schick, 1980).

Reams have been written about job performance evaluation. And there is no scarcity of performance review systems from which a manager can choose to evaluate his or her subordinates. But the subject
becomes less simple when it comes to evaluating the
manager's own performance (Lavoie, 1988:86).
Lavoie also emphasized that today, managers, as any other
employee, must be evaluated.

Executives need to be effectively and formally
evaluated (Longenecker & Gioia, 1988). Horace G. McDonnel,
chairman and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Perkin-Elmer
said Corporate America needs performance appraisal more at
the senior levels than at the bottom of the pyramid
(McGurrrin, 1986).

Formal appraisal systems decrease as the level of
management increases (BNA, 1983; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977;
Longenecker & Gioia, 1988). The higher the level of
management in an organization, the less formal the appraisal
(Longenecker & Gioia, 1988). Executives are typically
excluded from formal appraisal programs (Locher & Teel,
1977).

A 1985 ERS survey of 1,738 school superintendents
indicated that 85.9% of responding school districts had
formal evaluation procedures for evaluating administrative
or supervisory personnel. Of the responding districts with
student enrollments of 10,000 or greater, 92.2% had formal
evaluations; 96.6% of those systems with 25,000 or more
students conducted formal evaluations of administrators
(where the term included principals and assistant principals) and supervisors (ERS, 1985). Locher and Teel (1988) obtained similar results in a questionnaire survey sent to 1,459 organizations in private industry in southern California. Ninety-four percent of the 324 respondents indicated use of formal appraisal programs.

A Bureau of National Affairs (BNA) study conducted in 1983 revealed that 92% of the firms surveyed indicated formal evaluation of performance of employees. Of these companies, 87% conducted formal evaluation of their middle managers while only 67% had formal evaluation programs for top management executives. These figures varied only slightly with size of the organization with formal evaluation for middle managers by 89% of the large companies and 86% of the small companies. Formal evaluation of top managers occurred in 64% of large companies and 69% of the small companies (BNA, 1983). Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) reported the survey questionnaire responses of 239 U.S. corporations, information obtained from performance appraisal forms and manuals from 125 of the companies, and interviews with personnel executives and consultants from the companies. Three levels of management were of interest: lower, middle, and top. Approximately three-fourths of all responding companies reported performance appraisal systems
covering at least some of their managers. Virtually 100% of the larger companies reported performance appraisal systems for managers. While 71% of the firms reported formal appraisal for middle managers, only 55% conducted formal evaluation of top managers where top management was defined as the chief executive officer and/or president and personnel reporting immediately to them (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977).

In a project initially designed to obtain a better understanding of the executive as appraiser, Longenecker and Gioia (1988) conducted in-depth interviews with 60 upper-level managers. The interviews took an unexpected turn. Instead of focusing on the executive as appraiser, the executives expressed their concerns and frustrations encountered as appraisee in poorly conducted executive performance appraisals. Every executive in the Longenecker and Gioia study wanted periodic, thorough, formal feedback on performance. The executives expressed the need for specific feedback on ways to improve their personal performance or the performance of their departments. They felt a review provided an opportunity to talk with superiors about long term issues that are forgotten on a day-to-day basis. Finally, executives claimed that the evaluation process gave them an opportunity to review accomplishments
of the past year and what those accomplishments meant in
terms of career advancement. The formal evaluation process
also provided an opportunity for formal discussion to
clarify responsibilities, authority, personal and
departmental goals, plans, and priorities.

The Longenecker and Gioia study suggested that
executives may need appraisal more than other members of the
organization due to the sophistication and often ambiguous
nature of their jobs; changing responsibilities and
priorities; serious consequences to the organization of
ineffective performance on their part; high need for
achievement and recognition; and career progress.

Purposes of Evaluation

Establishing purposes or objectives is considered the
first step of any management system. All elements to be
included in an evaluation or appraisal system should be
included in an evaluation or appraisal system should be
tailored to meet those purposes (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977).
"Design of an effective evaluation program begins with the
district formulating its philosophy on evaluation and its
appropriate purposes in the particular school setting"
(ERS, 1985:6). Bolton (1980) said that if an evaluation
system is to be successful, purposes for evaluating
administrators must be "identified, discussed and agreed upon by all involved in the process." Doing so gives reason for the existence, and direction to, all other phases of the process (Bolton, 1980:48).

Personnel evaluations may serve multiple purposes (Bolton, 1980; Teel, 1980; Wehrenberg, 1988). Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) found as many as nine functions being served by single evaluation programs. Often these purposes are competing or conflicting (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977; Schick, 1980; Teel, 1980; Wehrenberg, 1988) or are used for both supportive and punitive purposes (Phi Delta Kappa [PDK], 1985). On the one hand, they are used to provide support to the evaluatee in identifying ways to improve skills and knowledge, while on the other they are used to make personnel decisions which are considered punitive when leading to dismissal or demotion (PDK, 1985). The evaluator is placed in the conflicting positions of being both coach and judge (Wehrenberg, 1988). Others refer to these conflicting sets of purposes as formative and summative (ERS, 1985) or developmental and compensational (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977), developmental and decision making (Oliver, 1985), developmental and administrative (Huber, 1983; Regel & Hollman, 1987; Teel, 1980) or evaluative and developmental (Baker, 1984; Bianco, 1984). Pyron (1968:4) expressed
concern whether evaluation systems could accomplish multiple goals such as increasing job performance and justifying salary while Cummings (1973) claimed multiple purposes are not only possible but that those using multiple goals are advocates for them. Bolton (1980) emphasized 'purposes' of administrative evaluation "because arguments are sometimes initiated over the 'only' or 'primary' purpose--such arguments are either facetious or misinformed." Bolton continued:

Of course, most systems are developed for the purpose of assisting people to improve performance, but to claim that this is the only purpose is to ignore the full scope of the environment in which schools exist and in which administrators work (1980:18).

A review of the literature for the 1985 ERS Evaluating Administrative Performance resulted in an extensive, although (the authors warn) not exhaustive, list of 30 separate purposes of evaluation or appraisal systems (ERS, 1985:1). Most authors identify fewer distinct purposes of evaluation systems and lump the less used purposes into an "other" category. In Evaluating Administrative Personnel in School Systems, Bolton (1980) lists the following for consideration as purposes of an evaluation system:
1. changing goals or objectives  
2. modifying procedures  
3. determining new ways of implementing procedures  
4. improving performance of individuals  
5. supplying information for modification of assignment  
6. protecting individual or the school system  
7. rewarding superior performance  
8. providing a basis for career planning and individual growth and development  
9. validating the selection process  
10. facilitating self-evaluation (p. 49).

A Bureau of National Affairs (BNA, 1983) study on appraisal systems for managers in 264 companies found similar purposes for evaluation. Listed below are the seven purposes identified in the study and the percent of responding companies using that purpose for appraisal of middle and top managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Top</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining Wage/Salary Adjustments</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Promotion Decisions</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communication Between Supervisor and Subordinate</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Training and Development Needs</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Human Resources Needs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bernardin & Beatty (1984) listed 11 purposes as a basis for nine personnel actions. The purposes are:

1. Fostering improvements in work performance.
2. Assigning work most efficiently.
3. Meeting employees' need for growth.
4. Assisting employees in setting career goals.
5. Recognizing potential for development to managerial positions.
6. Keeping employees advised of what is expected of them.
7. Improving job placement (i.e., effecting better employee-job matches).
8. Identifying training needs.
9. Validating selection procedures and evaluating training programs.
10. Fostering a better working relationship between subordinate and supervisor.
11. Fostering a better working relationship between work units (p. 8).

The personnel actions identified by Bernardin and Beatty are:

1. Periodic appraisal pursuant to laws or regulations.
2. Promotion based on merit.
4. Review at completion of a probationary period.
5. Warning about unacceptable performance.
6. Layoff or termination based on merit.
7. Career development or training needs on individual basis.
8. Demotion or reduction in grade.

On the basis of frequency mentioned in their survey of appraisal systems of managers in 293 U.S. corporations, Lazer & Wikstrom (1977) identified the eight general categories of purposes of appraisal quoted below:

1. Management Development—"provide a framework for future development" by identifying and preparing individuals for increased responsibilities.

2. Performance measurement—"establish the relative value of an individual's contribution to the company" or to "evaluate individual accomplishments."

3. Performance improvement—"encourage continued successful performance" and strengthen individual weaknesses to make employees more effective and productive.

4. Compensation—"pay for performance" or determining equitable salary and bonus incentives based on merit or results.

5. Identifying potential—"identifying candidates for promotion".

6. Feedback—"outline what is expected from employee against actual performance level."

7. Manpower planning—"audit management talent" to
evaluate present supply of human resources for replacement planning.

8. Communications--"provide a format for dialogue between superior and subordinate" or "improve understanding of personal goals and concerns" (p.9).

In this study, performance measurement was the most frequently (60%) stated purpose of evaluation for top executives while for middle managers, management development was first (62%). Results of the survey indicated the most prevalent use of evaluation data was performance feedback (73%, 82%) followed by compensation administration (63%, 70%) at both top and middle management. A random sample telephone survey follow-up of respondents revealed that the highest priority of usage in both levels of management was compensation administration followed by performance feedback. Compensation administration, in this study, was ranked fourth in terms of objectives or purposes of the evaluation system (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). The BNA (1983) study revealed similar results. Of the 264 companies responding to their survey, 87% used appraisal data to determine wage and salary adjustment for top management executives. "Decisions related to promotability, advancement, selection for special training, salary administration, discipline and even discharge may flow from performance appraisal results" (Wells, 1982:776). According
to Lazer & Wikstrom (1977), this discrepancy of purposes and uses is a pitfall of many evaluation systems.

In surveys conducted in 1977 and 1987, Locher and Teel obtained similar results. Performance appraisals were most widely used for "compensation decisions, performance improvement and feedback to employees" (1988:139). Locher and Teel's study revealed an increase from 11% in 1977 to 30% in 1987 in the use of appraisals to document personnel actions. Allan and Rosenberg (1978) also indicated the use of appraisals to improve performance and to obtain data for personnel decisions.

In summary, purposes of evaluation include:

1. improving performance (Allan & Rosenberg, 1978; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Bolton, 1980; ERS, 1985; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977; Locher and Teel, 1988);

2. determining promotability (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; BNA, 1983; Bolton, 1980; ERS, 1985; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977; Wells, 1982);

3. administering compensation or salary programs (BNA, 1983; Bolton, 1980; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977; Locher and Teel, 1988; Wells, 1982);

4. assessing performance (AASA, 1980; ERS, 1985; Kerr & Slocum, 1987; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977; Redfern, 1980; VA DOE, 1972);
5. improving communication/feedback (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; BNA, 1983; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977);

6. identifying training needs (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; BNA, 1983; Bolton, 1980);

7. establishing goals or objectives (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Bolton, 1980);

8. clarifying expectations (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977);

9. identifying strengths and weaknesses (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977);

10. protecting the individual or the system (Bolton, 1980).

Planning for Evaluation

The evaluation process is continual and cyclical consisting of three phases; planning, collecting information, and using information. Once information is used, plans for collection of additional information begin (Bolton, 1980). Thus, what some consider planning, others consider part of the appraisal review. Planning, according to Bolton, should include analysis of the specific situation (job description, general responsibilities, expectations of others), reviewing purpose of evaluation, setting goals or objectives, and deciding on the means for measuring
processes used and the desired outcomes. Schneier, Geis, and Wert (1987) agreed that performance appraisal begins by determining job elements, the most important job duties, and the outcomes of the particular position. Fully understanding the responsibilities and requirements of the position is the key to establishing objectives (Lavoie, 1988; Wells, 1982). Bernardin & Beatty (1984) recommended that an appraisal system be based on job analysis of each position in which people are to be evaluated. Oliver, (1985) specified that performance standards identified in planning be based on job analysis.

Laws designed to prevent employment discrimination require performance appraisal measures to be job-related and as objective as possible (Bianco, 1984). A number of court cases have been settled in favor of the employee when job descriptions or performance standards based on job analysis were not part of the performance appraisal system (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Lantham & Wexley, 1981). The employer must prove that the evaluation instrument is job related (Lantham & Wexley, 1981). The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Guidelines, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, and the courts specify that performance standards in appraisal systems must be based on "critical" elements of the job and the employee must be advised of these elements
called the job description the cornerstone of performance
appraisal; it is imperative that both the employee and the
supervisor understand the responsibilities of the job.
Bianco further emphasized that if a job description does not
exist, it is the responsibility of the appraiser to create
one which defines the duties of the job and the expected
outcomes of the position. Campbell and Lee (1988) agreed
that role specification and job description must be a part
identified job description and priority responsibilities as
the key in writing performance appraisal documents for all
administrators including the superintendent. Since
performance appraisal requires the evaluation of an
individual's performance in a given position against a set
of performance criteria, it is essential that the
personality, position requirements, and resulting
performance potential be understood and carefully evaluated
(Delamontagne & Weitzul, 1980).

In order for appraisal to be truly effective, it must
be a dynamic process. The supervisor and the employee
should jointly define goals, discuss possible ways of
achieving them, and agree on a future course of action
(TEel, 1980). Writing good objectives which are job related
is simply good management (Bianco, 1984). Finn and Fontaine (1984) recommended that goal-setting should be a non-threatening process to take place at a time other than the appraisal interview. The supervisor should encourage the employee to establish goals related to perceived performance deficiencies. A review of the purposes and uses of the evaluation should be included in planning. Prior to the appraisal, the employee must be informed of standards and expected results. In the planning sessions, the employee and the supervisor should identify and negotiate goals and the standards by which progress will be judged (Wells, 1982).

The objectives should be worth doing, well written, conceptualized by the administrator, and approved by the supervisor. The administrator should focus first on the desired results and then begin writing objectives. Goals worth doing are realistic and attractive, both relevant and important, challenging, and consistent with the organizational plan, policies, and procedures (Bolton, 1980). With the aid of the supervisor, the goals should be prioritized. Maximum and minimum time to complete goals should be estimated. Objectives can be modified by mutual agreement of supervisor and administrator (Bolton, 1980). In Setting Goals for Managerial Performance, Lavoie quotes
Peter Drucker, "Each manager needs clearly spelled-out objectives which are derived from the goals of the business enterprise" (Lavoie, 1988:88).

One of the biggest complaints employees have of their companies evaluation procedures is the lack of clear-cut objectives and evaluation criteria. The following guidelines are offered: specific rather than broad general goals; objectives defined in terms of anticipated results rather than activities; objectives set for all important responsibilities. In addition, there should be as few objectives as possible (Lavoie, 1988). Allan and Rosenberg (1978) cited difficulty in formulating "appropriate, concrete and usable objectives" as one of the major reasons results-based evaluations for managers are often abandoned. The criteria which Allan and Rosenberg insist objectives should meet include the following; represent most significant responsibilities; be achievable with reasonable effort and within existing resource limitations; and be stated precisely enough to avoid misrepresentation or disagreement over meaning. Responsibilities or broad areas of accountability, objectives or expected results, and standards for judging whether results have been obtained should all be considered.
Schneier, Geis, and Wert (1987) suggested that planning for evaluation include a definition of what needs to be accomplished and include general job duties. Specific work objectives should then be written which include outcomes related to the mission and strategy of the organization.

In summary, performance planning is integral to the appraisal process. It provides expectations or goals against which actual results are compared (Baker, 1984).

**Feedback and Frequency of Formal Review**

Feedback, communication of both positive and negative performance information, is considered the most critical and potentially the most productive element of the evaluation process (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977), the most important and overlooked process in the practitioner's world of personnel management (Walther & Taylor, 1983), the most important task in human resource management (Edwards & Sproull, 1983), and the most important part of performance appraisal (Baker, 1984). One reason evaluation has the potential for raising motivation of the individual's level of performance is due to feedback and the adjustment that can be made in response to it (Bolton, 1980). Teel expressed similar feelings, "without feedback, improved performance is unlikely, if not impossible" (1980:301). Wells (1982) said results must be
communicated if performance appraisal is to influence performance in a positive way. Feedback serves as an effective source of positive motivation (Baker, 1984; Meyer, 1977; Walther & Taylor, 1983) if it is consistent, timely, includes some positive information, and the employee feels the feedback is reasonable and is given the opportunity to respond (Walther & Taylor, 1983). Bernardin & Beatty (1984) emphasized that feedback, to be effective, must be specific in nature and provided reasonably close in time to the behavior or performance in question.

The executives in the Longenecker and Gioia (1988) study expressed the general need for performance feedback. These executives wanted specific feedback on what needed improvement in both their personal performance and performance of their division or departments.

If feedback is to bring about change in behavior or maintain high standards of excellence, results of performance appraisal must be given to the employee frequently, on a day to day, or continuous basis (Girard, 1988; Lantham & Wexley, 1981; Meyer, 1977; Oliver, 1985; Wells, 1982). Meyer (1977) reiterated that it is a well-established psychological fact that immediate feedback is much more effective than delayed feedback. Bolton (1980) warned that evaluation is continuous and cyclical and that
"normal 'annual' reviews" with no intermediate sessions to supplement feedback may not accomplish the purposes of the evaluation system (p. 80). Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) suggested periodic progress reviews to allow flexibility in adapting, revising, eliminating, or adding objectives. Peters and Waterman (1982) advocated "management by walking around" to maintain frequent progress of performance. Schneier, Brown, and Burchman (1988) claimed that the best run companies and most successful managers manage performance on a day-to-day basis and not by completing a form once a year (Schneier, Geis, & Wert, 1987). Bianco (1984) recommended frequent counseling sessions to praise good performance and provide counseling for failing performance so that improvements could be accomplished before the formal review. Bernardin & Beatty (1984) recommended frequent discussion based on progress toward specific, objectively-defined work goals. Slattery (1985) said the need for performance-related information is not a once-a-year event. Executives in the Longenecker & Gioia (1988) study expressed the need for feedback of some sort once a month.

Lavoie (1988) claimed the best approach is a combination of formal review with frequent informal sessions. If feedback is delivered frequently, there should
be no surprises at the formal review (Lavoie, 1988; Schneier, Geis, & Wert, 1987; Wells, 1982). Although feedback should serve as an effective source of motivation, Meyer (1977) warned that it seldom has the positive effect desired and often does more harm than good since in most programs intensive, comprehensive feedback comes but once-a-year.

You don't need a yearly appraisal for feedback. It is a day-to-day process. Any manager who relies on the annual appraisal to let his people know where they stand is really missing the boat. This kind of supervisor won't do any better with a form—if forced to communicate, he will probably botch the job (employee relations vice president quoted in Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977:35-36).

Bernardin & Beatty (1984) stated that traditionally, once a performance appraisal or evaluation rating is completed, an interview is conducted where the rater gives feedback on performance. The authors stressed that feedback provided in a yearly appraisal will have little effect on subsequent job performance. Girard (1988) claimed that the effect of feedback is frequently lost because it is tied to salary, and employees depend on salary to maintain their standard of living. The appraisal interview provides input
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for other processes including administration decisions concerning salary, promotion, retention, placement, as well as a discussion of job performance information (Baker, 1984). Wells (1982) indicated the coaching approach was likely to serve the developmental needs but does little for the administrative needs. Concentrating on past performance causes difficulty in providing a developmental approach (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). Developing plans (which specify both what improvements are desired and how progress is to be monitored) for performing in more effective ways in the future may be the most critical element of the annual review. If not done, the payoff to both the individual and the company is lost (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977).

Executives in the Longenecker and Gioia (1988) study viewed the formal review as an opportunity to talk about long term and big picture issues that are forgotten in daily work-oriented discussions. They also saw the review as a time to clarify expectations and to review their accomplishments in terms of career advancement. Lazer & Wikstrom (1977) stated the following purposes for the formal appraisal review:

1. Letting employees know where they stand.
2. Helping employees do a better job by clarifying expectations.
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3. Planning for developmental and growth opportunities.

4. Strengthening the superior-subordinate working relationship by developing mutual understanding of expectations.

5. Allowing subordinates to express themselves concerning performance-related issues.

Baker (1984), Meyer (1977) and Lantham and Wexley (1981) encouraged the employee to prepare for and actually participate in the appraisal interview. Teel (1978) suggested jointly discussing performance with the subordinate describing the performance and the superior commenting in response. Bernardin and Beatty (1984) reported that employees frequently felt more negative about the supervisor and less certain about where they stood after the appraisal interview. They also found few examples of constructive action or significant improvement as a result of the appraisal interview. Minimum criticism, goal setting activities, and a supportive attitude on the part of the superior are ways to improve the atmosphere of the appraisal interview (Baker, 1984; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Lantham & Wexley, 1981). Meyer (1977) emphasized that the interview should be problem-oriented, not personalized.
The job description and specific responsibilities (Baker, 1984; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984) and the purposes of the interview (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984) should be reviewed. The interviewer should have a thorough knowledge of the ratings and how they were derived (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). Some claimed that feedback should be a formal, written report (Baker, 1984; Finn & Fontaine, 1984) with a post-appraisal interview only if requested by either party (Finn & Fontaine, 1984). In fact, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 requires that organizations which fall under its jurisdiction must conduct at least yearly, and record in writing, a formal appraisal for employees (DeMarco & Nigro, 1983).

Lazer and Wikstrom's 1977 revealed that most (>95%) organizations provided feedback to employees but the requirement of a formal review decreased with an increase in management level (86% middle, 81% top managers). The authors added that although most organizations required feedback, discussions with managers revealed that many supervisors disregarded policy and did not discuss the appraisal with subordinates. In order to avoid such action, some organizations required the subordinate's signature on the appraisal form (Baker, 1984; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977);
others allowed the subordinate to make dissenting statements about the appraisal (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977).

The 1985 ERS study found annual evaluations used most frequently (75-80%) for upper level administrators in school districts. No indication was given as to the percentage of administrators who were allowed to sign or make comments on the appraisal form. The BNA (1983) study revealed that annual evaluation increased with management level (85% supervisors, 86% middle management, 89% top management). The executive was presented with a final evaluation and allowed to document reaction or disagreement (67% middle management, 64% top). A signature was required of top management executives in 80% of the companies while only 76% required the signature of the mid-management executives. The evaluatee was allowed to keep a copy of the evaluation in approximately equal proportions in middle and top management positions (75% mid, 76% top).

Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) found that 92% of the companies conducted annual appraisal for middle managers and 91% conducted annual reviews for top managers. In the ten years between surveys, Locher and Teel (1988) found the use of annual review had increased from 52% to 69%. They stated that an annual review was long enough to yield reliable
measures of performance and that more frequent reviews were often considered too time consuming.

**Who Evaluates**

The hierarchy of authority in most organizations legitimates the right of the superior to make both evaluative and developmental decisions concerning subordinates since the magnitude and scheduling of rewards are controlled by the superior. Appraisal and rewards and punishments should be in the same hands. To separate them undermines the legitimacy of the appraisal process (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977:27).

The immediate supervisor is the most frequent and often the sole appraiser (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977; Wells, 1982). If the supervisor does not have direct knowledge of actual performance, multiple raters, self-appraisal, and peer evaluation should be included (Wells, 1982). Mount (1984) and Tsui and Barry (1986) claimed that self-appraisals are more lenient than supervisor evaluations while Teel (1978) said it is far more likely for a person to underrate self. Employee involvement in the evaluation process could be increased by greater use of self-appraisal (Baker, 1984; Teel, 1978). Self-evaluation provides the opportunity for more meaningful discussion to occur (Bianco, 1984). Bolton
(1980) claimed the best evaluations are those which involve
self-evaluation and evaluation by outsiders where outsider
meant anyone other than self. Self-appraisal combined with
the highly participatory features of MBO and blended with
the graphic precision of rating scales can be a
constructive, positive experience for both parties (Teel,
1978). Self-appraisal answers the call for greater
subordinate involvement in the appraisal process. Teel
suggested that two weeks prior to the formal appraisal
review the subordinate could write his/her own appraisal.
Jointly, at the interview, the formal appraisal would be
written with the two agreeing on rating. The interview
would begin with the subordinate describing the major
accomplishments and then the superior would comment. This
process intimately involves the subordinate in the appraisal
process. No rating is given until the two reach consensus
based on the ground rules established prior to the interview
(Teel, 1978).

Campbell and Lee (1988) expressed reservation about the
usefulness of self-appraisal except as a vehicle for
personal development in which to uncover areas of
disagreement, assess strengths and weaknesses, and gain more
satisfying and constructive appraisals. As an evaluative
tool self-appraisal is used to gather performance
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information that is not or would not be possible to obtain in any other way. Use of self-appraisal might reduce the effectiveness of the evaluation by introducing more contamination than decreasing deficiencies (Campbell & Lee, 1988).

Use of peer review, the most frequent alternative to superior review according to Mount (1984), is increasing. Over time, peer review is a good indicator of performance and achievement. Ratings are reliable and highly accurate and have been found to be excellent predictors of future performance (Lavoie, 1988). Further, Lavoie claims that an employee may hide true performance from superior but subordinates will see the real performance. Edwards and Sproull (1986) recommended the use of lateral associates (peers) with whom the evaluatee has regular contact and the superior in their Team Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS) claiming use of both is more defensible, less biased, more creditable, and yields higher predictive validity. In the TEAMS evaluation, the superior is one of four on the self-selected evaluation team. Detractors of peer review claim that it is too lenient, that subordinates fear retaliation when its their turn, bias of personal likes and dislikes and that the peer may not be fully aware of the
dimensions and requirement of the other's job (Lavoie, 1988).

Grove (1984) recommended at least three appraisers be involved in the evaluation; the supervisor, the supervisor's supervisor, and a representative of the personnel department. Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) found that 75% of the responding companies had middle manager appraisals reviewed by the immediate supervisor. This decreases to 61% for top management. Review by representatives of the personnel department drops from 32% for middle management to 19% for top executives. If review occurs, it generally occurs prior to the formal appraisal interview (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977).

Appraisal by subordinates occurs infrequently (Mount, 1984). The limited empirical research on use of subordinate appraisal in evaluation of managers (Bernardin, 1986) supports use for both feedback (Bernardin, 1986; Mount, 1984) and personnel decisions (Bernardin, 1986) and has resulted in lasting change among supervisors and increased their productivity (Mount, 1984). In a study of 80 randomly selected mid-level managers, their 80 immediate supervisors, and 365 subordinates in a multinational corporation in a highly technical field, Mount found subordinate ratings more closely related to superior ratings than to self-ratings.
Bernardin (1986) cited management literature to support use of subordinate appraisals. Both the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LEDQ) and Likert's Profile of Organizational Characteristics (the basis of his System IV model of managerial effectiveness) request information about subordinate's attitudes toward managers. The Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, NC conducts 3-6 day assessment programs where managers are required to submit subordinate appraisals for scoring and interpretation. The indication is that subordinates may have different perspectives than superiors. Since management has to do with achieving results through people, subordinates offer an opportunity to gather information most related to the manager's function (Bernardin, 1986). IBM, Ford, and RCA place heavy emphasis on subordinate appraisal for personnel decision making (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). According to Bernardin and Beatty (1986), managers perceive themselves to be effective in areas that subordinates--those supposedly on the receiving end--found ineffective. Bernardin's research revealed few companies using subordinate appraisal, but those who were considered their appraisal system more effective than those who were not.

A study of 45 upper-level managers, none of whom had been involved with subordinate appraisals, indicated
subordinates could evaluate better than managers two of ten dimensions of managerial work as identified by Mintzberg. Six additional dimensions could be evaluated by the subordinates at least to a moderate extent (Bernardin, 1986).

There is virtually no empirical evidence to support problems mentioned in reference to subordinate appraisal. These problems include lack of ability, aptitude, and training; inevitability of gaming; paranoia about telling the truth; authority of manager undermined; and a fear that the manager will focus on pleasing subordinates while shirking other duties (Bernardin, 1986).

Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) found that in 95% of companies responding to their survey, the immediate supervisor appraised the middle manager while in only 86% of the companies did the immediate supervisor appraise the top managers. BNA (1983) did not address who evaluates but indicated that the appraisal is reviewed by the evaluator's immediate supervisor in 86% of the companies for middle managers and 84% for top managers. Representatives of the personnel department reviewed the middle manager appraisal in 67% of the companies and the top manager in 63% of the companies. The 1985 ERS study designated the person evaluating, not the rank in the hierarchy. Lazer and
Wikstrom (1977) found that 13% and 14% of the companies allowed self-appraisal for middle and top managers, respectively.

**Appraisal Methods or Formats**

Through the years a number of approaches to performance evaluation have been developed (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). These include rating scales; checklists; ranking or comparisons of employees with each other; open-ended narrative or essay descriptions of performance; and comparisons of results produced by an employee to pre-set objectives (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). Organizations tend to use a combination of methods rather than a single method for evaluation of employees (ERS, 1984; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977; Locher and Teel, 1988).

**Rating Scales.** The most widely used appraisal technique is the rating scale (Regel & Hollman, 1987; Teel, 1978). The evaluator determines where an employee's performance falls on a given range (BNA, 1983) of performance qualities and characteristics (Locher and Teel, 1988) or job behaviors (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). The rater evaluates the level of employee performance in each category by placing a mark along a continuum, circling a letter or number, or checking a box (Locher and Teel, 1988).
Redfern (1980) described the graphic rating scale which consisted of a list of traits and desirable qualities in management performance on one axis with numerical ratings on the other. Points are plotted at which the two intersect. These are then connected with lines. The resulting graph represents the rater's view of the individual's performance (Redfern, 1980).

The forced choice is another form of rating scale in which the rater chooses between equally positive or negative statements the one that best fits the evaluatee (Redfern, 1980; Locher and Teel, 1988). Forced choice comparisons reduce rater bias and establish a basis for comparison of current and past performance (Redfern, 1980). Rater bias is reduced since the rater has no knowledge of the weightings assigned to individual statements (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984).

A third type of rating scale is the behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS) (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984) or behavioral expectations scales (BES) (Lantham & Wexley, 1981) described as a graphic scale with specific behavioral descriptions utilizing various points along each scale (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). The scale values in BARS have been determined through research (Lantham & Wexley, 1981). In this method the rater is also asked to record critical
incidents throughout the appraisal period (Lantham & Wexley, 1981).

**Checklists.** In the checklist method of evaluation the rater checks only those statements describing employee behavior that accurately describe the performance of the individual (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; BNA, 1983; Locher and Teel, 1988). As the name implies, a list of traits, behaviors, or characteristics is checked if the rater feels they best describe the employee in question (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). In some cases the rater may be asked to choose the item which least describes the person (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). While forced choice was described as a rating scale method, Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) consider it as a checklist method. Checklist, if developed and used properly, reduce rater bias by removing item values from the evaluation form (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977).

**Critical Incidents.** The critical incidents approach is a variant of the essay method but is usually classified as a separate approach for performance appraisal (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). This approach involves the systematic recording of actual instances of either good or poor performance (Locher and Teel, 1988) or collecting reports of behaviors that are considered critical in the success or failure of work station (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984).
Supervisors maintain a log of such incidents throughout the year (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977); incidents must be clearly indicative of good or bad behavior. Average behavior is not recorded. A legitimate critical incident is a reference to "actual behavior in a specific situation with no mention of traits or judgements" (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984:77). The incidents must be described in detail and specifically. When the formal appraisal review occurs, the evaluator has specific, detailed information and thus avoids vague generalities (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977).

Ranking or Employee Comparisons. Personnel or employee comparison methods of appraisal require that the appraiser make relative comparisons of employees (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Locher and Teel, 1988) in terms of statement(s) of preference of organizational worth (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984) resulting in a rank ordering from best to worst (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977; Locher and Teel, 1988). Comparisons may be made on overall performance or on a number of separate characteristics. Examples of employee comparisons are paired-comparisons, rank ordering, and forced distribution (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Locher and Teel, 1988). Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) present a good discussion of the various ranking methods.
Straight ranking requires that an entire group of employees be placed in rank order. Alternation ranking is a variation in which the best employee is designated, then the worst, then the next best, next worst, etc., until all employees in the group are placed. This approach is said to be advantageous since managers find it easier to identify the extremes then to differentiate among the employees in the middle. Since each employee is to be compared with each other employee, the system is complex. This method is tedious and can be prohibitively time consuming. If seven employees are to be evaluated, 21 comparisons must be made; 66 comparisons are required for evaluation of 12 employees (Locher and Teel, 1988).

Forced distribution is based upon a normal statistical distribution and requires that the appraiser assign specified proportions of employees being appraised into specific performance categories. Although this approach eliminates central tendency, leniency, and strictness errors, it is considered too rigid by most managers and is meaningless with a small number of employees. Companies that reported using forced distribution on a survey were really not doing so as revealed by telephone follow-up (Locher and Teel, 1988).
Ranking systems identify the best and the worst performers but supply no information as to why the employee is best or worst (Locher and Teel, 1988).

**Essay or Narrative.** In some variation the essay is used in virtually all evaluation systems (Locher and Teel, 1988). Bernardin and Beatty (1984) called this the written narrative. Redfern (1980) referred to the method as the essay but in contrast to other authors claimed that it is rarely used. The essay is usually a narrative statement (Redfern, 1980) or answers to open-ended questions (Locher and Teel, 1988) regarding the strengths and weaknesses (Redfern, 1980) or good and bad points, training needs and potential (Locher and Teel, 1988). Using the essay as the only evaluation approach is impractical (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). It is time consuming (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977), and dependent upon the writing skills of the appraiser (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977) rather than the employee's actual performance or behavior (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). Redfern (1980) cited the major drawback as variability in length and content while Bernardin and Beatty pointed out that different value systems affect written responses. Narrative reports tend to be highly subjective and comparative judgements are rarely made among employees (Lazer &
Wikstrom, 1977) thus deeming them useless for administrative purposes (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984).

**Results-Oriented or Management-by-Objectives (MBO).**

One of the most popular and popularized management techniques is management by objectives (DeFee, 1977). Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) found that more than half of the firms responding to their survey used management-by-objectives (MBO) for appraising the middle and top executives. MBO is a system of management, not simply a performance appraisal system (Bucalo, 1977). It is "conceptually easy to understand but difficult to implement" (Bucalo, 1977:202). MBO is a results-oriented appraisal system which measures the attainment of mutually established goals set by the rater and the employee (BNA, 1983). Redfern (1980) referred to a variation of this approach as evaluation by objectives. The rationale of MBO is simple: performance can best be measured directly by comparing results produced with the result anticipated (Lazer & Wikstrom, 1977). This approach involves the employee in the appraisal by requiring the mutual establishment of goals (Locher and Teel, 1988). Middle managers who were appraised using results-oriented appraisal systems perceived their evaluations to be more accurate and fair than did their counterparts evaluated using the subjective trait approach.
Performance Standards. Performance standards are specific standards against which an employee's performance is measured (Alewine, 1982). Allan and Rosenberg (1978) distinguish between objectives and standards in the following way: expected results or objectives specify in fairly specific terms what the manager is to accomplish in broad areas; standards are the quantitative and qualitative measures for judging whether results have been achieved. The standards should be based upon job description to relate "static job definition to dynamic work performance" (Alewine, 1982). Goals or objectives are mutually agreed upon by the supervisor and employee. A final written statement should consist of goals expressed in measurable terms, how attainment of goal will be measured, and steps necessary to complete the goal. An integral requirement of the performance standard approach, which distinguishes it from MBO, is that the standard directs attention to the quantitative mechanism by which performance will be measured (Alewine, 1982). Redfern (1980) referred to both work standards and performance standards.

Effective standards are concrete, fair and reasonable (Redfern, 1980); realistic, measurable, and achievable (Alewine, 1982). Both Alewine and Redfern claim one of the biggest problems with this method is formulating the
objectives. The advantage is that employees know not only what is expected (Redfern, 1980) but also what is necessary to succeed (Alewine, 1982).

Sources of Information

Literature regarding the source of evaluation information is sparse. ERS (1985) identified several sources which include observation, review of records, and opinions of persons other than those conducting the appraisal. Evaluation information for central office administrators was most frequently (86%) obtained through observation by the superintendent even for administrators not evaluated by the superintendent. Other sources include observation by immediate supervisor (60%) and self-evaluation reports (52%). To a lesser extent, staff performance records (32%), school board member opinions (25%), and opinions of teachers, parents, and students (11, 8 and 3%, respectively) were used as sources of information for evaluation of central office administrators.

In corporations or businesses, the productivity rate of the unit may be used as a source of information for personnel evaluation (Bunning, 1988; Greenlaw, 1988; McAdams, 1988). Barbara Blackburn espoused networking with corporation presidents as a source of garnering evaluation
information for chief executive officers (Platt, Blackburn & Giove, 1985).

**Means of Appeal**

All administrators have the right to due process protection as prescribed by state law and contractual agreement (Ingram, 1986). "A formal process to appeal an appraisal believed to be inaccurate or unfair would certainly be effective in assuring due process" (Wells, 1982:782). The BNA survey also addressed appeals procedures. Nearly half of the respondents with formal appraisal programs had informal procedures to "appeal or seek retraction" of performance appraisal considered unfair or inaccurate (BNA, 1983:19). One of five respondents had no avenue of appeal. In those that had an appeal process, the appeal was usually through the "chain of command" to the appraiser's immediate supervisor (BNA, 1983:19). Between 75 and 80 percent of the companies required middle and top level executives to sign the evaluation report and permitted them to keep a copy of the final evaluation form.

Locher and Teel (1988) reported that 32% of the companies responding to their survey had formal grievance systems through which employees could appeal what they perceived to be unfair appraisal. In addition, 77% of the
respondents gave employees the opportunity to make comments on the appraisal form.

Ninety percent of the respondents in the ERS study required the signature of the evaluatee, 89.5% allowed dissenting comments if assessment was considered unfair, and 45.8% allowed the evaluatee to request review by other than the original evaluator (ERS, 1985). Lazer and Wikstrom (1977) found companies using the MBO approach most likely to allow the administrator to retain a copy of the appraisal form.

"It seems safe to conclude that employees have significant opportunities, both formal and informal, to express personal reactions to their appraisal" (Locher and Teel, 1988:140).
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METHOD

The purpose of this study was to determine the current status of evaluation of members of the superintendent's cabinet (central office personnel who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent) in selected school districts in the United States. Specifically, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What board policies and administrative procedures exist for evaluating central office personnel who are members of the superintendent's cabinet?

2. Are there differences in board evaluation policies and administrative procedures among school districts of varying sizes?

3. How do current procedures in evaluation of the superintendent's cabinet compare to procedures the superintendents feel should be used?

Methods and procedures used in this study are described in this chapter. Included in the chapter are the following sections: research method, population, instrumentation, data collection methods, and data analysis.
This descriptive study included use of a three page questionnaire, content analysis of district documents, and data obtained from Market Data Retrieval Educational Directories (Market Data Retrieval, 1988) to determine the status of evaluation of members of the superintendent's cabinet in selected school districts.

**Population**

The population for the study consisted of school districts that were members of either Mid-Urban Superintendents Association or National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts. These two associations represent school districts from across the United States. All superintendents of the school districts who were members of either association were sent the questionnaire.

The Mid-Urban Superintendents Association represents school districts that serve cities of populations of 100,000 to 300,000. The association currently has 123 member districts representing 36 of the 50 states. Membership in the association is held by individual superintendents who are serving as Superintendent of Schools in a school district that includes all or a major portion of a city of 100,000 or more, or has a school age population of at least 15,000 and lies at least 2/3 within a city of 100,000 or
more. The association exchanges publications, statistical information and professional concerns; serves as a vehicle for communication among member superintendents, and represents the interests of mid-urban districts with respect to federal governmental relations, policies, and legislation. The association also represents the unique interest of mid-urban districts in relations with larger urban districts, the American Association of School Administrators and other organizations sharing mutual concerns; and serves as a unifying, educational, and supportive association of superintendents of mid-sized urban districts having unique and similar concerns (Mid-Urban Superintendents Association, 1987).

The National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts serves large urban and suburban school districts. Membership in the association is limited to 30 districts; currently, there are 23 member districts. The Federation was formed in 1973, after more than a year of planning, to unite the large urban and suburban school systems. The stated purpose of the Federation is to further the cause of education by: promoting the exchange of ideas and knowledge about issues and concerns of member systems; undertaking important studies unique to member systems; facilitating dissemination of results of these studies through a network
of communication between member systems; and confronting
issues faced by local school districts from institutions on
regional and national levels.

The Federation sponsors studies, workshops, and
seminars to share important information and research with
its members. Member districts are encouraged to exchange
theories, examine practices, evaluate operations, and
benefit from their combined experiences. Areas of mutual
concern include student rights, teacher evaluation, improved
communications, special education, finance, and reduction in
force (The National Federation of Urban-Suburban School
Districts, 1988).

The entire population of districts belonging to the two
associations were contacted for inclusion in this study.
Seven of the districts held membership in both associations.
Thus, the population consisted of 139 school districts.

According to data from MDR Directories, enrollment in
the districts ranged from slightly less than 7,600 to
greater than 140,000 students with a mean of 32,000 (sd
25,000) students. There were as few as four and as many as
183 schools per district (mean 51, sd 34). All except one
district served students from kindergarten through grade
12.
**Instrumentation**

From a search of the literature on evaluation or performance appraisal of administrators in school systems and middle and upper level administrators in business and industry, a matrix (Appendix G) was designed which identified the purposes and procedures of evaluation of administrators. Authors of personnel evaluation/appraisal studies or articles were listed across the horizontal axis while items of interest in evaluation/appraisal were listed down the vertical axis. Items were categorized as below:

1. Purposes of Evaluation
2. Procedures (Planning) for Evaluation
3. Frequency of Formal Review
4. Method of Data Collection
5. Sources of Data Collection
6. Feedback
7. Persons Involved in Appraisal
8. Means of Redress

From the matrix, a questionnaire (Appendix C) was prepared. The superintendent was asked to indicate the number of central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent. Additional information concerning state mandates and board policies specifying evaluation of central office personnel was
included at the top portion of the questionnaire. An open-ended question allowed for pertinent comments regarding the evaluation of the cabinet.

**Pilot Study**

Ten current or former superintendents who were not in the study population were identified and contacted by phone. Each was asked to participate in the pilot study after being presented with a short explanation of the study. All ten superintendents agreed to complete the questionnaire. Each was sent a letter, the questionnaire, and a critique form related to the content and format of questionnaire. Comments were invited.

A copy of the pilot questionnaire, the letter sent to the pilot members, and the questionnaire critique form are included as Appendix C. The return rate of the pilot questionnaires was 100%. Respondents indicated the average length of time required to complete the questionnaire was less than 10 minutes. Before the questionnaire was distributed to the population, a Likert scale was added to the questionnaire to determine the extent to which the superintendent considered each item as desirable in the evaluation of members of the cabinet (Appendix A).
Document Analysis

To determine if the board policies and administrative procedures in use were specified in district documents, relevant documents were requested from the study districts. A worksheet (Appendix B) based on the questionnaire was designed for use in analysis of all documents (board policies, administrative procedure manuals, evaluation instruments) obtained from the districts.

Data Collection

Demographic information about the school districts was obtained from Market Data Retrieval Directories. The information obtained included student population, number of schools, relative wealth indicator, per student expenditure indicator, and grade span served by the district.

On March 30, 1989, each superintendent whose school district was a member of the target associations was sent a cover letter signed by an official of the appropriate association, Dr. Kenneth Underwood, chairman of the dissertation committee, and the researcher (Appendix A). This letter explained the nature of the research and assured the confidentiality of responses. Each superintendent was asked to return the questionnaire (Appendix A) and three
written documents, if they existed, in a coded, pre-stamped, self-addressed envelope. Written documents requested were:

1. board policies specifying evaluation of central office personnel,
2. administrative procedures regarding evaluation of central office personnel, and
3. evaluation instruments.

After a period of three weeks, a second letter (Appendix A) including the entire packet was sent to districts from which there had been no response. If the information had not been received by a second target date, the superintendent's office was contacted by phone. The superintendent was urged to return the questionnaire. Thus, a concerted effort was made to solicit responses from all districts in the population.
Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the Number Cruncher Statistical System (NCSS) computer software package (Hintz, 1988). Demographic data obtained from Market Data Retrieval Directories were analyzed using frequencies and percentages of responses. When appropriate, as with number of schools in district and student enrollment, the mean and standard deviation were determined.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data collected through the questionnaire and the written documents. Items on both the questionnaire and the data analysis worksheet required a "check if applicable" or choice of 0 to 4 Likert scale response and were coded appropriately. Questionnaire data were tabulated and reported by frequency and percentage of responses.

A document analysis worksheet based on the items in the questionnaire is included as Appendix B. This was employed in analyzing the documents obtained from the districts. The worksheet included the same categories as did the questionnaire. As documents were read and analyzed, items were identified as a part of the district's evaluation of the superintendent's cabinet only if specifically stated in the document(s). Items that fit a particular category but not included as a specific item on the worksheet/questionnaire
were listed as other. These data were also reported by frequency and percentages.

**Research Question 1.** Frequencies and percentages of responses for both questionnaire and document analysis data were used to determine what board policies and administrative procedures exist for evaluating the superintendent's cabinet. Crosstabulations and chi-square statistics were performed on current use versus document analysis results to determine if the policies and procedures specified in district documents were the same as those reported to be in current use in the questionnaire responses.

**Research Question 2.** Crosstabulations and chi-square statistics were used to determine whether there were relationships among districts in board evaluation policies and administrative procedures used to evaluate the superintendent's cabinet. Responses to questionnaire items were crossed with demographic variables including student enrollment in district, number of schools in district, and size of the superintendent's cabinet.

**Research Question 3.** Desirability of use of board policies and administrative procedures was obtained by determining frequencies, percentages, and means of desirability from the Likert scale data. Crosstabulations
on reported current use data versus desirability data were also run to determine if the board policies and administrative procedures reported as in current use for evaluating the superintendent's cabinet were those that the superintendents felt should be used.

Potential for Nonresponse Bias

Of the 139 districts surveyed, 92 responded with complete, usable questionnaires. In an effort to test for nonresponse bias, demographic characteristics of the responding and nonresponding districts were compared.

Information on student enrollment and number of schools per district was available through MDR directories, thus it was possible to determine if there were differences in the demographics of those school districts responding and those not responding to the questionnaire. Although both mean enrollment and mean number of schools per district were slightly larger for the respondents than in the districts not returning the questionnaire, these differences were not statistically significant (enrollment: t = 1.45, p<.15; number schools: t = 1.82, p<.08). In addition, t-tests revealed no statistically significant differences (p<.05) in enrollment or number of schools per district between the population and respondents to questionnaire or population
and those districts submitting documents for analysis. As a consequence, it was assumed that the responses that were received could be generalized to the entire population.
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RESULTS

This study was undertaken to determine the current status of evaluation of members of the superintendent's cabinet in selected school districts in the United States. The superintendent's cabinet was defined as central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent.

Reported in this chapter are the results of the questionnaire mailed to the superintendents of school districts in the participating associations and the information obtained from analysis of the documents received.

Profile of Respondents

Of the 139 school districts surveyed, 92 returned usable questionnaires for a response rate of 66%. The average school district consisted of 55 (sd 34) schools per district and had an enrollment of 35,000 (sd 25,000) students. All districts in the questionnaire response group served public school students from kindergarten through grade 12. Table I shows the number of responding districts
and size of the superintendents cabinet by three categories of size and two categories of number of schools.

Of the 15,376 public school districts in the United States, only 665 have student enrollments of 10,000 and greater. Thus this study represents 14% of all school districts of greater than 10,000 students. In addition, a quarter of all public school districts of greater than 20,000 students were respondents to this study. See Appendix E for additional information regarding district size.

Superintendents were asked to indicate the number of members in their cabinet--central office administrators reporting directly to and evaluated by the superintendent. As shown on Table I, most districts reported a cabinet of 7. Two-thirds of the districts reported a cabinet of seven or fewer members. The most frequently reported cabinet size was five with a median of six. One in ten districts reported cabinets of greater than 10 while only one district had a cabinet larger than 16 (i.e., 27).

No statistically significant differences (p<.05) were revealed for size of the cabinet by enrollment or number of schools per district. The average cabinet size was 6.8 for both the questionnaire respondents and those who returned documents.
Table I. Number of Districts and Size of the Superintendent's Cabinet by Enrollment and Number of Schools per District for Questionnaire Respondents and Document Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>N(^d)</th>
<th>Questionnaire Respondents</th>
<th>Document Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 92) Districts(^b)</td>
<td>(n = 71) Districts(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤20000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-40000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{a}\) Number of districts in population in this category
\(\text{b}\) Number of districts in questionnaire response group
\(\text{c}\) Average size of superintendent's cabinet
\(\text{d}\) Number of districts submitting documents for analysis
\(\text{e}\) Average size of superintendent's cabinet
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Current Policies and Procedures

Research Question 1: What board policies and administrative procedures are currently used for evaluation of the superintendent’s cabinet?

The data for research question one were obtained in two ways. The superintendent of the district was asked to complete a questionnaire indicating currently used evaluation practices. Documents, if they existed, were to be sent for analysis.

Board policies, administrative procedures, and evaluations submitted by the districts were analyzed for the same information that was requested on the questionnaire. An item was identified as present in the document only if it was specifically stated. Questionnaire responses for those districts submitting documents are included on document analysis tables for comparisons.

Multiple responses were received for most questions, thus percentages may total more than 100. To address multiple responses, a percentage response column is also included in the questionnaire response tables.

Questionnaire results are discussed first followed by document analysis results. Significant relationships between questionnaire responses and document analyses will be discussed in the appropriate document analysis sections.
Questionnaire Responses

State Mandates and Board Policy. Approximately two-thirds (65%) of those districts returning the questionnaire indicated that their state mandated evaluation of central office administrators (Table II). Over three-quarters of the districts had board policies specifying evaluation of central office administrators. When state mandates existed, virtually all districts (90%) indicated the existence of board policies for evaluation of central office administrators. In contrast, in the absence of such mandates districts were split almost equally between those who did and did not have board policy to require evaluation of these administrators (chi-square = 18, df=1, p<.01, Cramer's V=.45)

Purposes of Evaluation. Superintendents were asked to indicate all purposes for which their current evaluation of central office administrators was used. As shown on Table III, evaluation served multiple purposes. Assessing performance, establishing/changing goals or objectives, identifying strengths and weaknesses, facilitating communication/feedback, and clarifying expectations were used to some extent by almost all districts (>91%) and were the most frequently cited among all responses (12-13%). Improving performance was used to some extent by nearly 85%
### Table II. State Mandates and Board Policies for Evaluation of Superintendent's Cabinet

(n = 92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Mandate</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 18.4
df = 1
p = .0001
Cramer's V = 0.4495
Table III. Currently Used Purposes of Evaluation as Indicated by Responses to Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%Respondents</th>
<th>%Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing performance</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing/changing goals or objectives</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying strengths/weaknesses</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communication/feedback</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying Expectations</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving performance</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/staff development</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying assignment/promotion/demotion</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting system/individual from legal action</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding performance through merit pay/bonus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of respondents indicating current use of this item
*b % of respondents indicating current use of this item
*c % of total responses assigned to this item; this figure represents the responses to this item divided by the total responses to this question
of all districts and constituted more than 10% of the responses. Rewarding performance through merit pay/bonus was the least cited response (<4%) and was indicated as used by only slightly over a quarter of all districts.

Planning for Evaluation. The superintendents were asked to indicate those activities used in planning for the evaluation of the members of the their cabinet. As shown on Table IV, each of the three planning activities--conferencing to mutually establish goals, reviewing the job description, and writing objectives for performance expectations--were used to some extent by three-quarters of the districts (>73%) and were cited nearly equally (30-36%) among all responses.

Frequency of Evaluation. To determine the frequency of formal review the superintendents were asked to indicate whether review was continual, cyclical or periodic formal with frequent informal review. The three were not mutually exclusive. As shown on Table V, formal review most frequently occurred on an annual basis (38%) but cyclical review was often accompanied by either periodic or continual review on an informal basis because the superintendent has such close contact with the cabinet members. Periodic formal with frequent informal review and annual review were reported approximately equally by more than one-third of the
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Table IV. Currently Used Activities in Planning for Evaluation as Indicated by Responses to Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Activity</th>
<th>Frequency (^a)</th>
<th>% Respondents (^b)</th>
<th>% Responses (^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferring to mutually establish goals</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing evaluatee's job description</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing objectives for performance expectations</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of respondents indicating current use of this item  
\(^b\) % of respondents indicating current use of this item  
\(^c\) % of total responses assigned to this item; this figure represents the responses to this item divided by the total responses to this question
Table V. Frequency of Formal Review as Indicated by Responses to Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Review</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%Respondents</th>
<th>%Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Annual</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic formal with frequent informal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Semi-annual</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Quarterly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \) Number of respondents indicating current use of this item
\( ^b \) % of respondents indicating current use of this item
\( ^c \) % of total responses assigned to this item; this figure represents the responses to this item divided by the total responses to this question.
districts (>37%) and each received almost equal number (27%) of the total responses.

**Evaluation Method or Format.** The superintendents were asked to indicate all methods and formats used to obtain and report evaluation information in the district. As shown on Table VI, most districts obtained information for evaluation by more than one method. The most used methods or formats accommodate the wide range of requirements of members of the superintendent's cabinet since many functions are one-time or specialized. Essay/narrative/descriptive statement was reported as used by approximately two-thirds of the districts and accounted for more than one-quarter of all responses.

Rating scale, reported as currently used by one-half of the districts, was the second most cited response (21%). Results-oriented/MBO/performance objectives and performance standards were each reported as used by approximately four in ten districts. Performance standards differ from performance objectives in that standards are specific measurable results. Only one respondent reported using a forced-choice/pairs approach.

**Additional Forms of Appraisal.** The superintendents were asked to indicate who, in addition to the superintendent, was involved in the evaluation of the cabinet members. As
Table VI. Methods or Formats of Obtaining Evaluation Information as Indicated by Responses to Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method or Format</th>
<th>Frequency (92)</th>
<th>%Respondents(^b) (92)</th>
<th>%Responses(^c) (218)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay/narrative/descriptive statement</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating scale</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results-oriented/MBO/performance objectives</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance standards</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical incidents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced choice/pairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of respondents indicating current use of this item

\(^b\) % of respondents indicating current use of this item

\(^c\) % of total responses assigned to this item; this figure represents the responses to this item divided by the total responses to this question
shown on Table VII, self-appraisal was by far most frequently reported as currently used (59%) and most cited among all responses (71%). To a much lesser extent, subordinate appraisal (15%) and peer appraisal (<10%) were considered by the superintendent in evaluating members of the cabinet. One district included school board appraisal in evaluation of the cabinet member.

Collecting Data and Communicating Results. The superintendents were asked to indicate all methods used in obtaining evaluation information and to indicate the method by which results of evaluation are communicated to the cabinet member. As shown on Table VIII, more than three-quarters of the districts (>76%) reported current use of observation and/or reviewing written records as means of obtaining evaluation information.

As shown on Table IX, total responses were split almost equally (19-21%) among the various modes of communicating evaluation results to the cabinet member. Conducting a post-observation conference, allowing a comment by the evaluatee, and providing a copy of the report to the evaluatee to keep were reported as currently used by almost all of the districts (>90%). More than eight of ten districts (83%) reported that the results were written and that the evaluatee's signature was required.
Table VII. Additional Forms of Appraisal Used in Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent’s Cabinet as Indicated by Responses to Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency(^a)</th>
<th>%Respondents(^b)</th>
<th>%Responses(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-appraisal</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate appraisal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer appraisal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of respondents indicating current use of this item
\(^b\) % of respondents indicating current use of this item
\(^c\) % of total responses assigned to this item; this figure represents the responses to this item divided by the total responses to this question
Table VIII. Methods of Obtaining Evaluation Information as Indicated by Responses to Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%Respondents&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%Responses&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written records</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Number of respondents indicating current use of this item
<sup>b</sup> % of respondents indicating current use of this item
<sup>c</sup> % of total responses assigned to this item; this figure represents the responses to this item divided by the total responses to this question
Table IX. Feedback and Communication of Results of Evaluation as Indicated by Responses to Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (92)</th>
<th>%Respondents (92)</th>
<th>%Responses (406)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluatee comment allowed</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy provided to evaluatee to keep</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written report</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluatee's signature required</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of respondents indicating current use of this item
* % of respondents indicating current use of this item
* % of total responses assigned to this item; this figure represents the responses to this item divided by the total responses to this question
Means of Appeal. The superintendents were asked to indicate the mode of appeal if the cabinet member disagreed with the evaluation. As shown on Table X, virtually all (<5% with no procedures) provided a means of redress and these means were split virtually equally between formal and informal means among all responses (47%).

Document Analysis

A second method of determining current practice is to analyze district documents for policy and procedures. Of the 92 districts returning the questionnaire, 71 submitted documents for analysis. Presented below are the results obtained from the analysis of board policies, administrative procedures, and evaluation instruments submitted by the districts.

Documents were analyzed for the same information that was requested on the questionnaire. An item was identified as present in the documents only if it was specifically stated. Therefore the absence of an item in the documents does not mean that the procedure is not used in the district—only that it is not specified in the documents received. For comparison purposes, questionnaire responses for those same 71 districts are also presented on the tables.
Table X. Mode of Appeal if Cabinet Member Disagrees with Evaluation Rendered by Superintendent as Indicated by Responses to Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency(^a)</th>
<th>%Respondents(^b)</th>
<th>%Responses(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal procedures</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal procedures</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other methods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No procedures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of respondents indicating current use of this item
\(^b\) \% of respondents indicating current use of this item
\(^c\) \% of total responses assigned to this item; this figure represents the responses to this item divided by the total responses to this question
Cross tabulations and chi-square analyses of current use data versus document analysis data yielded only five significant results. These are indicated on the appropriate document analysis tables by an asterisk and are discussed in the relevant sections below. Chi-Square tables are presented in Appendix F.

**Purposes of Evaluation.** With the exception of rewarding performance, all purposes were reported as currently used more than they were specified in district documents (Table XI). Nearly 50% of the districts had documents which specified improving performance as a purpose of evaluation. Nearly one-third of the districts submitted documents that specified identifying strengths and weaknesses and modifying assignment as a purpose of evaluation. With the exception of identifying strengths and weaknesses, the purposes that were most reported (>80%) as used in response to the questionnaire were those that were least specified in policy (<20%). Only those districts that specified that evaluation was used to reward performance seemed to use evaluation for that purpose.

Of the 71 districts returning documents, less than a third (31%) included statements requiring evaluation for the purpose of modifying assignment/promotion/demotion while more than half (56%) indicated that evaluation was currently
Table XI. Purposes of Evaluation as Specifically Stated in Documents of those Districts Responding to Questionnaire and Submitting Documents for Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency (71)</th>
<th>%Documents (71)</th>
<th>%QuestRes (71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving performance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying strengths/weaknesses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying assignment/promotion/demotion</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding performance through merit pay/bonus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing performance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/staff development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communication/feedback</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying expectations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing/changing goals or objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting system/individual from legal action</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of districts with documents specifying use of this item  
\(^b\) % of districts with documents specifying use of this item  
\(^c\) % of districts indicating current use of this item on the questionnaire; this figure represents the responses to this item for those districts that returned the questionnaire and submitted documents for analysis  
\(\dagger\) Chi-square analyses yielded a significant result for this item at \(p < .05\)
used for this purpose (chi-square = 6, df = 1, p<.02, Cramer's V = 0.28).

Planning for Evaluation. All three planning activities were specified in district documents and each was specified by approximately four in ten districts (Table XII). Again, questionnaire responses suggest that planning is used in practice much more often than it is specified in policy.

Three-quarters (75%) of the 71 districts returning documents reported current use of the planning activity of having available written objectives for performance expectations while four in ten (40%) specified its use in documents (chi-square = 9, df = 1, p < 0.01, Cramer's V = 0.35). More than nine in ten (93%) of the districts specifying written objectives for performance expectations reported current use of this planning activity (Appendix F.)

Frequency of Formal Review. The period of review most specified in district documents was annual review although the most reported period of review for this group of questionnaire respondents was periodic formal with frequent informal review (Table XIII). Continual and cyclical, other were specified in approximately one-fifth to one-quarter of the district documents. 'Other' was specified as 'at least' biannual or 'at least' every third year, or every five years. Some districts specified in their documents that
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Table XII. Planning for Evaluation as Specifically Stated in Documents of those Districts Responding to Questionnaire and Submitting Documents for Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Activity</th>
<th>Frequency&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%Documents&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>%QuestRes&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferring to mutually establish objectives</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing evaluatee's job description</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing objectives for performance expectations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>74.6&lt;sup&gt;†&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Number of districts with documents specifying use of this item
<sup>b</sup> % of districts with documents specifying use of this item
<sup>c</sup> % of districts indicating current use of this item on the questionnaire; this figure represents the responses to this item for those districts that returned the questionnaire and submitted documents for analysis
<sup>†</sup> Chi-square analyses yielded a significant result for this item at p≤.05
Table XIII. Frequency of Formal Review as Specifically Stated in Documents of those Districts Responding to Questionnaire and Submitting Documents for Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Review</th>
<th>Frequency(^a) (71)</th>
<th>%Documents(^b) (71)</th>
<th>%QuestRes(^c) (71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Annual</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic formal with frequent informal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Semi-annual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Quarterly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of districts with documents specifying use of this item
\(^b\) % of districts with documents specifying use of this item
\(^c\) % of districts indicating current use of this item on the questionnaire; this figure represents the responses to this item for those districts that returned the questionnaire and submitted documents for analysis.
evaluation should occur during the first year in a position. Thus, a district may actually be using one of the periods specified on the questionnaire even though the documents specified a different period of review.

**Evaluation Method or Format.** As shown on Table XIV, nearly two-thirds of the districts submitted documents which specified the rating scale as a method or format of obtaining evaluation information while over half specified essay/narrative/descriptive statement. In reported use, essay/narrative/descriptive statement was slightly higher than rating scale. Rating scale is the only item that was reported as used less than it was specified in the documents (chi-square = 14, df = 1, p<.01, Cramer's V = 0.44).

Roughly twice as many districts indicated current use of performance standards as an appraisal method or format used in obtaining information for evaluation as those that specified its use in documents (38% and 17%, respectively; chi-square = 5, df = 1, p<.03, Cramer's V = 0.27).

**Additional Forms of Appraisal.** As in reported use, self-appraisal was the most often specified additional form of appraisal. Subordinate and peer appraisal were less often specified in district documents than reported in use on the questionnaire (Table XV).
Table XIV. Methods or Formats of Obtaining Evaluation Information as Specifically Stated in Documents of those Districts Responding to Questionnaire and Submitting Documents for Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method or Format</th>
<th>Frequency (^a) (71)</th>
<th>%Documents (^b) (71)</th>
<th>%QuestRes (^c) (71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating scale</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>57.7 (^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay/narrative/descriptive statement</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance standards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>38.0 (^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results-oriented/MBO/performance standards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical incidents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced-choice/pairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of districts with documents specifying use of this item 
\(^b\) % of districts with documents specifying use of this item 
\(^c\) % of districts indicating current use of this item on the questionnaire; this figure represents the responses to this item for those districts that returned the questionnaire and submitted documents for analysis 
\(^d\) Chi-square analyses yielded a significant result for this item at \(p \leq 0.05\)
Table XV. Additional Forms of Appraisal Included in Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent's Cabinet as Specifically Stated in Documents of those Districts Responding to Questionnaire and Submitting Documents for Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (71)</th>
<th>%Documents (71)</th>
<th>%QuestRes (71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-appraisal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate appraisal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer appraisal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Number of districts with documents specifying use of this item
\(^b\) % of districts with documents specifying use of this item
\(^c\) % of districts indicating current use of this item on the questionnaire; this figure represents the responses to this item for those districts that returned the questionnaire and submitted documents for analysis
\(^d\) Chi-square analyses yielded a significant result for this item at \(p \leq .05\)
Nearly two-thirds (63%) of the districts reported current use of self-appraisal as part of the evaluation while less than three in ten (29%) specified its use in documents (chi-square = 6, df = 1, p<.02, Cramer’s V = 0.30).

**Methods of Obtaining Evaluation Information.** As shown on Table XVI, both observation and written records were specified in district documents as methods of obtaining evaluation information. Each method was reported on the questionnaire as currently used far more frequently than it was specified in district documents.

**Feedback and Communication of Results.** As shown on Table XVII, post-observation conference was specified in documents of only six in ten districts but, according to questionnaire results, was used by virtually all districts (>94%).
Table XVI. Methods of Obtaining Evaluation Information as Specifically Stated in Documents of those Districts Responding to Questionnaire and Submitting Documents for Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%Documents</th>
<th>%QuestRes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Records</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Number of districts with documents specifying use of this item

*b % of districts with documents specifying use of this item

*c % of districts indicating current use of this item on the questionnaire; this figure represents the responses to this item for those districts that returned the questionnaire and submitted documents for analysis
Table XVII. Feedback and Communication of Results of Evaluation and Means of Appeal as Specifically Stated in Documents of those Districts Responding to Questionnaire and Submitting Documents for Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (71)</th>
<th>%Documents (71)</th>
<th>%QuestRes (71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluatee's signature required</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written report</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation conference</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluatee comment allowed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy provided to evaluatee to keep</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal means of appeal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Number of districts with documents specifying use of this item
b % of districts with documents specifying use of this item
c % of districts indicating current use of this item on the questionnaire; this figure represents the responses to this item for those districts that returned the questionnaire and submitted documents for analysis
Summary

In evaluating members of the superintendent's cabinet, districts go beyond what their documents specify. Of all items in the study, only use of the rating scale as a method/format of obtaining evaluation information was more frequently specified in the documents than reported as in current use by the districts.

The few items that yielded a significant chi-square result were those in which there was inconsistency. Inconsistency is usually not good, but in this case it is. It simply means that those districts whose documents specified use of particular procedure were using it and, in addition, many that did not specify the practice were also using it. Thus, as stated above, in evaluating members of the superintendent's cabinet districts go beyond that which is required by policy.
Comparisons Across Districts by Size

Research Question 2: Are there differences in board policies and administrative procedures among school districts of varying sizes?

Data collected via the questionnaire were analyzed according to district enrollment, number of schools per district, and by cabinet size in order to examine relationships and/or differences related to the variables. In general, policies and procedures are more alike than different across districts using these variables. Presented in this chapter are the results of the crosstabulation and chi-square statistics for those particular cases which yielded significant variations.

By Size. Analyses by size revealed several statistically significant relationships (p<.05) among districts. Both enrollment and number of schools per district showed significant relationships with frequency of formal review. In comparing responses from districts with 40 or fewer schools and those with greater than 40 schools, more than twice as many districts with 40 or fewer schools conducted reviews on a semiannual basis than did those districts with more than 40 schools per district (chi-square = 5.3, df = 1, Cramer's V = 0.24).

Although there were almost equal proportions of districts with 20000 or fewer students and more than 40000
students (27, 26% respectively), the smaller districts reported use of semiannual review almost 10 times more frequently than did the districts of more than 40000. In addition, districts of 20000 to 40000 students reported use of semiannual review almost seven times as frequently as did districts of over 40000 students (chi-square = 8.7, df = 2, p<.02, Cramer's V = 0.31). In contrast, the smaller districts (≤20000) less often reported use of frequent informal with periodic formal review than did larger districts (>40000). Approximately half of the districts of 20001-40000 students reported frequent informal with periodic formal review (chi-square = 9.5, df = 2, p<.01, Cramer's V = 0.32).

Thus it appears that smaller school districts conduct formal review on a semiannual basis more often than larger districts.

By Cabinet Size. Districts with a cabinet of seven or fewer members were almost equally split between those who did and did not use frequent informal with periodic formal review while only one-fifth of those districts with cabinets of more than seven used this cycle of review (chi-square = 5.1, df = 1, p<.03, Cramer's V = 0.24).
Research Question 3: Are there differences in what is currently used and what the superintendents think desirable in terms of evaluating members of the superintendent's cabinet?

The superintendents were asked to complete the questionnaire in terms of evaluation policies and procedures currently used and to indicate the extent to which they believe each item is desirable as a component in evaluation of the members of the cabinet. A five point Likert scale was used in which 0 represented "not at all" and 4 represented "most" desirable. Current use results are presented as percentages on Tables XVIII through XXIV on which the desirability results are presented. Desirability tables include the percentage of districts reporting current use of the item, the percentage of superintendents who responded to desirability of using the item, and the mean of all responses on the 0-4 Likert scale for the item. The mean of the responses on the Likert scale is labeled the mean desirability score (mds).

As in current use, the purpose of evaluation considered most desirable was assessment of performance. The least desirable, as in current use, was rewarding performance through merit pay or salary increase above base pay. As shown on Table XVIII, nearly all (>96%) of the
Table XVIII. Desirability: Purposes of Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent's Cabinet
(n = 92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Evaluation</th>
<th>%Use</th>
<th>%DesUse</th>
<th>mds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing performance</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing/changing goals or objectives</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying expectations</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying strengths/weaknesses</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communication/feedback</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving performance</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/staff development</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying assignment/promotion/demotion</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting system/individual from legal action</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding performance through merit pay/bonus</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a % of districts reporting this item as currently used
b % of superintendents responding to desirability of use of this item
c mean desirability score—average of all Likert responses where 4.0 is most desirable, 0 not at all desirable
superintendents responded to this question and indicated assessing performance, establishing/changing goals or objectives, clarifying expectations, and identifying strengths and weaknesses as highly desirable purposes of evaluation with mean desirability scores of at least 3.69.

Use of all three planning activities was indicated as desirable by more superintendents than those who reported currently using the activities. More than nine of ten superintendents responded to this question and indicated use of all three planning activities as desirable (mds of 3.73 to 3.23) while current use ranged from 88% for conferencing to mutually establish objectives to less than three quarters (74%) having available written objectives for performance expectations (Table XIX).

Periodic formal with frequent informal review was rated as desirable (mds of 3.45) and was responded to by more than half (51%) of the responding superintendents. Annual review, the most frequent review period in current use, received a higher mean desirability score (3.50) but was based on fewer respondents (38%). These comparisons are shown on Table XX.

The most desirable method or format indicated for obtaining evaluation information was the essay/narrative/descriptive statement. As shown on Table XXI, more than
Table XIX. Desirability: Use of Planning Activities in Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent's Cabinet  
(n = 92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Activity</th>
<th>%Use</th>
<th>%DesUse</th>
<th>mds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing to mutually establish objectives</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing objectives for performance expectations</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing evaluatee's job description</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a % of districts reporting this item as currently used  
b % of superintendents responding to desirability of use of this item  
c mean desirability score--average of all Likert responses where 4.0 is most desirable, 0 not at all desirable
Table XX. Desirability: Frequency of Formal Review in Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent's Cabinet  
(n = 92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Review</th>
<th>%Use $^a$</th>
<th>%DesUse $^b$</th>
<th>mds $^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, Annual</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic formal with frequent informal</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, semiannual</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical, quarterly</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ % of districts reporting this item as currently used  
$^b$ % of superintendents responding to desirability of use of this item  
$^c$ mean desirability score--average of all Likert responses where 4.0 is most desirable, 0 not at all desirable
Table XXI. Desirability: Methods or Formats for Obtaining Information for Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent’s Cabinet

(n = 92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Format</th>
<th>%Use</th>
<th>%DesUse</th>
<th>mds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay/narrative/descriptive statement</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results-oriented/MBO/performance objectives</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance standards</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating scale</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical incidents</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced-choice/pairs</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % of districts reporting this item as currently used

b % of superintendents responding to desirability of use of this item

c mean desirability score--average of all Likert responses where 4.0 is most desirable, 0 not at all desirable

Chapter Four
three-quarters (76%) of the superintendents returning questionnaires responded to this item while less than two-thirds (64%) indicated its current use. As in current use, forced-choice/pairs with a mean desirability score of 0.70 was the least desirable method of obtaining evaluation information. Checklist was neither much used (22%) nor considered desirable with a mean desirability score less than 1.

As shown on Table XXII, both observations and written records were considered desirable methods of obtaining evaluation information with more than three-quarters of the districts currently reporting use of both methods and over 80% responding to the use as desirable.

Although less than 60% of the districts currently included self-appraisal as part of the evaluation of members of the superintendent's cabinet, more than eight in ten responded to its use as desirable with a mean desirability score of 3.46. Peer appraisal was little used (8%); more than half of the responding superintendents indicated low desirability (mds = 2.10) in its use (Table XXIII).

With a mean desirability score of 3.8, approximately nine in ten superintendents responded to the desirability of the use of the following in communicating the results of evaluation: written report; copy provided to evaluatee to
Table XXII. Desirability: Methods of Obtaining Information for Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent's Cabinet (n = 92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>%Use(^a)</th>
<th>%DesUse(^b)</th>
<th>mds(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Records</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) % of districts reporting this item as currently used
\(^b\) % of superintendents responding to desirability of use of this item
\(^c\) mean desirability score--average of all Likert responses where 4.0 is most desirable, 0 not at all desirable
Table XXIII. Desirability: Use of Appraisal of Other than the Superintendent in Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent's Cabinet

(n = 92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Appraising</th>
<th>%Use(^a)</th>
<th>%DesUse(^b)</th>
<th>mds(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) % of districts reporting this item as currently used
\(^b\) % of superintendents responding to desirability of use of this item
\(^c\) mean desirability score--average of all Likert responses where 4.0 is most desirable, 0 not at all desirable
keep; comment allowed by evaluatee; and post conference discussion. Both the use of written report and requirement of signature on the report were indicated as desirable by more superintendents than those that indicated current use. Less than three-quarters (73%) responded to the desirability of having a formal means of redress but indicated it as desirable ($mds = 3.61$). Approximately two-thirds reported current use of a formal means of redress in their district (Table XXIV).

Crosstabulations and chi-square statistics were calculated for current use data and desirability; no statistically significant results were obtained. Desirability data was then collapsed into two categories (0-2, 3-4). Of the 35 tests, only two were statistically significant, with the likelihood these occurred by chance.
Table XXIV. Desirability: Feedback/Communication of Results of Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent's Cabinet  
\( n = 92 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%Use(^a)</th>
<th>%DesUse(^b)</th>
<th>mds(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written report</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy provided to</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluatee to keep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-conference discussion</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment allowed</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature required</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal mode of redress</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) % of districts reporting this item as currently used  
\(^{b}\) % of superintendents responding to desirability of use of this item  
\(^{c}\) mean desirability score--average of all Likert responses where 4.0 is most desirable, 0 not at all desirable
Chapter Five

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Administrators in the central office are the least studied of any sector in educational administration. Little is known about evaluation at this level. The purpose of this study was to determine the current status of evaluation of central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent. For this study these administrators were called the superintendent's cabinet.

Through a search of relevant literature on evaluation or personnel appraisal of upper and middle managers/administrators in schools and other businesses, a questionnaire addressing evaluation policies and procedures was designed to answer the following research questions:
1. What board policies and administrative procedures exist for evaluating members of the superintendent's cabinet?
2. Are there differences in board evaluation policies and administrative procedures among school districts of varying sizes?
3. How do current procedures in evaluation of the superintendent's cabinet compare to procedures the superintendents feel should be used.
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The questionnaire was comprised of the following categories with two to eight items listed per category:

1. Purposes of Evaluation
2. Planning for Evaluation
3. Frequency of Formal Review
4. Method of Data Collection
5. Sources of Data Collection
6. Communication/Feedback
7. Persons Involved in Appraisal
8. Means of Redress

The questionnaire was sent to the 139 superintendents of school districts that were members of either the Mid-Urban Superintendents Association or the National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts. Mid-Urban Superintendents Association represents school districts that serve cities of populations of 100,000 to 300,000. National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts serves the large urban and suburban school districts.

Each superintendent was asked to check those items which were currently used in evaluation of members of the cabinet and to indicate on a five point Likert scale the desirability of use of each item in evaluation of these administrators. The superintendent was also asked to specify the number of central office administrators in the
cabinet, and whether or not state mandates and/or board policies specified evaluation of central office administrators. District documents specifying evaluation policies and procedures were requested for analysis. Demographic data on the school districts was obtained from Market Data Retrieval Directories for 1988-89.

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, cross-tabulations, and chi-square tests. As stated above, the population consisted of 139 school districts holding membership in either association. Mid-Urban Superintendents was the larger association with 123 member districts. Seven districts held dual membership. The average school district in the population had a student enrollment of 32,300 and 51 schools. For those districts responding to the questionnaire, the mean student enrollment was 34,500 and the number of schools per district, 55.

Of the less than 16,000 public school districts in the United States, only 665 have student enrollments of 10,000 and greater. Therefore, the respondents to this study represent 25% of all public school districts in the United States with enrollments of 20,000 or more students and 14% of all districts with enrollments of 10,000 or more students.

Chapter Five
Seven in ten of the districts returned the questionnaire. Ninety-four percent of those were usable for a response rate of 66.2%. More than three-quarters of those returning the questionnaire also submitted documents for analysis.

Summary of Findings

Research Question 1. Current board policies and administrative procedures for evaluating members of the superintendent's cabinet include:

1. Formal evaluation of central office administrators was mandated by the state for two-thirds of the districts responding to the questionnaire and was specified in board policy in more than three-quarters.

2. The size of the superintendents cabinet--central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent--varied from 2-27 with a mean of 7.

3. Evaluation of members of the superintendent's cabinet served multiple purposes. The most frequently reported purpose in current use was "assessing performance" while the most frequently specified purpose in documents was "to improve performance". The biggest discrepancy in current use and documents seemed to be in "Rewarding
performance through merit pay or salary increases above base salary". This was the fourth most specified purpose in the documents but least reported as a currently used purpose of evaluation. The five purposes reported in response to the questionnaire as currently used most (by more than 9 in 10 districts) were "assessing performance", "establishing/changing goals or objectives", "identifying strengths and weaknesses", "facilitating communication or feedback", and "clarifying expectations". The purposes most frequently specified in district documents include: "improving performance", "identifying strengths and weaknesses", "modifying assignment", "rewarding performance", and "assessing performance".

4. Planning for evaluation (88.0%) consisted of a conference between the superintendent and the cabinet member to "mutually establish objectives" and usually included a "review of the job description" (78.3%) and "having available written performance expectations" (73.9%).

5. Formal review occurred "annually" in most districts followed closely by "periodic formal with frequent informal review".

6. Districts used multiple formats or methods to obtain evaluation information. According to questionnaire responses, the most frequently used format was the "essay,
narrative, or descriptive statement" while the format most specified in district documents was the "rating scale". "Results-oriented or Management-by-Objectives" was reported as currently used by less than half of the districts.

7. Evaluation information was obtained through "observation" in nearly 90% of the districts and included perusal of "written records" in three-quarters of the districts.

8. "Self-appraisal" was considered as part of the evaluation in approximately 6 of 10 districts. Subordinate and peer appraisal were rarely used.

9. Results were most frequently communicated in a post-conference discussion and usually included a written report which was signed by and given to the cabinet member to keep. If the administrator disagreed with the evaluation, a comment was allowed on the report.

10. Nearly all districts reported some means of redress if the administrator disagreed with the evaluation rendered by the superintendent. Two-thirds of the districts had formal means of redress and two-thirds reported informal means.

11. In practice, the districts generally go beyond the specifications in their documents.
Research Question 2. Few statistically significant differences were found in policies and procedures used by the districts of varying sizes. Those that were found are:

1. Frequency of formal review varied by size of the district. Smaller districts, in terms of both number of schools and student enrollment, reported reviewing members of the cabinet on semiannual basis more often than did larger districts.

2. Cabinets exceeding seven members were less likely to be reviewed on a periodic formal with frequent informal basis than were those cabinets of seven or fewer members.

Research Question 3. Board policies and administrative procedures currently used were compared with those the superintendents indicated as desirable.

1. Those policies and procedures most frequently reported as currently used were generally those that the superintendents indicated as most desirable.

2. Superintendents indicated self-appraisal as a desirable component of evaluation even though it was reported as currently used by fewer than 60% of the districts.
Conclusions

Based on the results of this study the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. In comparison to current literature on evaluation, superintendents do that which they should do in terms of evaluating members of their cabinet. Thus, state of practice is roughly coincident with the state of the art.

2. Considering what superintendents reported as current practice in evaluating members of their cabinet, then districts exceed in practice that which they are required to do in terms of their district policy. Thus, practice exceeds policy.

Speculation

Even though in practice evaluation of members of the cabinet exceeded that which was required, and superintendents indicated that what they were currently doing was, in general, desirable, there is still room for improvement in some areas. Superintendents indicated that others beyond themselves should be involved in evaluating members of the cabinet. The most desirable source of additional information indicated on the questionnaire was the individual cabinet member.
Recommendations for Further Study

This is a beginning in a field for which there is scant information in the literature in either educational administration or business administration. If a similar study were to be undertaken, I would recommend the following:

1. Conduct personal interviews with the superintendents to elicit the evaluation policies and procedures used.

2. Conduct a similar survey study of members of the cabinet as well as the superintendent to compare that which the superintendent claims is occurring with the cabinet members perception of current policies and procedures used in their evaluation.

3. Ask superintendents individually about the desirability of each item since often only those that were used were rated in terms of desirability.

4. Conduct a comparison study in which several superintendents of school systems and CEO's of corporations are interviewed as to procedures used in evaluating members of their cabinets to determine how closely evaluation at this level is related in the two sectors.
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Appendix A

Census Questionnaire and Letters to Association Members
EVALUATION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Please complete the items below pertaining to the evaluation of central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by you, the superintendent:

1. How many central office administrators report directly to and are evaluated directly by you? ___

2. Does your state mandate evaluation of central office administrators? yes___ no___

3. Does board policy specify formal evaluation of central office administrators? yes___ no___

Respond to each of the remaining items in two ways: (1) in the first column, check any item that is CURRENTLY USED in evaluation of central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by you; and (2) on the scale in the second column, indicate to what extent you feel it is DESIRABLE that the item be included in evaluation of these administrators by circling the appropriate number where 0 = not at all to 4 = most desirable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENTLY USED</th>
<th>DESIRABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. assessing performance</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. establishing/changing goals or objectives</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. facilitating communication/feedback</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. clarifying expectations</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. identifying strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. improving performance</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. modifying assignment/promotion/demotion</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. rewarding performance through merit pay/bonus above base salary</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. protecting system/individual from legal action</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. training/staff development</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. other ____________________________________________</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Initial planning for the evaluation process includes:

a. reviewing evaluates’s job description | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| b. conferencing to mutually establish objectives | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| c. having available written objectives for performance expectations | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| d. other ____________________________________________ | 0 1 2 3 4 |
6. What is the frequency of formal review:
   a. continual
   b. cyclical
      quarterly
      semi-annually
      other
   c. periodic formal with frequent informal review

   CURRENTLY USED  DESIRABLE
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4

7. Which of following appraisal methods or formats are used in obtaining information for evaluation:
   a. checklist
   b. rating scale
   c. essay/narrative/
      descriptive statement
   d. forced choice/pairs
   e. performance standards
   f. critical incidents
   g. results-oriented/
      MBO-performance objectives
   h. other____________________

   CURRENTLY USED  DESIRABLE
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4

8. Other methods of obtaining information for evaluation include:
   a. observations
   b. written records
   c. other____________________

   CURRENTLY USED  DESIRABLE
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4

9. Results of evaluation are communicated to evaluatee by:
   a. written report
   b. post conference discussion
   c. other____________________

   CURRENTLY USED  DESIRABLE
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4
   ___ 0 1 2 3 4

10. Results of such communication:
    a. require signature of evaluatee
    b. allow for evaluatee comments
    c. are provided to evaluatee to keep
    d. other__________________

    CURRENTLY USED  DESIRABLE
    ___ 0 1 2 3 4
    ___ 0 1 2 3 4
    ___ 0 1 2 3 4
    ___ 0 1 2 3 4
11. In addition to your appraisal, the following forms of appraisal are included in the evaluation:

a. self-appraisal
b. peer appraisal
c. subordinate appraisal
d. other

CURRENTLY 
USED

DESIRABLE

0 1 2 3 4

0 1 2 3 4

0 1 2 3 4

0 1 2 3 4

12. If the evaluatee disagrees with the evaluation, the following modes of redress are available:

a. formal
b. informal
c. none
d. other

CURRENTLY 
USED

DESIRABLE

0 1 2 3 4

0 1 2 3 4

0 1 2 3 4

0 1 2 3 4

Thank you for your time. In the space below, please feel free to make additional comments regarding the evaluation of central office administrators whom you evaluate.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Please remember to enclose:

1. Board Policies
   yes___ Not Applicable___
2. Administrative procedures
   yes___ Not Applicable___
3. Evaluation instrument
   yes___ Not Applicable___

Thank you.
March 29, 1989

We are aware that your school district has received many requests for information; even so, we are appealing for your support in completing a study that is being conducted by Beth James, a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech. This is a study on the policies and procedures used to evaluate central office personnel who report to and are evaluated by you as superintendent. Members of the Mid-Urban Superintendents Association will be participating in this study and results of the study will be shared with the association.

In recent years the accountability movement in education has lead to performance based evaluations for teachers, principals, and superintendents. This study is designed to determine the board policies and administrative procedures used to evaluate central office personnel who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent. Policies and procedures of Mid-Urban school districts will be analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the current status of evaluation of these personnel. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire. It should take no more than ten minutes of your time and your input will be of great value. In addition to the completed questionnaire, please include in the stamped return envelope each of the following, if available:

1) a copy of board policies pertaining to evaluation of central office personnel.
2) a copy of administrative procedures pertaining to evaluation of central office personnel.
3) a copy of the instrument used in evaluation of administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by you, the superintendent.

Confidentiality of data is assured. No individual district will be identified.

2000 Telextr Court, Falls Church, Virginia 22042
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We believe that the information requested will yield essential data critical to the current status of personnel evaluation at this level.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert N. Fortenberry, President
Mid-Urban Superintendents Association

[Signature]

Kenneth Underwood, Professor
Educational Administration
College of Education
Virginia Tech

[Signature]

Beth James
Doctoral Candidate
Virginia Tech
We are aware that your school district has received many requests for information; even so, we are appealing for your support in completing a study that is being conducted by Beth James, a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech. This is a study on the policies and procedures used to evaluate central office personnel who report to and are evaluated by you as superintendent. Members of the National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts will be participating in this study. Results of the study will be shared with the association.

In recent years the accountability movement in education has lead to performance based evaluations for teachers, principals, and superintendents. This study is designed to determine the board policies and administrative procedures used to evaluate central office personnel who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent. Policies and procedures of National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts will be analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the current status of evaluation of these personnel.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire. It should take no more than ten minutes of your time and your input will be of great value. In addition to the completed questionnaire, please include in the stamped return envelope each of the following, if available:

1) a copy of board policies pertaining to evaluation of central office personnel.
2) a copy of administrative procedures pertaining to evaluation of central office personnel.
3) a copy of the instrument used in evaluation of administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by you, the superintendent.

Confidentiality of data is assured. No individual district will be identified.
We believe that the information requested will yield essential data critical to the current status of personnel evaluation at this level.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Frank E. Barham

Frank E. Barham, Executive Consultant
National Federation of Urban-Suburban
School Districts

Kenneth Underwood, Professor
Educational Administration
College of Education
Virginia Tech

Beth James
Doctoral Candidate
Virginia Tech
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April 24, 1989

On March 30, 1989 we mailed you a questionnaire regarding evaluation of central office administrators in Mid-Urban Superintendents Association. At this time we have not received a reply from your district.

It is most important that we receive a reply from your district in order that the Association is well represented. Enclosed is another packet with a return envelope.

If we can be of assistance, please call Beth James at 703-451-6257.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert N. Forstenberry, President
Mid-Urban Superintendents Association

Kenneth Underwood, Professor
Educational Administration
College of Education
April 24, 1989

On March 30, 1989 we mailed you a questionnaire regarding evaluation of central office administrators in National Federation of Urban-Suburban School Districts. At this time we have not received a reply from your district.

It is most important that we receive a reply from your district in order that NFUSSD is well represented. Enclosed is another packet with a return envelope.

If we can be of assistance, please call Beth James at 703-451-6257.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Frank E. Barham, Executive Consultant
National Federation of Urban-Suburban
School Districts

Kenneth Underwood, Professor
Educational Administration
College of Education
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Document Analysis Worksheet
1. ID code __________

2. ___Written board policy re evaluation of central office administrators

3. ___Written administrative procedures re evaluation of central office administrators

4. Purposes of evaluation include:
   ___ assessing performance
   ___ establishing/changing goals or objectives
   ___ clarifying expectations
   ___ facilitating communication/feedback
   ___ identifying strengths and weaknesses
   ___ improving performance
   ___ modifying assignment/promotion/demotion
   ___ rewarding performance
   ___ protecting system/individual
   ___ training/staff development
   ___ other______________________

5. Planning for evaluation includes:
   ___ reviewing administrator's job description
   ___ conferring to mutually establish objectives
   ___ written objectives
   ___ other______________________

6. Frequency of formal review:
   ___ continual
   ___ cyclical:
      ___ quarterly ___ semiannually
      ___ annually ___ other
   ___ periodic formal with frequent informal review
7. Method of data collection:

___ checklist
___ rating scale
___ essay/narrative/descriptive statement
___ forced choice/pairs
___ performance standards
___ critical incidents
___ results-oriented (MBO-performance objectives)
___ other__________________________

8. Sources of data collection:

___ observations
___ written records
___ other__________________________

9. Feedback:

___ written report
___ post conference discussion
___ other__________________________

10. Results of such communication

___ require signature of administrator
___ allow comments by administrator
___ are provided to evaluatee to keep
___ other__________________________

11. In addition to superintendent, appraisal includes:

___ self-appraisal
___ peer appraisal
___ subordinate appraisal
___ other__________________________

12. Means of redress if administrator disagrees with evaluation:

___ formal
___ informal
___ none
___ other__________________________
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Pilot Study: Letter, Questionnaire, and Critique Form
Dr. Sidney L. Faucette, Superintendent
Stafford County Schools
1729 Jefferson Davis Hwy.
Stafford, VA 22554

Dr. Faucette,

Thank you for agreeing to pilot my questionnaire on evaluation of the superintendent's cabinet.

As I explained on the phone, I am a Doctoral candidate at Va Tech. The subject of my dissertation is evaluation of the superintendent's cabinet—those members of the central office who report directly to and/or are evaluated directly by the superintendent. It would be most helpful if you would complete the questionnaire and make comments about the appropriateness of the items. If any item is unclear, please comment directly on the questionnaire or on the supplemental attachment.

I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the documents.

Thank you very much for your help. If you are interested in the results of the study, I will be glad to share them with you when the study is complete.

Thank you,

Beth James

Appendix C
A Study of Policies and Procedures Used to Evaluate Members of the Superintendent’s Cabinet in Selected School Districts in the United States, 1988-89

In recent years the accountability movement in education has led to performance-based evaluations for teachers, principals, and division superintendents. Organizational structure points to the central office as a critical leadership role in the school system. If all school personnel are to be held accountable, and evaluation is a tool of accountability, then all school personnel should be evaluated. If an evaluation system is going to be effective it must be supported by the total environment of the organization; without use of evaluation at the highest level of the school system, acceptance of its use at lower levels will be retarded.

The purpose of this study is to determine policies and procedures used to evaluate central office personnel who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent. Titles for these personnel differ from district to district. To avoid confusion those personnel who report directly to the superintendent and are evaluated by the superintendent will be defined as the "superintendent’s cabinet." Policies and procedures of selected school districts in the United States will be analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the current status of evaluation of the superintendent’s cabinet. These policies and procedures will also be analyzed for similarities among districts and similarities to policies and procedures recommended by the superintendents as what should be used in evaluating the superintendent’s cabinet.

Linda Bethel (Beth) James
Virginia Tech

Doctoral candidate

Committee members:

Kenneth Underwood
Houston Conley
Robert Spillane

Gabriella Belli
Wayne Worner
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Evaluation of Members of the Superintendent's Cabinet

The purpose of this survey is to determine the policies and procedures used to evaluate members of the superintendent's cabinet (central office administrators who report directly to and are evaluated by the superintendent) in selected school districts in the United States.

1. How many central office administrators report directly to and are evaluated directly by the superintendent?

2. Does your state mandate evaluation of central office administrators? yes__ no__

3. Does board policy specify formal evaluation of central office administrators? yes__ no__

In spaces on the left check all items which currently apply to evaluation of the superintendent's cabinet; on the right check those items you feel should be included in evaluation of members of your cabinet.

4. Purposes of evaluation include:

   assessing performance __ __
   establishing/changing goals or objectives __ __
   clarifying expectations __ __
   facilitating communication/feedback __ __
   identifying strengths and weaknesses __ __
   improving performance __ __
   modifying assignment/promotion/demotion __ __
   rewarding performance __ __
   protecting system/individual __ __
   other (__________) __ __

5. Evaluation planning includes:
   reviewing administrator's job description __ __
   conference to mutually establish objectives __ __
   written objectives for performance expectations __ __

6. Frequency of formal review:
   continual __ __
   cyclical:
   quarterly __ __
   semi-annually __ __
   annually __ __
   other (__________) __ __
   periodic formal with frequent informal review __ __
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7. Methods of data collection:

- checklist
- rating scale
- essay/narrative/descriptive statement
- forced choice/pairs
- performance standards
- critical incidents
- results-oriented (MBO-performance objectives)

8. Sources of data collection:

- observations
- questions asked of clients/subordinates
- written records (artifacts)
- school board member opinions

9. Feedback:

- written
- conference
- requires signature of administrator
- comments by administrator allowed
- written copy provided to administrator

10. In addition to the superintendent's appraisal, the following are included:

- self-appraisal
- peer appraisal
- subordinate appraisal

11. Means of redress if administrator disagrees with evaluation:

- formal
- informal
- no action

12. Superintendent has received evaluation training:

- none
- at regional level
- at state level
- at national level
- other (___________)

Thank you for your time. Please feel free to make additional comments regarding the evaluation of members of your cabinet in the space below and on the back of this page.
Questionnaire Critique Form

As you complete the questionnaire on evaluation of the superintendent's cabinet, please consider the following points. Any additional comments which you may wish to make either on the questionnaire or on this sheet will be appreciated.

1. Is the format of the questionnaire easy to follow? ___Yes ___No

2. Are the directions for completing the questionnaire complete? ___Yes ___No

3. Is the meaning of each question easily understood? ___Yes ___No

4. Are the response options for each question adequate? ___Yes ___No

5. Does any aspect of the questionnaire suggest bias on the part of the researcher? ___Yes ___No

6. Is the length of the questionnaire appropriate? ___Yes ___No

7. How long did it take you to complete the questionnaire? _______ minutes

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
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States Mandating Evaluation of Administrators
The following states were listed as requiring evaluation of administrators as per a 1985 ERS Study:

Alaska
Arizona
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Florida
Hawaii
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Mississippi
Montana
Nevada
New Jersey
New Mexico
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Virginia
Washington
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Additional Information on Size of Districts
Table 1. Enrollment in Districts of Questionnaire Respondents Compared to Districts in US and in Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Questionnaire Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15,376)ᵡ</td>
<td>(139)</td>
<td>(92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 10,000</td>
<td>14,711</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-40,000</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data obtained from National Center for Educational Statistics for 1988-89. Numbers may vary slightly depending upon source.*
Table 2. Enrollment in Districts by Quartiles of Questionnaire Respondents Compared to Districts in US and in Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US (15,376)\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Population (139)</th>
<th>Questionnaire Respondents (92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 17,761</td>
<td>15071</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 27,062</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 39,795</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 142,000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 142,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Data obtained from National Center for Educational Statistics for 1988-89. Numbers may vary slightly depending upon source.
Table 3. Schools in Districts by Quartiles of Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartile</th>
<th>Population (139)</th>
<th>Questionnaire Respondents (92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 183</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Current Use vs Document Analysis Tables
Table 1. Current Use vs Document Analysis: Modifying Assignment as a Purpose of Evaluation (71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification in Documents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 5.6795

df = 1

p = 0.0172

Cramer's V = 0.2828
Table 2. Current Use vs Document Analysis: Written Performance Expectations as a Planning Activity
(71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently Use</th>
<th>Specification in Documents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{chi-square} = 8.8233\]
\[\text{df} = 1\]
\[p = 0.0030\]
\[\text{Cramer's V} = 0.3525\]
Table 3. Current Use vs Document Analysis: Rating Scale as an Appraisal Method of Format

(71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently Use</th>
<th>Specification in Documents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 13.9934  
df = 1  
p = 0.0002  
Cramer's V = 0.4439
Table 4. Current Use vs Document Analysis: Performance Standards as an Appraisal Method or Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently Use</th>
<th>Specification in Documents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 5.0256  
df = 1  
p = 0.0250  
Cramer's V = 0.2661
Table 5. Current Use vs Document Analysis: Use of Self-Appraisal in Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently Use</th>
<th>Specification in Documents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 6.4087  
df = 1  
p = 0.0114  
Cramer's V = 0.3004
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Search of Literature Matrix
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