

THE EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES EMPLOYED
TO ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF SECONDARY PUBLIC
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN VIRGINIA,

by

James Earl Rountree //

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Educational Administration

APPROVED:

~~_____~~
G. T. Earthman, Chairman

J. Flou

W. M. Worner

L. McCluskey

P. K. Edwards

December, 1981
Blacksburg, Virginia

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, , and sons, and , for their sacrifice and support. Without their love, encouragement, understanding, and patience this study would not have been completed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is indebted and sincerely appreciative to those who have contributed to the development of this study. Deep gratitude is expressed to Dr. Glen I. Earthman, Graduate Committee Chairman, for his sincere guidance, encouragement, personal interest, and untiring counsel throughout this study. Much appreciation and gratitude are also expressed to , Dr. Lawrence McCluskey, Dr. Wayne M. Worner, Dr. Patricia K. Edwards, and Dr. Josiah Tlou who also provided counsel and guidance as members of the Graduate Committee.

Appreciation is also due to the "Review Panel"--

, and who helped validate the research instrument that was employed in this study.

Special appreciation is extended to the division superintendents in Virginia who employed their valuable time to complete and return the questionnaires. Without their cooperation, this study could not have been done.

Appreciation is expressed to who employed her valuable time at the shortest possible notice to read the rough draft of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Significance of the Problem	5
Assumptions	5
Limitations	6
Definition of Terms	6
Organization of the Study	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
STUDIES RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE EVALU- ATION	8
Studies Related to Administrative Perfor- mance Evaluation	9
Studies Related to Participation in Evaluation	11
Studies Related to Administrative Evalu- ation Criteria	13
STUDIES RELATED TO PURPOSES OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION	16
STUDIES RELATED TO PROCEDURES/METHODOLOGY OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION	24
SUMMARY	45

Chapter	Page
III. METHODOLOGY	48
DESIGN OF STUDY	48
PRELIMINARY SURVEY	50
Descriptive Analysis of the Preliminary Survey Results	51
POPULATION	56
DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT - MAJOR SURVEY	56
Validation of the Instrument	59
DATA COLLECTION	60
Nature of Returns	61
DATA ANALYSIS	61
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	63
DATA TREATMENT	65
FINDINGS	67
Sub-Question One	67
Sub-Question Two	73
Sub-Question Three	76
Sub-Question Four	78
Sub-Question Five	78
Sub-Question Six	84
Sub-Question Seven	88
Sub-Question Eight	89
PERSONAL WRITE-IN COMMENTS BY SUPER- INTENDENTS	90

Chapter	Page
DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA . .	91
DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION DATA . .	94
SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER	97
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	103
THE PROBLEM	103
SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES	105
The Population and Procedures	105
Development of the Questionnaires	106
Data Treatment and Statistical Analysis .	107
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	108
The Preliminary Survey	108
Summary of Sub-Question One	110
Summary of Sub-Question Two	113
Summary of Sub-Question Three	113
Summary of Sub-Question Four	115
Summary of Sub-Question Five	115
Summary of Sub-Question Six	117
Summary of Sub-Question Seven	119
Summary of Sub-Question Eight	120
CONCLUSIONS	120
DISCUSSION	121
IMPLICATIONS	123
RECOMMENDATIONS	125
Recommendations for Further Research . .	125

Chapter	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	127
APPENDICES	134
A. LETTER TO DIVISION SUPERINTENDENTS RE- GARDING THE PRELIMINARY SURVEY AND THE PRELIMINARY SURVEY QUESTION- NAIRE	135
B. LETTER TO DIVISION SUPERINTENDENTS REGARDING THE INSTRUMENT	138
C. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT	140
D. LETTER TO REVIEW PANEL	151
E. ROSTER OF PANEL MEMBERS	153
F. FOLLOW-UP LETTER	155
G. TABLES CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES REGARDING THE SOQ EVALUATION CRITERIA	157
H. TABLES CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES REGARDING THE NON-SOQ EVALUATION CRITERIA	166
I. TABLE CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES REGARDING THE IMPOR- TANCE OF THE PROCEDURES EMPLOYED TO GATHER DATA TO MAKE PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS	171
J. TABLE CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES REGARDING THE PURPOSES OF THE EVALUATION OF SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS	174
K. TABLE CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE OVERALL EVALUATION PROCESS	177
L. TABLES CONTAINING ALL NON-SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION FIVE	179

Chapter	Page
M. TABLES CONTAINING ALL NON-SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION SIX	184
N. TABLES CONTAINING ALL NON-SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION SEVEN	189
O. TABLES CONTAINING ALL NON-SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION EIGHT	193
P. TABLES CONTAINING SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION FIVE	198
Q. TABLES CONTAINING SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION SIX	200
VITA	202
ABSTRACT	

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Preliminary Survey - Evaluation Process Which Best Describes Those Used in Virginia School Divisions to Evaluate Secondary Principals	53
2. Preliminary Survey - Basis for Arriving at the Secondary Principals' Evaluation in Virginia School Divisions	55
3. Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Standards of Quality Evaluation Criteria as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia	68
4. Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Non-Standards of Quality Evaluation Criteria as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia	71
5. Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of Procedures Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations in Virginia	74
6. Importance Placed on Purposes of Evaluating Secondary Public School Principals in Virginia	77
7. Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Overall Evaluation Process of Secondary Public School Principals in Virginia	79
8. School Division Size and the Importance of Evaluation Criteria	81
9. School Division Size and the Importance of Evaluation Procedures	86
10. Summary of Types of Administrative School Divisions and School Division Sizes (Enrollment) in Virginia	92

Table		Page
11.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Years Respondents Served as Division Superintend- ents in Virginia	93
12.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Types of Instruments Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals in Virginia	95
13.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Who Formally Evaluates Secondary Principals in School Divisions in Virginia	96
14.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of How Often a Formal Written Evaluation Is Done in School Divisions and Whether a Conference Is Held After Evaluation Has Been Completed in Virginia	98

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The demand for educational accountability has increased the need for the formal evaluation of public school principals in Virginia. The public in demanding educational accountability has become very articulate with regard to holding all school personnel accountable for educational outcomes.

As a result of the "Standards of Quality for Public Schools," it is now incumbent upon all division superintendents in Virginia to develop specific procedures for measuring and providing evidence concerning the effectiveness of school principals. Because of the principal's position in the organization, he or she is the single most important determinant of the educational climate in a school, and many boards of education and superintendents believe that the principalship is the logical commencing point for initiating a formal system of administrative evaluation (Green, 1972: IX-X).

In 1972, the new Virginia Constitution required the State Legislature and State Board of Education to promulgate the "Standards of Quality." The mandated standard pertaining to the evaluation of administrators specifies that:

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. (Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools, 1972:74).

The SOQ mandated standard specifically requires that principals shall be evaluated in terms of eight performance criteria. The principal shall: (1) develop an annual school plan; (2) develop a handbook of policies and procedures; (3) coordinate services of persons working in the school; (4) assign pupils to classes, programs, and activities; (5) provide instructional materials and equipment; (6) evaluate pupils' progress and instructional effectiveness; (7) supervise instruction and assist teachers; and (8) provide for a cooperative evaluation program (Evaluation of Personnel, 1972:119-121). These performance criteria are employed for the purpose of assessing the performance of secondary public school principals, and they are also used to aid evaluators in determining levels of effectiveness and acceptable performance.

Evaluation by objectives is the method that the State Department of Education recommends for evaluating secondary public school principals. The purpose of this approach is to determine administrative weaknesses and then to develop measurable objectives in which improvement can be achieved. This administrative evaluation approach is based upon the assumptions that performance criteria are employed to assess administrative performance, that administrative

performance can be measured in terms of the criteria, and that improvement of performance can be attained.

There has been no research done that pertains to the assessment of the evaluation process of secondary public school principals in regard to the "Standards of Quality" mandate, which requires that all principals shall be evaluated for the purpose of improving performance. As a result, the degree to which the stated criteria and procedures of the "Standards of Quality" are utilized by division superintendents to evaluate secondary school principals is not documented. Therefore, this seems like a profitable area of research.

Statement of the Problem

Formal evaluation criteria and procedures are set forth in the "Standards of Quality for Public Schools in Virginia" to evaluate secondary public school principals. What are the criteria and procedures used in the formal evaluation of secondary public school principals' performance in Virginia, and how important are these to the process? Further inquiries were made to determine the purposes of evaluating secondary public school principals.

The study was directed toward the following sub-questions:

1. What formal criteria are employed by division superintendents in Virginia to evaluate secondary public school

principals, and how important are these criteria?

2. What procedures are considered very important by division superintendents for gathering data to evaluate secondary public school principals?

3. What is the most important purpose and what is the least important purpose of the evaluation of secondary public school principals as identified by division superintendents?

4. Overall, how important is the evaluation process regarding secondary public school principals according to perceptions held by division superintendents?

5. Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria that are employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

6. Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

7. Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

8. Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures that are employed to gather data to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

Significance of the Problem

Since the establishment in 1972 of the formal systematic procedures for evaluating secondary public school principals, there has been no evaluation of this mandate. This study will provide some findings that may be useful to the State Department of Education in its effort to improve the "Standards of Quality" criteria. Additionally, findings from this study may provide division superintendents with recommendations by which they may improve the process and criteria that they utilize in complying with the "Standards of Quality" mandate to evaluate secondary public school principals.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in regard to this study:

1. The superintendents participating in this study were in the position to judge the importance of the evaluation

criteria and procedures employed to gather data that are employed to evaluate secondary public school principals.

2. Evaluation criteria and procedures are used to formally assess the performance of secondary public school principals.

Limitations

The study included the following limitations:

1. This study was limited to division superintendents in school divisions that were listed in the Virginia Educational Directory for the 1980-81 school year.

2. This study was limited in that the importance of the formal evaluation criteria and procedures is an evaluative judgment of the superintendents.

Definition of Terms

The terms that were used in this study are defined to provide clarity for general agreement of usage.

Evaluation -- The process in ascertaining or judging accomplishments and performance.

Standards of Quality Evaluation Criteria -- A set of predetermined evaluation standards that were enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia in 1972; they are used for the purpose of evaluating the performance of public school principals.

Organization of the Study

The study is organized in five chapters. The introduction, statement of the problem, assumptions, limitations, definition of terms, and the organization of the study are described in chapter 1. A review of literature is presented in chapter 2. The design of the study, preliminary survey, population employed, measuring instrument, data collection procedures, and the data analysis procedures are presented in chapter 3. The analysis of the data is presented in chapter 4, and a summary of the research, conclusions, and recommendations for future research are presented in chapter 5.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature has revealed that a great deal of interest has emerged in the last decade regarding evaluation of the principal's performance. This interest has prompted scholars to study and write upon various aspects of the principal's evaluation process.

In this chapter, the review of literature is organized in three sections. It deals with studies that relate to administrative evaluation, purposes of administrative evaluation, and procedures/methodology of administrative evaluation.

STUDIES RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

Ellinger's (1968) doctoral dissertation revealed the current status of programs used to evaluate professional public school personnel in twenty-four county school systems in the state of Maryland. Principals were regularly evaluated in six of sixteen, or 37.5 percent of the school systems.

The evaluation program that is employed to assess the principal's performance is very important. Rosenberg (1971) posited that the evaluation program should be a sound one, a balanced, valid, and reliable one. It should be based upon

actual on-the-job behaviors, and not theoretical tests of ability or knowledge. It should provide a comprehensive review of the principal's performance, utilizing relevant and reliable criterial standards. A self-evaluation followed up by an evaluation conducted by a team are both necessary. The evaluation must be built upon a sound and solid foundation of evidence, and the whole program will need to be relatively economical of time and energy. He further stated that:

The clear and proper goals of any administrator evaluation program ought to be constructive, developmental, and grounded in a guidance and counseling approach. In every case, there should be a post-evaluational follow-up, and joint cooperative planning for a "next step" action program, tailored to the needs of the principal. (pp. 212-213)

Studies Related to Administrative Performance Evaluation

In an unpublished doctoral dissertation at the University of Southern California, Towns (1969) determined the status of performance evaluation of secondary public school principals in Michigan. He concluded that:

1. Principals who have experienced formal performance evaluations strongly support the concept of administrative evaluation.
2. Principals who have experienced formal performance evaluations consider evaluations helpful in their administrative efficiency.
3. The prescribed rating scale method of evaluation was used slightly more often than the performance objective method of evaluation.

4. Principals indicated a high level of interest in administrative formal performance evaluation as evidenced by the percentage of respondents and many requests for the results of the study.

A practical research-based program for the competency evaluation of administrative performance was devised by Demeke (1971). His "Performance Evaluation of Educational Leaders' Roles" revealed several functions that leaders should perform. As a director of the educational program, the educational leader employs leadership skills to enhance learning opportunities and promotes the growth of students. In coordinating the program of guidance and special services, the principal facilitates the addition of a variety of rich dimensions to enhance the opportunities for normal and exceptional students. As a member of the district and school staff, the principal expounds productive team membership while moving in and out of leader and group-member roles. As a link between the community and the school the principal labors to secure understanding, acceptance, and support, internally and externally, for the total school program, while encouraging community participation in a continuing search for ways to improve the curriculum. As an administrator of personnel, the principal participates in the selection of faculty and staff personnel and then works with them so that they may realize their full potential. As a member of the profession, the principal demonstrates appreciation of the social importance of the profession by

carefully providing for personal professional growth while contributing to the profession through its organizations and by his or her own exemplary behavior. And, finally as a director of support management the principal recognizes that the only viable business of the school is the education of human beings. Therefore, an effort is made to get on with the business of improving instruction, delegating many responsibilities to other qualified individuals.

Demeke's research indicates that these seven areas are those in which principals must demonstrate competence and superintendents should evaluate principals in accordance to the accomplishment of these roles. (Demeke, 1972: 1-79)

Studies Related to Participation in Evaluation

A most significant study that dealt with the evaluation process was conducted at the General Electric Company. Faced with contradictory evidence regarding patterns of evaluation, General Electric conducted a year-long comprehensive and scientific testing of the best of their programs. The test included evaluation based on job responsibilities rather than on personal characteristics of individuals.

Tests were designed to evaluate the effects of participation in the evaluative process. One group of managers was instructed to use high participation and another to use low participation. The latter group operated in much the same way as in traditional evaluation programs. They

formulated goals for their subordinates and then conducted the review in a performance assessment conference. Results of this study were significant:

1. Those employees involved in the low participation groups reacted more defensively than those in the high participation level and achieved fewer goals.
2. The high participation group was associated with better mutual understanding between manager and subordinate, greater acceptance of goals, a better attitude toward being evaluated, and a feeling of self-realization on the job.

The study also found that:

1. Criticism has a negative effect on good achievement.
2. Praise has little effect one way or the other.
3. Appreciable improvement is realized only when specific goals and deadlines are mutually established and agreed upon.
4. Defensiveness resulting from critical evaluation produces inferior performance.
5. Mutual goal-setting, not criticism, improves performance.
6. Participation by the employee in goal-setting fosters favorable evaluation results. (Green, 1972: 7-8)

Studies Related to Administrative Evaluation Criteria

Mac Queen's (1969) doctoral dissertation dealt with formulating and establishing the importance of various criteria for evaluating the job performance of a high school principal. The survey covered a cross-section of school districts in the United States.

Superintendents rated highly the importance of seventy criteria for evaluating the job performance of a high school principal, while principals rated the criteria only slightly lower and teachers afforded the lowest rating. However, uniformity of opinion was evident among the three groups of respondents, as there were only eleven instances in which there were as many as ten points between the highest and lowest mean scores accorded a criterion. In every instance, the lowest score was accorded by teachers.

Among those criteria that were rated very important were the principal:

1. Develops with the staff an atmosphere of purposeful, cooperative action.
2. Interprets and clarifies the goals of the district to the faculty.
3. Gives guidance and support to personnel selection for the school.
4. Provides the opportunities for others to communicate with him/her.

5. Earns respect as an educational leader in the community.

Palucci (1978) stated that the most often employed criteria for the purpose of evaluating principals in Lake County, Illinois were resourcefulness/creativity/innovativeness, along with decision-making effectiveness. Personal traits (i.e. enthusiasm, initiative, etc.) and leadership ability, were the second most frequently employed criteria. The criterion of policy implementation and the criterion of participation in community affairs/activities/organizations were the least frequent in terms of use by superintendents.

Corwin (1965) stated that:

Basically, there are two sets of criteria for evaluating principals, one official and the other informal. Because the formal roles always embrace the informal ones, informal roles are taken into consideration during evaluation. The official bases for evaluation are competence and seniority rank; but unofficially, such criteria as agreement with superiors and personal compatibility with them and with peers (favoritism, friendship, and other personal and social considerations) are also involved. Evaluation, accordingly is the point at which various inconsistent expectations in the school division are compromised. In this sense, evaluation has a pivotal function. (p. 279)

The evaluation of the principal's performance requires attention to both dimensions of that performance, process and task declared, Abbott (1975). The criteria for evaluation should be drawn from expectations for performance that are held by relevant reference groups, with appropriate

attention being given to the conflicts that exist regarding those expectations.

There are many groups that hold expectations for the performance of the principal, including parents, professional peers, legal agencies, and community interest groups, all of which are secondary reference groups. The primary interest groups, subordinates and superordinates, are members of the organization and are those whose expectations provide the major source of evaluative criteria. In developing principals' evaluation criteria, it is essential to pay attention to the need for both facilitative and controlling behavior. This means that the expectations from which the criteria are drawn should be generated from personnel in the organization, school or school district, in which the performance is being evaluated. (pp. 52-64)

Campbell and Gregg (1957) have cited an important step in the evaluation process, and they emphasized that developing criteria by which to judge the principal is important. The persons who develop the criteria should make use of available knowledge and expert opinions from those who must be evaluated, but the accepted criteria should represent more than a summarization of opinions. It should encompass the principal's job description, predetermined goals of the school system, and objectives that the principal believes should be accomplished. It is important that the persons

who are involved in the evaluation mutually agree upon the criteria which are to be used. (pp. 312-316)

STUDIES RELATED TO PURPOSES OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

Harris, McIntyre, Littleton, and Long (1979) identified three purposes of evaluating principals and they stated:

Three of the most important purposes are: (1) formative evaluation--to assist in making evaluation more effective as it goes along; (2) summative evaluation--to provide a basis for making decisions at the conclusion of task performance; and (3) validation of the selection process--to test the predictive validity of whatever causes were influential at the time of selection. (pp. 289-290)

A variety of purposes exist for evaluating principals. Nygaard (1974) has emphasized that the purposes of evaluating principals are: (1) to point out continuing education needs; (2) to determine whether the organization should transfer, demote, or dismiss; (3) to provide an official appraisal record of the principal's performance; (4) to determine the degree to which decisions are sound, timely, and effectively carried out; (5) to establish objectives for school-based administrators' improvement; and (6) to motivate self-improvement. (pp. 3-4)

Virginia's Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives (1972) made it clear about the intent of the purpose of evaluating principals. The purposes of evaluating principals are to eliminate those who are incompetent,

to assess principals for promotion, and to enhance professional development. Although these and other purposes may be served simultaneously by the evaluation process, the central thrust is directed toward improvement of performance. (p. 74)

Marcotte (1978) stated that the purpose of evaluation is communication. It is a two-way communication process between the person being evaluated and the evaluator, with the desired result of improving performance. The more the purpose of evaluation moves toward ranking principals, differentiating among them, or determining merit raises, the more it moves away from improvement of performance, and the less valid are the arguments for keeping the process flexible and assuring that real communication is attained. (p. 62)

Sroufe (1977) has postulated that the purpose of evaluating the principal is to improve decision making, directly or indirectly. Evaluation is considered essential for effective administration of programs.

Kimbrough and Nunnery (1976) emphasized that persons who were involved in the accountability movement made demands in the late 1960's for accountability of principals, which placed emphasis on administrative competence. The accountability movement brought pressure on the state legislature and school boards. As a result of this pressure, the "Standards of Quality" mandated that all personnel shall be evaluated, and the purpose is to improve performance.

According to Fiedler's (1972) Contingency Theory, the most important purpose of a principal evaluation program is to find out if the principal is an effective leader. The theory also reported that effective leadership is not easy to define, much less to measure, and it meant different things in different situations.

Gaslin (1974) has postulated that the purpose of evaluating principals was to improve performance in the variety of roles they play in instructional leadership and building management. (pp. 77-81)

According to Redfern's (1972) survey, among the various purposes of the evaluation of principals, four purposes predominate: (1) to identify areas needing improvement; (2) to measure current performance against prescribed standards; (3) to establish evidence to dismiss personnel; and (4) to enable the individual to formulate appropriate performance objectives. He further stated that the performance of principals should be evaluated periodically for the purpose of improving leadership performance, which requires: (1) the establishment of appropriate work goals; (2) development of a clearcut program of action; (3) collection of evidence of leadership productivity; (4) more frequent contacts between the principal and the evaluator; (5) assessment of the principal's performance by the evaluator; (6) evaluation conference; and (7) appropriate follow-up action. (pp. 58-93)

Jacobson and others (1973) were very explicit about the purpose of the evaluation of principals, and they emphasized that the primary purpose of the evaluation of principals is to improve performance. Evaluation should be made periodically by those charged with the responsibility of supervising principals. These evaluations should be considered with the principals as a means of helping them discover needs for improvement and to appraise the nature of the progress being made. They further stated:

Among the items on which a principal might be rated are supervision, attitude toward teachers and students, balance between administration and supervision, organization, assignment of extra-curricular duties, and relations with parents. (p. 137)

Andersen (1972), and Mosher and Purpel (1972) have proposed that if evaluation is to result in improved administrative performance, it should be supportative and professional growth of the administrator should be the paramount purpose of evaluation. They refer to a "client-centered counseling approach" of evaluation through which: (1) the supervisor of the administrator is a helper; (2) relationships between the administrator's activities and results are explored; (3) obstacles are considered in the evaluation process; and (4) the administrator is encouraged to consider revised ways of thinking. (pp. 603-616)

According to Hunt and Buser (1977) several purposes are given most often for the evaluation of principals. One is to

collect information upon which to base recommendations for salary increments. Closely related to this purpose is the need to determine tenure recommendations. Interwoven with these are recommendations for retention or dismissal. In much the same vein, information is required in order to make decision on transfer, reassignment, or promotion. These purposes support those held by Nygaard.

In recent years, two more purposes of evaluating principals have emerged. These are to assist the principal in his professional development and to identify job targets or professional competencies to be achieved in the future. Hunt and Buser further stated that:

Evaluation should never be perfunctory, and other than in those instances in which the principal receives the highest rating, the evaluator has a professional obligation to identify job targets or behaviors to be achieved and to suggest specific means for their achievement. (p. 12)

Campbell and Gregg (1957) have posited that the general purpose of evaluating the principal is to improve the effectiveness of goal achievement. Evaluation is a means of determining how well the organization, the program, the person, or the activity is achieving the purpose for which it was designed. By means of the evaluation process, strengths of the principal can be discovered and maintained; weaknesses can be identified and minimized or eliminated. Effective use of the evaluation process should result in continuing improvement of organization plans and procedures and

of individual and group efforts in the accomplishment of accepted purposes. It can provide evidence and lead to conclusions which may lead to modification of purposes, better decisions and plans for achieving purposes, and more effective contributions of members of the organization. (p. 312)

In Palucci's (1978) doctoral dissertation, the purpose of evaluating principals by superintendents was to assist the principal in professional development. However, in terms of relative value, the purpose of improving educational leadership to the school was ranked first. The purpose to assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards was the least frequently stated purpose of evaluation, and in addition was valued the least by the superintendents.

Purposes of evaluation must be clearly stated and understood by the superintendent and principal. Once the purposes of the organization have been determined, the evaluation process should be designed to assist in fostering the desired achievement of the school's goals and objectives (Grill, 1978:35).

Pharis (1973) has reported the purpose of administrative evaluation, and it is the means employed to distribute the contents of public funds, and based on a score or some other results, tenure may be given or denied. Salaries tied to appraisal may be in terms of dollars, increments, levels, steps, and merit advancement.

When it is necessary to reduce staff, a judgment must be made about the comparative abilities of members of the group including principals. Dollar shortages, school consolidation, reduction in state aid, declining enrollment, and discontinued programs can cause evaluation purposes to become more important because superintendents need reasons to reduce staff. (pp. 36-38)

McCleary (1979) theorized that the primary purpose of evaluation is to establish a basis for change of individual behavior such that both personal satisfaction and organizational effectiveness are improved. Factual information is collected through written procedures regarding the performance of the principal in relation to specified objectives. Expectations for performance resulting from evaluation are determined both by the individual whose performance is being evaluated and by the superior(s). Performance strengths and weaknesses are identified and plans are made in terms of them in relation to changes, improvements, and revised expectations for the future. Diagnosed strengths and weaknesses influence superiors' decisions about compensation, promotion, transfer, or dismissal. (p. 46)

Educational Research Service personnel completed two studies, one in 1968 and another in 1971, and determined the purpose of evaluating administrators. The results of both studies revealed that the majority of the school systems

reported that the purpose of evaluating administrators was to identify areas needing improvement.

Armstrong (1973) has concluded that the purpose of performance evaluation is to improve performance through improved supervision, planning for individual growth and development, providing information to assist in improving marginal performance, identification of special talents and skills, and a means of protecting both individual and district rights in determination of dismissal due to substandard performance. (p. 53)

Lipham (1975) has identified four considerations that are essential in planning for the evaluation of principals: (1) the purposes of the evaluation; (2) the means for measuring performance; (3) the person who will do the measuring; and (4) how often the measures be made. There may be many purposes for evaluating principals, but the following are typical: (1) to change goals or objectives; (2) to modify administrative procedures; (3) to implement programs; (4) to hire or promote personnel; (5) to protect organizational participants; (6) to change role assignments; (7) to change and improve behavior; and (8) to terminate service or to reward role performance. Lipham further stated that:

An administrative evaluation system may be designed to serve any or all of these purposes. In any event, in implementing an administrative evaluation system, it is absolutely essential

that the purposes for the evaluation be raised from an implicit to the explicit level. (pp. 22-28)

Abbott (1975) has identified two major purposes for assessing principals' performance. First, and most importantly, the results of assessment should be made available to the individual involved, the object of assessment, and the results should be employed as a basis for personal and professional growth and improvement. Inevitably, however, decisions must be made regarding such issues as promotion, retention, and salary improvement. Thus, assessment data also serve a managerial function, that of providing a rational basis for making those decisions.

Abbott further stated that:

When attempts are made to assess performance, and certainly when the assessment is conducted with the ultimate objective of improving that performance, it is essential to think in terms of effects. There is little point in attempting to improve the performance of administrators unless there is reason to think that in doing so some improvement will occur in the organization. The hope is that such improvement will ultimately facilitate student learning. (pp. 52-64)

STUDIES RELATED TO PROCEDURES/METHODOLOGY OF ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION

Rentsch (1976) has posited that before establishing any assessment program for principals, it is essential that consideration be given to the relative importance and implications of formative and summative assessment. He also

postulated that formative assessment is: (1) supervisory in nature; (2) neutral in value orientation; (3) supportive of the person; and (4) designed to help one's observed performance fall more in line with expected performance. Contrarily, summative assessment is administrative in nature. It is product oriented, and it is designed to provide a terminal measure of one's performance. Therefore, summative evaluation is judgmental and often value laden. Since it serves as a final record of performance, it influences decisions on appointment, promotion, tenure, and retention. Rentsch further stated that in order for administrative evaluation to be useful, the formative and summative approaches should be employed if a sound evaluation system is to be developed. (p. 78)

The principal's evaluation should be a cooperative process between the superintendent and the principal if the process has the intent to improve performance. Virginia's Tentative Report for Evaluation of Personnel makes it clear that:

Evaluation by objectives tries to turn the process around to make it a bilateral, cooperative endeavor to improve the evaluatee's performance. It also strengthens the evaluator's skills in supervision and administration.

If improvement is to be achieved, the individual and the evaluator need to be quite clear about the goals which the process is fashioned to accomplish. (p. 33)

Redfern (1974) stated that the productivity of the principal's performance can be evaluated by means of a logical, step-by-step process. The steps are:

1. Establish criteria for the evaluation.
2. Diagnose current performance.
3. Develop performance objectives for areas of weaknesses.
4. Implement the objectives.
5. Evaluate the accomplishment of the objective(s).
6. Analyze the year's accomplishment(s). (pp. 6-9)

According to the Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, 1972-74, assuming that the principal is capable of improving performance, appropriate performance objectives can be formulated to help guide in strengthening performance areas where weaknesses are apparent. The process of evaluating the principal should include:

1. Establish Performance Criteria: As the first step, broad areas must be defined, and performance criteria for each area must be designed (based upon job content and job expectations) to use in assessing job performance.
2. Identify Performance Targets: When job performance has been assessed, areas which can be strengthened and improved should be identified. These performance targets, identified in terms of objectives

to be sought, will dictate actions to be taken to improve job performance.

3. Collect Performance Data: In this step, evidence is assembled to indicate the extent to which performance targets are being or have been accomplished.
4. Make Evaluative Assessments: The fourth step is the involvement of the superintendent and principal in assessing the degree to which performance targets have been met. Data collection as done in step 3 is used at this point.
5. Conduct Evaluation Conference: As a final step, a conference should be held to review the evaluation, to assess accomplishments, and to identify further steps to be taken. (pp. 75-77)

McDonald (1979) made a survey about the extent of principals' evaluation. The survey revealed that ninety-six percent (96%) of all principals in Georgia are evaluated. The report concluded that to evaluate an administrator, seven steps are necessary in the process. First, the principal must evaluate his or her own behavior and experience. Second, a panel should conduct a follow-up evaluation to check on the subjective interpretations supplied by the principal. Third, criteria for both the self-evaluation and the follow-up evaluation should center around "areas of administrator

performance," including school organization; instructional program; schedules; accounts and other management matters; relationship with students, staff, community, and superiors; facilities; and school climate.

After these criteria are outlined, evidence of the principal's performance within these areas must be collected. Finally, the evaluators should summarize the principal's performance in each of the areas and should provide counseling action that is tailored to the specific needs of the principal. (pp. 32-33)

A doctoral dissertation that was completed by Metzger (1976) dealt with the identification and analysis of procedures of evaluating public school principals in the State of Maryland. The evaluation of principals in Maryland public schools is an established practice resulting from board policy which is implemented by rules, regulations, procedures, and criteria cooperatively developed by the professionals in each school system. Involvement of parents, teachers, and students is not considered essential for principals' evaluations. Self-evaluation by principals is based on performance criteria and performance objectives.

Poliakoff (1973) has reported that the job target procedure of evaluating administrative personnel has been employed in twenty-five percent of the school systems in the United States. This approach focuses basically on the

improvement of one's job performance in a nondefensive atmosphere. This atmosphere is fostered through cooperation between the evaluator and the person being evaluated on all aspects of the evaluation procedure. That is, they first agree on the design and operations of the evaluation process; subsequently, they work together to set goals for the person being evaluated, develop a plan by which the goals can be achieved, and monitor progress. This procedure not only helps to relieve the defensive feeling the person being evaluated may have; but also, at the very least, due process is guaranteed. Poliakoff further stated that the job target approach evaluation procedure should begin with a system-wide collaborative effort to determine and write down not only the policies and purposes of the school district, but also the broad goals and expected results for each administrative unit and position. (pp. 39-42)

Redfern's (1972) survey revealed that about seventy-five percent of the responding school systems in the United States evaluate administrators by means of predetermined performance standards, ratings being made numerically or by descriptive phases, or by written comments with indications of needed improvement. The remaining twenty-five percent of the reporting school systems employ performance objectives, cooperatively determined.

Larger school systems tended to use predetermined performance standards to evaluate principals, and smaller school systems used the performance objectives procedure. Assistance was provided the individual who received an unsatisfactory evaluation. This was usually a form of counseling with concrete suggestions for improvement.

Redfern advocates the performance objective procedure approach for evaluating principals rather than the predetermined performance standards procedure approach because great stress is placed upon the use of rating scales and checklists when the predetermined standard procedure is employed, and there is doubt about the validity of the approach. However, the performance objectives procedure approach of evaluating principals allows the principals to set goals to be attained cooperatively with the evaluator. This approach allows more flexibility in the evaluation process, and is less threatening to the evaluatee. (pp. 85-93)

Pulucci's (1978) doctoral dissertation revealed that even though principals are evaluated on an annual basis in Lake County, Illinois the probability of their evaluation being formal in nature was only slightly better than fifty percent. Eighteen out of thirty-three, or fifty-five percent, of the superintendents who participated in the research relative to the formality versus informality of how principals were evaluated, indicated that a formal evaluation of principals was conducted.

Evaluation by management objectives was the most common formal procedure utilized to evaluate principals in Lake County, Illinois. Seven out of eighteen school districts employing formal procedures to evaluate principals did so solely in terms of evaluation by objectives; whereas, an additional eight school districts evaluated principals using evaluation by objectives in conjunction with either a rating checklist or blank narrative appraisal procedure or both. Fifteen superintendents in total employed the use of evaluation by objectives wholly or in part in evaluating principals.

According to McCarty (1971), the superintendent and principal must agree at the beginning of each year on a set of objectives which they jointly hope to accomplish. The purpose of instituting a joint plan is to insure that a clear mandate for specific program development is established early in the year. It also guarantees that substantial energy will be directed toward achievement of the goals. If performance objectives are spelled out in detail, adjustments demanded by the inevitable unforeseen contingencies are easily instituted.

At the end of the school year, the principal and the superintendent must set aside sufficient time for an extended conference focusing on how much overall progress has been attained. To discourage superficiality, the superintendent

should rank in order the degree in which the performance objectives have been met using student and teacher input. The emphasis on task accomplishment removes defensiveness and encourages openness. (pp. 38-39)

Deal (1977) has made several suggestions in regard to improving the principal evaluation procedure. First, principals should be evaluated more frequently. According to research, the greater frequency of evaluation is related to greater principal satisfaction with both criteria and sampling. Visits to the school are not the final stage in evaluation, but should be followed with a continuing discussion of strengths and weaknesses.

Second, specific evaluation criteria, which should reflect a balance between performance and outcome measures, should be developed and made known before evaluations are conducted. Such criteria are difficult to generate, and some principals suggest that teachers, parents, students, and central office personnel be included in the process of developing criteria. Others suggest that principals generate the criteria or that the principal and superintendent together establish a job description from which criteria will be developed.

Third, sampling procedures for gathering data should be improved. The relationship between a principal's activities and educational results is highly complex; educational

outcomes as a criterion must be augmented by direct observations by clients, teachers, or superiors. Some principals suggest that a team including other principals and central office staff observe the principal in action. Other principals suggest that information be collected from various sources and the different weights be assigned to each source.

A fourth procedure for improving the evaluation of principals is to have them evaluate one another. This approach emphasizes professional or collegial relationships among principals as a vehicle for self-improvement. In this collegial process, principals could jointly develop criteria, observe each other in action, gather information from self-appraisals, and rely on periodic conferences to mutually appraise performance and to consolidate appraisals and information into concrete plans for improvement. (pp. 273-274)

Rosenberg (1973) has recommended seven specific steps for implementing a principal evaluation program that will not be resented. Principals will not resent the program because it has constructive and developmental goals that are grounded in a guidance and counseling approach. Step One: The principal completes a self-evaluation. Step Two: Arrangements are made for a follow-up evaluation. Step Three: The criteria that were used in both the self-evaluation and the follow-up evaluation should be set up. Step Four:

Evidence is collected to support the evaluation. The evaluation should be made during usual, customary, everyday school activities. Just about anything could be included such as observations, visitations, interviews, conferences, surveys, reports, letters, newsletter clippings, and through the examination of records. Step Five: Before the final evaluation, the principal should provide brief background information including his or her previous positions and current professional activities; number of students and staff members in the school, etc. Step Six: A single-page summary to indicate the over-all achievement of the principal's performance should be written covering the areas in step three. It is important to remember that: The whole idea of the evaluation process is to guide and counsel the principal--not to check up on him or her. For the self-evaluation and the follow-up, the same appraisal instrument should be employed. (pp. 35-36)

Hersey (1976) posited that principals should be evaluated by employing a twice-a-year procedure. It begins in the summer when the principal meets with the superintendent to determine the coming year's short and long-range goals. After this first meeting, a periodical check is made by the superintendent with the principal to discuss the progress--or lack of it--made toward meeting projected goals.

A second formal evaluation meeting between the superintendent and principal is held in the spring. Together, they measure progress recorded in achieving the previously established goals. According to Hersey's limited research of the twice-a-year evaluation procedure, principals like it. "It gives the principals a chance to get involved in establishing goals for the school." (pp. 24-25)

Hersey advocated that principals should be evaluated twice each year; however, Deal posited that research has revealed that the greater frequency of evaluating principals, the greater satisfaction they have with both criteria and sampling. Therefore, a formal on-going evaluation process may help promote greater satisfaction among principals regarding evaluation and evaluation criteria.

Pharis (1973) stated that secondary results evaluation are predicated on the notion that the assessment of an administrator's performance can be determined by measuring the achievements of those under the administrator's supervision. The assumption is that a good principal is one who supervises a group of predominately good teachers and achieving students. This philosophy of evaluation is built around the behavioral objectives approach for evaluating administrators.

However, the typical checklist rating evaluation procedure is characterized by generalizations, and such procedures have little value because: (1) they are one-sided

and subjective; (2) they do not provide for participation; (3) they provide no help in improving performance; (4) they assess the person rather than the act; and (5) they have no value as documentation. (p. 38)

McCleary (1979) postulated that informal rating includes a number of forms. Perhaps the most valid form stems from an annual school plan in which priorities, types of activities, allocation of resources, and expected results are specified. Periodic meetings, three or four times a year, indicate administrative steps taken and results being obtained and expected. Near the conclusion of the school year, a conference and a written description of the principal's work and reactions to it are prepared and shared with the principal. It was further stated that:

The quality of planning and the character of the evaluation procedure itself determines whether the procedure is effective in providing the results intended. Treated as a formative evaluation, and integrated with the other kinds of evaluation, informal evaluation can be a useful goal-free approach to evaluation in that both intended and unintended administrative actions can be examined and the focus is upon results obtained rather than upon specified predetermined criteria for performance. (p. 47)

Adams (1971) discussed the evaluation steps in the management by objectives procedure for evaluating principals that are employed in the West Hartford School District in Connecticut. The principal determines goals that will improve performance and makes a commitment to accomplish them.

1) Management Objective. For each objective, there is a precise statement of the specific results that are to be accomplished by some designated future date.

2) Standards of Performance. Explanations are made in regard to how goals are to be accomplished.

3) Measurements To Be Applied. The superintendent and principal decide what is to be accepted as evidence that a desired result has occurred.

4) Results. The principal compares what was done with what was intended.

5) Performance Rating. The principal makes judgments regarding his or her performance, and the superintendent makes final judgments about the principal's performance. (p. 21)

Armstrong (1973) reported that performance evaluation procedures are disarmingly simple. At the start of the evaluation period, the superintendent and principal examine the job that the principal performs in accordance with rules that have been adopted. The two select a few specific areas of the job where a special effort needs to be made to improve the performance level. Near the end of the evaluation period, they jointly review what has been accomplished. Together, they discuss the evaluation made by the superintendent and the self-evaluation. From the analysis of the experience, they seek to determine the actions or alternatives, if any, that should be considered for future improvement. (pp. 53-54)

Goldman (1970) has postulated that adequate evaluation of on the job performance is necessary. Specifically, he stated that the principal be required to establish:

annual targets. . . that are implicit in the job held. These would provide for judging performance in terms of these targets rather than for purely mathematical measurement.

When utilizing such a system, each principal has an opportunity to be evaluated in terms of goals that are agreed upon and are worthwhile. These goals are pertinent to the specific position which is held within the organization. The specific task of goal-setting for each principal should be a joint project involving, at a minimum, the principal and at least one administrative superior. (p. 72)

Appraisal by results is an evaluation procedure that is similar to management by objectives. It is similar in the respect that evaluation is based upon objectives that are agreed upon by the superintendent and principal. Heier (1970) has stated that the basic idea of appraisal by results is an agreement between the superintendent and principal that the principal will meet a certain objective, or series of objectives, within an agreed-upon length of time. Furthermore, the superintendent and principal may discuss tentative approaches to carrying out tasks. Appraisal by results comes after the end of the time period for accomplishing objectives, and it consists of both an oral and written review by the

superintendent regarding the competence with which the principal has performed specified jobs. (p. 24)

Herman (1978) has explained the (Management by Objectives) procedure that is employed in the West Bloomfield School District in Orchard Lake, Michigan for the purpose of evaluating the principals. The West Bloomfield's version of MBO encompasses a comprehensive job description based on tasks performed and a self-evaluation guide that serves as a discussion tool during evaluation conferences.

The total administrative team (principals, assistant principals, central office administrators, and the superintendent of schools) spend months analyzing the total management functions performed in the school district for the purpose of determining the duties needed in order to create and maintain an effective management operation in the school system. Job descriptions are written and widely distributed to the administrative staff; they become an integral part of the evaluation methodology--comprising approximately fifty percent of the standard for evaluation.

Yearly performance objectives are written for each principal. The objectives are limited to a maximum of ten in number, and they evolve from the suggestions of the principals being evaluated, the immediate supervisor, or as a portion of the district-wide objectives given the superintendent by the board of education.

The principals' evaluation guide sheets are used in the final evaluation conferences, and the guide sheets provide a discussion guide for two-way communication; they also identify areas that might well be appropriate for the subsequent year's performance objectives. (pp. 34-42)

The goals of the performance evaluation procedure have implications for both the organization and the principals. The organization needs information about principals' performance so that decisions can be made about improving their position behavior, as well as to enable it to deal more effectively with other related personnel problems such as compensation, recruitment, selection, transfer, and discipline. Principals need to know what is expected of them, how they are doing, and what their administrative destiny within the school organization appears to be (Castetter and Haisler, 1971:37).

To help the school organization determine performance of administrators, Castetter and Haisler developed an evaluation procedure consisting of four steps. They suggest that the evaluation procedure should include: (1) a performance appraisal; (2) a performance progress review conference; (3) an individual development program; and (4) a post-development program review conference. (p. 40)

Pol (1976) developed a procedure for the purpose of evaluating principals. He noted that a unilateral staff evaluation

by the superintendent only alienates principals, and it gives a bad connotation to the term "evaluation" since this type of assessment is seen as the kind that is only employed to hire or dismiss them. The procedure provides for more than a unilateral evaluation of principals by the superintendent. Teachers and parents have a close and direct relationship with principals and their perceptions are important in terms of a fair assessment. Self evaluation has also proven to be a reliable procedure and principals contribute their own perceptions regarding the assessment of their performance. As a result, data were collected from persons familiar with or involved in the role of the principals. The approach took into consideration the input coming from the "educational community" (patrons, superordinates, incumbents, and subordinates). (pp. 3-16)

Contemporary principals' success should be evaluated on the basis of how well they perform activities and discharge responsibilities. Melton (1975) has emphasized that modern principals must be evaluated in terms of how well they organize the resources at their command, first to define and then to achieve truly important job-targets. Melton recommends the following as necessary steps in the job-target evaluation procedure. The principal should: (1) identify the full range of possible job-targets; (2) determine achievable job-targets; (3) establish performance criteria; (4) get the job

done; and (5) get ready for the final evaluation. The principal and the superintendent measure the achievement of the job-targets, and both keep in mind the restrictions and constraints that might have emerged. (pp. 11-16)

Regarding the procedures for gathering data to measure the principal's performance, no entirely satisfactory method has yet been discovered or devised. Current suggestions range from including only the principal's organization superiors to including anyone and everyone who may know or have a right to know about the principal's performance. Within the educational organization, at least the following should be involved: (1) immediate organizational superiors; (2) immediate organizational subordinates, and (3) the principal being evaluated (Lipham, 1975:22-24).

Strickler (1957) reported that in school systems of over 100,000 in population, current practice was that in practically all of these systems, over 96 percent, evaluated the principal, and that the majority made the evaluation at regular intervals throughout the tenure of office; that a cooperative approach to the evaluation was generally practiced; and that evaluation was frequently done according to a rating scale or device and more often represented a purely subjective judgment on the part of the individuals making the evaluation. (pp. 55-59)

In an unpublished doctoral dissertation at the University of the Pacific (1976), Anthony Ruocco concluded that all principals are evaluated in New York State. Procedures for evaluation are informal, visitations to the schools to observe principals are not done on a regular basis, and evaluations are done in written form. There was substantial disagreement reported by the superintendents and principals as to whether or not regular conferences for evaluative purposes are held with principals. A majority of the administrators suggested that two, three, or four yearly visitations for evaluative purposes be conducted, and that two, three, or four evaluations be conducted before tenure, with one of two after tenure.

Saif (1976) developed a model for the principal's job description which serves as the framework for evaluation. Evaluation requires input of data from a variety of sources to assist the principal in the effective performance of responsibilities, all geared toward the improvement of the student-learning experience.

The principal's job deals with four major categories of interrelated responsibilities in which performance should be assessed. They are: (1) management; (2) personnel (including students and staff); (3) curriculum; and (4) human relations. (pp. 100-102)

Those persons who are affected by decisions of the principal need to be involved in the evaluation process. Elicker (1969) has stated that since a large degree of objectivity is not readily available to determine the efficiency of the principal, superintendents must not take the sole responsibility for determining the degree of competence. The superintendent should call upon members of the official staff to participate as well as teachers and students. (p. 123)

Gephart (1976) has developed a design for evaluating principals by employing group participation in the process. The efforts were synthesized into the following steps; (1) determine the purpose of the effort; (2) translate the purpose into appropriate criteria; (3) locate or design instruments to gather needed information to measure against the criteria; (4) compare gathered data against criteria; (5) use the insights gained to write a descriptive report of strengths, weaknesses, or discrepancies, and make summative judgment on worth of the program and its administrators; and (6) recycle into the formative evaluation process for decision-making. (pp. 11-12)

According to Pharis (1973), despite the obvious inadequacies of evaluation procedures, principals should be-- and want to be--evaluated. They do, however, want a system that: (1) measures reality; (2) considers only the variables that can be controlled; (3) spells out clearly and ahead of

time what the principals are to be measured against; (4) is not subject to different conclusions by different evaluators; and (5) permits principals to have some voice in determining goals. All of these necessities are satisfied by a job target procedure, which is a personalized adaptation of the management by objectives approach. (p. 38)

SUMMARY

The intent of the literature review was to present findings regarding administrative evaluation, purposes of administrative evaluation, and procedures/methodology of administrative evaluation.

Secondary school principals want to be evaluated in order to be made cognizant of their satisfactory and unsatisfactory job performance. They do, however, want a system of evaluation that is fair. They want to provide input into their evaluation process, and they prefer to help design the evaluation system that is employed to measure their performance. The General Electric study is most significant in revealing that high participation in the evaluation process is associated with better mutual understanding between the superordinate and subordinate, greater acceptance of goals, a better attitude toward being evaluated, and a feeling of self-realization on the job.

Criteria that are employed for the purpose of evaluating the principal should be drawn from expectations for performance held by the principal's professional peers and superordinates. Criteria should encompass the job description, predetermined goals of the school and school system, and objectives that the principal can reasonably accomplish.

There are various purposes for evaluating secondary principals which include formative and summative evaluation, validation of the selection process, determining whether to transfer, promote, demote, or dismiss the principal, determining if decisions are sound, timely, and effectively carried out to improve performance and professional development, and to determine areas needing improvement. Regardless of the intended purpose of the secondary principal's evaluation, it should be supportative, if evaluation is to foster growth and attain the paramount purpose(s).

The most prevalent procedures of evaluating secondary principals focus upon summative and formative evaluation, employing predetermined standards, the job-target evaluation approach, and evaluation by objectives. The formative evaluation procedure is employed to allow the principal to assess his or her performance, determine objectives if needed, and assess the accomplishment of the objectives. The summative evaluation method is employed when personal judgment is used to assess whether a principal is worthy of continuing to function in an administrative position.

Administrative evaluation procedures that encompass the predetermined standards approach to evaluation set forth standards that principals are required to meet in order to attain satisfactory improvement according to the judgment of the superordinate and subordinate. Both the job-target approach and evaluation by objectives focus upon having the principal to write behavioral objectives in an area of administrative weakness with the intent of accomplishing the objectives, and therefore, improving job performance.

It is generally believed that principals can be evaluated by: (1) using predetermined established evaluation criteria; (2) diagnosing performance; (3) developing performance objectives; (4) implementing the objectives; (5) evaluating the accomplishment of the objectives; and (6) analyzing the accomplishments.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to present criteria and procedures used in the formal evaluation of secondary public school principals in Virginia and to determine the perceptions of superintendents regarding the importance of each in assessing their performance. Further inquiries were made to determine the purposes of assessing principals' performance. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the design of the study, the preliminary survey, the population sampled, the instrument that was used to gather data, the data collection method, and the data analysis method.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The research methods employed in this study were descriptive surveys. The data were gathered from division superintendents of schools in Virginia through the administration of two questionnaires.

The procedure for the study included the following:

1. A preliminary survey was mailed to the population of one hundred and thirty-two division superintendents in Virginia to determine the evaluation process which best describes the one used in their school divisions such as: (1) formal evaluation based on predetermined standards; (2) formal evaluation based on tasks performed; or (3) informal evaluation.

Question number two of the preliminary survey was constructed to determine if the secondary public school principal's evaluation was based upon the following procedures: (1) a survey of teachers; (2) personal observation by the superintendent; (3) a survey of pupils; or (4) other procedures. Evaluation instruments were sought to gather information for constructing the questionnaire for the major survey.

2. From the results of the preliminary survey and evaluation instruments received, a questionnaire for the major survey was constructed of items on the evaluation instruments that were employed by division superintendents to assess the performance of secondary public school principals in Virginia. Also, items were included on the major survey questionnaire that were derived from the review of literature.

3. A review panel was asked to validate the questionnaire employed for the major survey. This review panel was composed of three university professors, two high school principals, and one superintendent.

4. Revisions were made in the major survey questionnaire as suggested by the review panel.

5. The major survey questionnaire was mailed to the population of division superintendents in Virginia.

6. A follow-up survey was carried out to solicit responses from nonrespondents regarding the major survey.

7. A telephone call was made to the nonrespondents who did not respond to the major follow-up survey, and a final follow-up telephone call was made to ten percent of the nonrespondents who did not return the major survey questionnaire after the initial telephone call to ensure representativeness of the population of respondents.

8. Data were analyzed by employing descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages). The one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffé test were employed to determine if differences existed between variables.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY

In the initial planning of this research study, it was decided that in order to describe the evaluation process and basis for arriving at secondary principals' evaluation in Virginia, a survey of the population of division superintendents needed to be done. A letter and the questionnaire were forwarded to one hundred and thirty-two division superintendents. The letter explained the purpose of the preliminary survey, and the questionnaire solicited information that pertained to the evaluation process of secondary public school principals as administered in each school division by superintendents.

The purpose of the preliminary survey was to determine the evaluation process which best describes the one used in

school divisions such as: (1) formal evaluation based on predetermined standards; (2) formal evaluation based on tasks performed; or (3) informal evaluation. The second question of the preliminary survey was asked to determine if the secondary public school principal's evaluation was based upon the following procedures: (1) a survey of teachers; (2) personal observations by the superintendent; (3) a survey of pupils; or (4) other procedures. Also, evaluation instruments were sought to gather information for constructing the questionnaire for the major survey.

Descriptive Analysis of the Preliminary Survey Results

As stated previously, it was necessary to determine the evaluation process which best describes those employed in Virginia school divisions for the purpose of evaluating secondary principals and the basis for arriving at the results of secondary principals' evaluation. The preliminary survey revealed the formerly mentioned information.

One hundred and thirty-two questionnaires were forwarded to division superintendents in Virginia. Of this number, one hundred and fifteen division superintendents responded. The results obtained from the preliminary survey are reported in this chapter.

Table 1 shows that 45 percent of the respondents indicated that the evaluation process employed to evaluate

TABLE 1

PRELIMINARY SURVEY

The Evaluation Process Which Best Describes Those Used in Virginia
School Divisions to Evaluate Secondary Principals
(N = 115)

Evaluation Process Employed	Counties	Cities	Total*
Formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards	38.3%	61.8%	45.0%
Formal evaluation determined by tasks performed	17.3%	11.8%	16.0%
Informal evaluation	17.3%	5.9%	14.0%
Formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards and tasks performed	16.0%	11.8%	15.0%
Formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards and informal evaluation	3.7%	2.9%	4.0%
Formal evaluation determined by predetermined objectives	4.9%	2.9%	4.0%
Formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards, tasks performed, and informal evaluation	2.5%	2.9%	3.0%

*Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

secondary principals is formal evaluation framed by predetermined standards. Sixteen percent of the respondents reported that formal evaluation based upon tasks performed is the evaluation process employed in their school divisions, and 14 percent of the respondents indicated that the informal evaluation process is employed in their school divisions. Fifteen percent of the respondents employ formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards and tasks performed as the evaluation process used in their school divisions.

A minimal number of school divisions employ other evaluation processes. Four percent of the respondents employ formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards and informal evaluation. Four percent of the respondents employ formal evaluation determined by predetermined objectives, and only 3 percent employ formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards, tasks performed, and informal evaluation as processes for evaluating secondary public school principals.

The data contained in table 1 reveals that all of the division superintendents who responded to the preliminary survey evaluate secondary public school principals, and a specific process is employed to evaluate them. The majority of respondents in a single category, 45 percent, employ the formal evaluation process determined by predetermined standards to evaluate secondary principals. Therefore, it appears

that a large number of school division superintendents evaluate secondary principals in accordance to standards that they perceive to be important in their school divisions.

Table 2 reveals the basis for arriving at secondary principals' evaluations. The table shows that division superintendents do not employ input from teachers and pupils in isolation to evaluate secondary principals. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents base the evaluation of principals on personal observations. Two percent of the respondents interact with principals, use central office staff input, and input from the general public to arrive at the results of secondary principals' evaluations. Two percent of the respondents arrive at the results of secondary principals' evaluations by determining the accomplishments of performance based objectives; staff and student input are also employed. Three percent of the respondents arrive at the results of secondary principals' evaluations by assessing accomplishments of predetermined objectives. Three percent of the respondents reported that they arrive at the results of secondary principals' evaluations by observing the principals and by employing assistant superintendents' observations. Nine percent of the respondents survey teachers and use personal observations to arrive at the results of secondary principals' evaluations, and 3 percent of the respondents employ personal observations and use central office input to arrive at the results of secondary principals' evaluations.

TABLE 2

PRELIMINARY SURVEY

The Basis for Arriving at the Secondary Principals'
Evaluation in Virginia School Divisions
(N = 115)

Factors for Evaluation of Secondary Principals	Counties	Cities	Total*
Surveying teachers	0%	0%	0%
Personal observations of the superintendent	75.3%	88.2%	79.0%
Surveying pupils	0%	0%	0%
Principals' interaction with superintendent, central office staff, and general public	2.5%	0%	2.0%
Accomplishments of objectives performance based--students and staff input	1.2%	2.9%	2.0%
Accomplishments of predetermined objectives	2.5%	2.9%	3.0%
Personal observations by the superintendent and the assistant superintendent	3.7%	0%	3.0%
Personal observations by the superintendent and a survey of teachers	11.1%	2.9%	9.0%
Personal observations by the superintendent and central office input	3.7%	2.9%	3.0%

*Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

Table 2 clearly reveals that division superintendents in Virginia prefer to employ their personal observations to gather data for evaluating secondary principals. Seventy-nine percent of the one hundred fifteen divisions surveyed prefer to employ this method. Other responses to the questions regarding the basis of gathering data to make principals' evaluations were minimal.

POPULATION

Data were sought for the major survey from division superintendents in one hundred and thirty-two school divisions in Virginia. The division superintendent population was listed in the Virginia Educational Directory for the 1980-81 school year. Division superintendents were chosen as the population to supply data for this study because they are in the position to judge the importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures that are employed to evaluate secondary principals, and they are the ones who are legally responsible for the evaluation of the principals.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT - MAJOR SURVEY

A review of related literature and the existing questionnaires that relate to the evaluation process of secondary public school principals did not reveal an appropriate instrument that met the purpose of the research problems. Therefore, it was necessary to develop an original questionnaire

to measure the perceptions held by division superintendents in Virginia regarding the importance of criteria and procedures that are employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals.

The design of the questionnaire and the selection of demographic data, evaluation data, criteria data, and procedures data were included in the major survey questionnaire after the preliminary survey data were received from division superintendents. The preliminary survey data were reviewed along with literature that pertains to administrative evaluation. Some of the preliminary survey data were included in the major survey questionnaire.

The major survey questionnaire was divided into four sections. The first section contained items which sought to determine: (1) the number of county and city school divisions; (2) enrollment in school divisions; and (3) the number of years that division superintendents have served in their positions in Virginia.

The second section of the questionnaire contained items that relate to evaluation of secondary principals. The purpose of this section of the questionnaire was to determine: (1) the type of instrument that is employed to assess the performance of secondary principals; (2) who formally evaluates secondary principals; (3) how often the written formal evaluation of secondary principals is done; (4) if a

conference is held after the evaluation procedure has been completed; and (5) the purposes of evaluating secondary principals.

In section three of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate the degree of importance that they perceived the "Standards of Quality Criteria" and non-SOQ criteria that were employed to assess the performance of secondary principals. The purpose of this section was to determine the degrees of importance of evaluation criteria employed by division superintendents to evaluate secondary principals.

The fourth and final section of the questionnaire dealt with procedures that were employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. This section sought to determine the degree of importance that division superintendents perceive various procedures to be for collecting data to assess the performance of secondary principals.

Brief general directions appeared at the beginning of the questionnaire for the purpose of providing directions for those superintendents who had questions about responding to questions that did not specifically relate to their school divisions. Also, an assurance of confidentiality was given to division superintendents.

Validation of the Instrument

A review panel was selected, consisting of six persons, for the purpose of refining and validating the major survey questionnaire. The following persons consented to serve on the panel:

- 1) Three university professors in the College of Education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University were chosen to serve because of their eminence in the field of evaluation.
- 2) The division superintendent in Salem, Virginia public schools was chosen to serve on the panel because of his experience and involvement in evaluating principals by the use of SOQ criteria and his knowledge of questionnaire validation and construction.
- 3) Two high school principals were chosen to serve on the panel because they were familiar with the SOQ evaluation procedure and criteria.

A preliminary draft of the major survey questionnaire was prepared and presented to members of the panel for their comments and recommendations regarding the merits of each criterion, appropriateness of wording, and general construction of the questionnaire. Each panel member worked independently in making comments, recommendations, and giving final approval of the questionnaire. After several additions,

deletions, and refinements, a questionnaire that was acceptable to all panel members was formed, printed, and forwarded to one hundred thirty-two division superintendents in Virginia.

DATA COLLECTION

The major survey questionnaire was forwarded with a letter of introduction and a pre-addressed postage-paid envelope to one hundred thirty-two school division superintendents in Virginia on June 4, 1981, whose names and addresses appeared in the Virginia Educational Directory for the 1980-81 school year. Division superintendents were asked to complete the questionnaire according to instruction and return it in the postage-paid return envelope as soon as possible. On June 19, 1981, a follow-up survey of nonrespondents was completed. A letter requesting division superintendents to consider completing the questionnaire and a pre-addressed postage-paid envelope were mailed emphasizing the need of a response in order to make the study a success. On June 26, 1981, a telephone call was made to all nonrespondents who did not respond to the follow-up survey questionnaire requesting the need of a response in order to make the study successful. On July 1, 1981, another follow-up telephone call was made to a random selection of ten percent of the nonrespondents who did not respond to the follow-up survey to ensure representativeness of the population of respondents.

Nature of Returns

One hundred and thirty-two division superintendents, who comprise the population of superintendents in Virginia, were mailed the major survey questionnaires regarding the evaluation criteria, procedures, and purposes. Of the 132 division superintendents, 105 completed and returned the questionnaires after one follow-up mailing, one telephone call to those who did not respond to the follow-up questionnaire, and one telephone call to ten percent of the nonrespondents. The completed questionnaires that were returned constituted 79.54 percent of those that were mailed to division superintendents. Questionnaires were returned from very small, small, medium, large, and very large size city and county school divisions that are representative of the region-study groups of division superintendents in the state.

DATA ANALYSIS

A four-point Likert Scale was employed in this study to assess the opinions of division superintendents regarding the importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures employed to evaluate secondary public school principals. The Likert four-point scale was used to allow respondents to indicate for each statement in parts three and four of the questionnaire, a choice between one of four degrees of responses: very important, important, slightly important, or

not important. According to Borg (1963), the Likert Scale technique is usually the easiest method of developing scales to measure attitudes or opinions.

After all data were collected, they were coded, transferred to optical scanner sheets, key punched, and verified for computer processing. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), a system designed for computer programs was employed to facilitate processing and analyzing the data.

Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were employed to analyze data relative to sub-questions number one, two and four. Mean ratings were used to analyze sub-question three, and the one-way analysis of variance was employed to determine if differences existed between demographic variables and responses of groups of division superintendents to degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures. The Scheffé test was employed to determine which groups differed significantly at the .05 alpha level.

Chapter IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter reports the results of the study regarding data received from division superintendents in Virginia relative to evaluation criteria, evaluation procedures, and purposes of evaluating secondary public school principals. Data are presented from the responses of one hundred five superintendents.

This study was designed to present the criteria and procedures employed in the formal evaluation of secondary public school principals in Virginia and to determine the perceptions of the superintendents regarding the importance of each in assessing their performance. Further inquiries were made to determine the purposes of evaluating secondary public school principals' performance and to answer the sub-questions relative to the evaluation process that are presented in chapter 1. They are repeated below:

1. What formal criteria are employed by division superintendents in Virginia to evaluate secondary public school principals, and how important are these criteria?
2. What procedures are considered very important by division superintendents for gathering data to evaluate secondary public school principals?
3. What is the most important purpose and what is the least important purpose for the evaluation of secondary

public school principals as identified by division superintendents?

4. Overall, how important is the evaluation process regarding secondary public school principals according to perceptions held by division superintendents?

5. Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria that are employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

6. Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

7. Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

8. Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures that are employed to gather data to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

DATA TREATMENT

All twelve evaluation criteria that are employed to assess the performance of secondary principals received positive ratings by the division superintendents. The tables indicating these responses as well as those relative to the evaluation procedures, evaluation process, and purposes of evaluating secondary principals were included as Appendices of this study.

A frequency distribution table was constructed to present each group of data shown in the questionnaire regarding responses of division superintendents relative to the importance of the evaluation criteria, evaluation process, and procedures employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations.

Tables number 3 and 4 present superintendents' responses relative to the importance of the evaluation criteria. Also, table 3 contains the mandated "Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria, and table 4 contains other evaluation criteria that are employed by division superintendents to evaluate secondary public school principals in Virginia.

During the review of data, it became evident that the superintendents reported that all evaluation criteria were important to the evaluation of secondary public school principals. For this reason, it seemed redundant to report all favorable responses. Instead, only those items rated very

important by more than 60 percent of the respondents are reported and discussed here. This level of response served as a discriminator between the most pertinent evaluation criteria, procedures, and process that division superintendents rated, and it helped to focus upon those which seemed most pertinent.

Sub-question three was analyzed by ranking the purposes for the evaluation of secondary principals in order to determine the most important and least important purposes. The most important and least important purposes are discussed in this chapter.

To analyze sub-questions five through eight, the one-way analysis of variance was employed to determine if there were significant differences between demographic variables and division superintendents' responses regarding the importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures at the .05 alpha level. The Scheffé test was employed to determine if there were significant differences in group means at the .05 alpha level regarding responses to sub-questions five through eight.

Findings that revealed positive results were presented and analyzed in this chapter relative to all sub-questions. Those findings that did not reveal significant results relative to sub-questions five through eight were included as Appendices to this study.

FINDINGS

Sub-Question One

What formal criteria are employed by division superintendents in Virginia to evaluate secondary public school principals, and how important are those criteria? Division superintendents' very important responses which exceeded 60 percent are reported in tables 3 and 4 regarding the importance of the "Standards of Quality" and "non-Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria.

Table 3 reveals that the respondents tended to rate the criteria that involved the secondary principal in a supervisory role highest, which suggests that these criteria were more important to the superintendents for evaluating the principals. With reference to the criterion, "The secondary principal allocates time for supervision," 78 percent of the respondents rated the criterion very important and 22 percent rated the criterion important. Similarly, the respondents afforded a positive rating of the criterion, "The secondary principal develops a plan of supervision." Seventy-six percent rated the criterion very important, and 23 percent of the respondents rated it important. "The secondary principal monitors work performance," was rated very important also by 73 percent of the respondents, while 25 percent rated the criterion important, and only 2 percent rated it slightly important. The lowest rated criterion

TABLE 3

Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Standards of Quality Evaluation
Criteria as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N=105)

SOQ Evaluation Criteria The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Makes the annual school plan consistent with the school district-wide plan.	62%	33%	5%	0%
b. Implements the annual school plan.	68%	30%	3%	0%
c. Uses the handbook after its completion.	69%	30%	2%	0%
d. Inducts new employees into the school.	61%	37%	2%	0%
e. Resolves work problems.	67%	32%	1%	0%
f. Monitors work performance.	73%	25%	2%	0%
g. Develops a plan of supervision.	76%	23%	0%	0%
h. Allocates time for supervision.	78%	22%	0%	0%
i. Coordinates evaluation and supervision.	63%	35%	2%	0%

that dealt with supervision was, "The secondary principal coordinates evaluation and supervision," which was afforded a very important rating by 63 percent of the respondents, while 35 percent rated the criterion important, and only 2 percent rated it not important.

The annual school plan SOQ evaluation criteria which have been set forth for the purpose of requiring the secondary principal to formulate immediate and long-range plans for achieving school improvement received positive ratings by a substantial number of the superintendents. "The secondary principal implements the annual school plan" was afforded the highest rating. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents rated the criterion very important, 30 percent rated it important, while only 3 percent of the respondents rated the criterion slightly important. Also, the respondents rated positively the criterion, "The secondary principal makes the annual school plan consistent with the school district-wide plan." This criterion was rated very important by 62 percent of the respondents, while 33 percent rated the criterion important, and only 5 percent rated it slightly important.

Of the four criteria that related to the handbook of policies and procedures, the superintendents afforded only one a positive rating. More respondents rated the criterion, "The secondary principal uses the handbook after its completion" very important than they did that the

secondary principal: (1) determines the content of the handbook; (2) develops a school handbook; and (3) decides whom to involve in preparing the handbook. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents rated the criterion, "The secondary principal uses the handbook after its completion," very important, while 30 percent rated it important, and only 2 percent of the respondents rated it slightly important.

"The secondary principal resolves work problems" received a positive rating by the superintendents. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents rated the criterion very important, and 32 percent rated it important. Only 1 percent of the respondents rated the criterion slightly important.

The superintendents also afforded a positive rating of the criterion, "The secondary principal inducts new employees into the school." Sixty-one percent of the respondents rated the criterion very important, which suggests that the respondents regarded the criterion for making principals' evaluations highly. Thirty-seven percent rated the criterion important, and only two percent gave it a slightly important rating.

Table 4 shows that of all the non-SOQ evaluation criteria that were employed by division superintendents to assess the performance of secondary principals, these criteria contained in table 4 received positive ratings.

TABLE 4

Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Non-Standards of Quality Evaluation Criteria as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia (N=105)

NON-SOQ Evaluation Criteria	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
The secondary principal:				
a. Follows the school division's guidelines in the management of school monies.	77%	21%	2%	0%
b. Ensures that systematic and auditable records are kept of all funds over which the school has custody.	79%	20%	1%	0%
c. Allocates budget funds based on evaluation of existing programs, expressed program needs, and budget limitations.	72%	28%	0%	0%
d. Interprets and enforces the school's policies and regulations regarding use of the building.	61%	38%	1%	0%
e. Provides opportunities which strengthen the lines of communication between home and school.	74%	26%	0%	0%
f. Interprets the school program and the policies and regulations to the community.	68%	32%	0%	0%
g. Is receptive to inquiries from parents regarding the school program.	64%	35%	1%	0%

However, the respondents tended to rate the criteria that involved the secondary principal in business and financial matters highest, which suggest that these criteria were more important to the respondents for evaluating the principals.

With reference to the criterion, "The secondary principal insures that systematic and auditable records are kept of all funds over which the school has custody," 79 percent of the respondents rated it very important, 20 percent rated it important, while only 1 percent of the respondents rated the criterion slightly important. Similarly, the respondents regarded highly the criterion, "The secondary principal follows the school division's guidelines in the management of school monies." Seventy-seven percent of the respondents rated the criterion very important, 21 percent rated it important, and only 2 percent of the respondents rated the criterion slightly important. "The secondary principal allocates budget funds based on evaluation of existing programs, expressed program needs and budget limitations," was rated very important by 72 percent of the respondents, and 28 percent rated the criterion important.

The public relations evaluation criteria were afforded positive ratings by division superintendents, which suggest that they regarded these criteria for evaluating secondary principals highly. "The secondary principal provides opportunities which strengthens the lines of communication between

home and school," was afforded a "very important" rating by 74 percent of the respondents, and 26 percent rated the criterion important. "The secondary principal interprets the school program and policies and regulations to the community," was rated very important by 68 percent of the respondents, while 32 percent rated the criterion important. Of all the public relations criteria contained in table 4, "The secondary principal is receptive to inquiries from parents regarding the school program," was rated lowest. Sixty-four percent of the respondents rated this criterion very important, 35 percent rated it important, and only 1 percent of the respondents rated the criterion slightly important.

The school plant evaluation criterion received the lowest rating of all the criteria contained in table 4. "The secondary principal interprets and enforces the school's policies and regulations regarding use of the building," was rated very important by 61 percent of the respondents, while 38 percent rated the criterion important, and 1 percent rated it slightly important.

Sub-Question Two

What procedures are considered very important by division superintendents for gathering data to evaluate secondary public school principals?

According to the data shown in table 5, four procedures received positive ratings by division superintendents. Those

TABLE 5

Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of Procedures
Employed to Gather Data to Make Secondary Principals'
Evaluations in Virginia
(N = 105)

Data Are Gathered to Make Principals' Evaluations by:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Making personal school visits (superintendent)	64%	30%	6%	1%
b. Assessing the principals' accom- plishment of predetermined ad- ministrative objectives	64%	32%	4%	0%
c. Assessing the principals' profi- ciency in supervising the school staff	79%	21%	0%	0%
d. Assessing the principals' perfor- mance in supervising business and finance	65%	34%	1%	0%

procedures that were employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations that were employed to assess the work performance of principals received the highest ratings. The positive rating of these procedures suggests that they are more important for assessing principals' job performance.

With reference to table 5, 64 percent of the respondents rated the procedure, "assessing the principals' accomplishment of predetermined administrative objectives," very important, 32 percent rated the procedure important, 4 percent rated it slightly important, and none of the respondents rated the procedure not important. The procedure, "assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff," was rated very important by 79 percent of the respondents, while 21 percent rated the procedure important, and none of the respondents rated the procedure slightly important or not important. Sixty-five percent of the respondents rated the procedure, "assessing the principals' performance in supervising business and finance," very important, while 34 percent rated it important, and only 1 percent of the respondents rated the procedure slightly important. None of the respondents rated the procedure not important.

Table 5 also reveals that the superintendents afforded a positive rating of the procedure employed for gathering data to make principals' evaluations, "making personal school visits (superintendent)." The procedure was rated very important by 64 percent of the respondents. Thirty percent

of the respondents rated the procedure important, while 6 percent rated it slightly important, and only 1 percent of the respondents rated the procedure not important.

Sub-Question Three

What is the most important purpose and what is the least important purpose for the evaluation of secondary public school principals as identified by division superintendents? According to the data contained in table 6, the most important purpose of the evaluation of secondary principals was to "improve task performance" and the least important purpose was to "grant merit or performance pay."

Division superintendents were requested to rank the purposes for the evaluation of secondary public school principals in their school divisions. Numbers one through ten (1-10) were employed; one (1) represented the most important purpose, and ten (10) represented the least important purpose of the evaluation of secondary principals. Table 6 contains the mean ratings of division superintendents' responses regarding the ranking of purposes for the evaluation of secondary public school principals.

Table 6 shows that according to the respondents, the most important purpose for the evaluation of secondary public school principals was, "to improve task performance." This purpose was ranked first, and a mean rating of 8.83 was obtained. Respondents ranked the purpose, "to grant merit

TABLE 6

Importance Placed on Purposes of Evaluating Secondary
Public School Principals in Virginia

Purpose of Evaluation	Mean	Rank***
*a. Improve task performance	8.83	1
b. Increase productivity of the individual, the total management team, and the school division	8.58	2
c. Let the principal know exactly what is expected and how well the superintendent feels that expectations are met	7.47	3
d. Provide information related to strengths and weaknesses of the principal in order to develop in-service and job upgrading programs	7.28	4
e. Provide informational input upon which wise management decisions can be made	6.35	5
f. Eliminate those who are incompetent	3.92	6
g. Differentiate administrative assignments	3.66	7
h. Decide on tenure or permanent appointment	3.58	8
i. Screen principals for promotion or demotion	3.56	9
**j. Grant merit or performance pay	1.85	10

*Denotes most important purpose

**Denotes least important purpose

***Division superintendents rated the purposes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 in rank order of importance. Mean ratings were determined by assigning each rating a weight as follows:

<u>Rate</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Weight</u>
1	10	5	6	8	3
2	9	6	5	9	2
3	8	7	4	10	1
4	7				

or performance pay," as being the least important purpose for the evaluation of secondary public school principals, and a mean rating of 1.85 was obtained.

Sub-Question Four

Overall, how important is the evaluation process regarding secondary public school principals according to perceptions held by division superintendents?

The purpose of this question was to determine the importance of the overall evaluation process employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals in Virginia. Table 7 shows that the superintendents did not perceive the overall evaluation process to be very important for assessing the performance of secondary public school principals. Fifty-four percent of the respondents rated the evaluation process very important, 45 percent rated it important, while 1 percent of the respondents rated the evaluation process slightly important, and none of the respondents rated it not important.

Sub-Question Five

Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria that are employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

TABLE 7

Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the Overall Evaluation
Process of Secondary Public School Principals in Virginia
(N = 105)

Question	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
Overall, how important is the evaluation process of secondary public school principals?	54%	45%	1%	0%

The objective of this question was to determine if school division size (enrollment) was a factor that related to how division superintendents responded to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria that were employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals. Each relationship was tested by employing the one-way analysis of variance, and the Scheffé test was employed to determine which group means differed significantly at the .05 alpha level.

Table 8 shows that there was a statistical significant difference ($p < .05$) in school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the "cooperative evaluation program" evaluation criteria. An F-ratio of 2.68 was obtained (0.04) at the .05 alpha level.

The Scheffé test revealed that group means were significantly different at the .05 alpha level. Superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained an enrollment of 1,000-3,499 students group means differed from those who were employed in school divisions that contained enrollments of 0-999 students, 3,500-9,999 students, 10,000-30,000 students, and 30,001 or more students respectively. Those superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained an enrollment of 1,000-3,400 students rated the importance of the "cooperative evaluation program"

TABLE 8

School Division Size and the Importance of Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	School Division Size and Means					
	0-999	1,000-3,499	3,500-9,999	10,000-30,000	30,001+	F
a. Annual School Plan in the Individual School Building R = 6-24	11.80	9.33	8.71	8.73	8.29	1.91 (.21)
b. Handbook of Policies and Procedures in the School R = 4-16	7.20	6.20	6.17	6.40	5.71	.51 (.72)
c. Coordinating Services of Persons Working in the School R = 6-24	9.60	9.72	8.29	9.27	9.43	1.77 (.14)
d. Usage of Instructional Materials and Equipment R = 4-16	8.00	8.35	7.29	7.87	7.43	1.05 (.38)
e. Assignment of Pupils to Classes, Programs, and Activities R = 4-16	7.00	7.07	6.80	6.87	5.86	.78 (.54)
f. Evaluation of Pupil Programs and Instructional Effectiveness R = 4-16	5.40	6.60	6.00	6.80	5.42	1.46 (.22)

TABLE 8 - Continued

Criteria	School Division Size and Means					
	0-999	1,000-3,499	3,500-9,999	10,000-30,000	30,001+	F
g. Instructional Supervision and Assistance to Teachers R = 4-16	5.20	5.74	5.17	5.53	4.86	.91 (.46)
h. Cooperative Evaluation Program R = 5-20	8.00	8.65**	7.05	8.00	7.29	2.68* (.04)
i. Business and Finance R = 3-12	3.80	3.86	3.74	3.53	3.43	.32 (.86)
j. School Plant R = 4-16	5.40	5.86	5.66	6.40	6.43	.62 (.64)
k. School Community Relations R = 4-16	5.40	5.60	5.14	6.13	4.57	1.91 (.11)
l. Professional Qualities and Growth R = 4-16	5.40	6.23	5.31	7.13**	5.43	3.52* (0.00)

R = Range of Means

* Denotes significant F

** Denotes significant Scheffé

evaluation criteria higher than other groups of superintendents. Superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained enrollments of 0-999 students, 3,500-9,999 students, 10,000-30,000 students, and 30,001 or more students group means were essentially the same regarding their rating of the importance of the "cooperative evaluation program" evaluation criteria.

Table 8 also reveals that there was a statistical significant difference ($p < .05$) in school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the "professional qualities and growth" evaluation criteria. An F-ratio of 3.52 was obtained (0.00) at the .05 alpha level. The Scheffé test revealed that group means were significantly different at the .05 alpha level. Superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained an enrollment of 10,000-30,000 students group means differed from those who were employed in school divisions that contained enrollments of 0-999 students, 1,000-3,499 students, 3,500-9,999 students, and 30,001 or more students respectively. Those superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained an enrollment of 10,000-30,000 students rated the importance of the "professional qualities and growth" evaluation criteria higher than other groups of superintendents. Superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained

enrollments of 0-999 students, 1,000-3,499 students, 3,500-9,999 students and 30,001 or more students group means were essentially the same regarding their rating of the importance of the "professional qualities and growth" evaluation criteria.

No statistical significant differences existed at the .05 alpha level between school division size (enrollment) and responses of division superintendents to the degrees of importance of the other tested evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary principals. The non-significant findings that pertain to sub-question five are listed in appendix L.

Sub-Question Six

Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

The objective of this question was to determine if school division size (enrollment) was a factor that related to how division superintendents responded to the degrees of importance of procedures that were employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. Each relationship was tested by employing the one-way analysis of variance, and the Scheffé test was employed to determine which group means differed significantly at the .05 alpha level.

Table 9 shows that there was a statistical significant difference ($p < .05$) in school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the procedure, "assessing the principals' accomplishment of predetermined administrative objectives," employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. An F-ratio of 3.21 was obtained (0.01) at the .05 alpha level. The F was significant, but the Scheffé, a more stringent test, revealed that there were no significant differences between the groups of superintendents.

Table 9 also reveals that there was a statistical significant difference in school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the procedure, "assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff," evaluation procedure employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. An F-ratio of 2.54 was obtained (0.04) at the .05 alpha level. The F was significant, but the Scheffé, a more stringent test, revealed that there were no significant differences between the groups of superintendents.

No statistical significant differences existed at the .05 alpha level between school division size (enrollment) and responses of division superintendents to the degrees of importance of the other evaluation procedures employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. The non-significant

TABLE 9

School Division Size and the Importance of Evaluation Procedures

Procedures	School Division Size and Means					
	0-999	1,000- 3,499	3,500- 9,999	10,000- 30,000	30,001+	F
a. Making personal school visits (superintendent)	1.60	1.37	1.49	1.47	1.43	.23 (.91)
b. Employing central office personnel input	1.80	1.77	1.60	1.73	1.71	.43 (.78)
c. Employing the principals' input (self-evaluation)	1.20	1.60	1.49	2.07	1.42	2.17 (.07)
d. Assessing the annual appearance of the school	1.80	1.84	1.80	1.80	2.00	.23 (.91)
e. Assessing the principals' general personality	1.60	2.16	2.05	2.13	2.14	.76 (.55)
f. Assessing the principals' accomplishment of predetermined administrative objectives	1.60	1.60	1.26	1.20	1.14	3.21* (.01)
g. Assessing the principals' proficiency to communicate with parents	1.40	1.49	1.43	1.40	1.14	.69 (.60)

TABLE 9 - Continued

Procedures	School Division Size and Means					
	0-999	1,000-3,499	3,500-9,999	10,000-30,000	30,001+	F
h. Assessing the principals' performance in supervising business and finance	1.40	1.49	1.26	1.33	1.14	1.43 (.22)
i. Using data collected through observations of the superintendent and assistant superintendent	1.60	1.58	1.43	1.33	1.43	.75 (.55)
j. Assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff	1.20	1.35	1.14	1.06	1.00	2.54* (.04)

* Denotes significant F

Mean ranges for all procedures are 1-4.

findings that pertain to sub-question six are listed in appendix M.

Sub-Question Seven

Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

The objective of this question was to determine if years of service was a factor that related to how division superintendents responded to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals. Each relationship was tested by employing the one-way analysis of variance, and the Scheffé test was employed to determine which group means differed significantly at the .05 alpha level.

There were no statistical differences found at the .05 alpha level between the variable regarding years of service and division superintendents responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals. Tables are listed in appendix N regarding the non-significant findings.

Sub-Question Eight

Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures that are employed to gather data to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

The objective of this question was to determine if years of service was a factor that related to how division superintendents responded to the degrees of importance of the procedures employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. Each relationship was tested by employing the one-way analysis of variance, and the Scheffé test was employed to determine which group means differed significantly at the .05 alpha level.

There were no statistical significant differences found at the .05 alpha level between the variable regarding years of service and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the procedures that were employed to gather data to assess the performance of secondary public school principals. Tables are listed in appendix O regarding the non-significant findings.

PERSONAL WRITE-IN COMMENTS BY SUPERINTENDENTS

The objective of including a write-in comment section on the questionnaire was to allow division superintendents to freely respond to areas of concern that dealt with evaluation of secondary public school principals in their local school divisions and also in Virginia. The comments are as follows:

1. I honestly believe that most of the evaluation items that are listed in the procedures section of the questionnaire are important.
2. The formal evaluative process is important; however, many assessments of the quality of the principal's work are made on a much more frequent and informal basis.
3. The day-to-day relationship of the secondary principal and superintendent is more important than the formal process, instruments used, etc.
4. Most of us know what to evaluate and perhaps how to do it. The problem seems to be taking the time and having the courage to do it.
5. In a small school division the evaluation process is rather informal.
6. The evaluation process of secondary principals in our school division is not as important as we would like for it to be.

7. The school division needs to formalize the evaluation process of administrators including secondary principals.

8. We need to improve the evaluation process to achieve greater specificity.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Data were sought regarding: (1) types of administrative school divisions in which superintendents were employed; (2) the student enrollment in school divisions; and (3) the number of years respondents have served as division superintendents in Virginia.

Table 10 reveals that most of the division superintendents were employed in county school divisions. Seventy-one percent of the respondents were employed in county school divisions, while 29 percent were employed in city school divisions. Most of the school divisions could be considered small to medium size containing 74 percent of the total enrollment population in Virginia, while the very small, large, and very large school divisions made up 26 percent of the enrollment.

Table 11 shows that most of the respondents, 36 percent, have served as division superintendents of schools in Virginia 0-4 years, while only 18 percent have served 13 years or more. Twenty-six percent of the superintendents have served 5-8 years and 20 percent have served 9-12 years.

TABLE 10

Summary of Types of Administrative School
Divisions and School Division Sizes (Enrollment)
in Virginia
(N=105)

Types of Administrative School Divisions				
			<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
County			75	71
City			30	29
School Division Sizes (Enrollment)				
			<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
0 -	999	Very Small	5	5
1,000 -	3,499	Small	43	41
3,500 -	9,999	Medium	35	33
10,000 -	30,000	Large	15	14
30,001 -	and over	Very Large	7	7

TABLE 11

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Years
Respondents Served as Division Superintendents
in Virginia

Years Served	County and City Responses	
	No.	%
0 - 4	38	36
5 - 8	27	26
9 - 12	21	20
13 - or more	19	18
Total	105	100

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION DATA

Evaluation data were sought regarding: (1) types of instruments employed to evaluate secondary principals; (2) who formally evaluates secondary principals in school divisions; (3) how often a formal written evaluation was done; and (4) whether a conference is held after an evaluation has been completed.

Table 12 shows that most of the superintendents employed both a checklist and narrative summary types of instruments to evaluate secondary principals. Sixty-six percent of the respondents employed these types of instruments. A checklist type instrument was used by 22 percent of the respondents to assess the performance of secondary principals. Ten percent of the respondents employed a narrative summary, while 2 percent used no instrument, and only 1 percent of the respondents employed a conference to evaluate secondary principals.

Table 13 reveals that most of the superintendents, 53 percent, formally evaluated secondary principals in their school divisions. Eighteen percent of the respondents delegated the evaluation process to assistant superintendents, 16 percent cooperatively performed the evaluation with their assistant superintendents, 6 percent delegated the task to directors of instruction, 2 percent cooperatively performed the evaluation with the director of instruction,

TABLE 12

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Types of
Instruments Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals
in Virginia

Instrument	County and City Responses	
	No.	%
A checklist	23	22
A narrative summary	10	10
Both, a checklist and a narrative summary	69	66
No instrument	2	2
Conference	1	1
Total	105	101

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest
whole number and may not equal 100%.

TABLE 13

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Who Formally Evaluates Secondary Principals in School Divisions in Virginia

Evaluator	County and City Responses	
	No.	%
Superintendent	56	53
Assistant Superintendent	19	18
Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent	17	16
Director of Instruction	6	6
Superintendent and Director of Instruction	2	2
Superintendent, Director of Instruction, and Director of Personnel	1	1
Superintendent and Board of Education	2	2
Superintendent and Committee	1	1
Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and Teachers	1	1
Total	105	100

1 percent of the respondents performed the evaluation task with the director of instruction and director of personnel, 2 percent cooperatively performed the evaluation with the board of education, 1 percent cooperatively performed the evaluation task with a committee, and 1 percent of the respondents employed the assistant superintendent and teachers to formally evaluate secondary principals.

Table 14 shows that most, 82 percent, of the division superintendents and those persons who were delegated the responsibility by the superintendents to evaluate the performance of secondary principals evaluated them annually on a formal written basis. Eleven percent of the respondents evaluated secondary principals semi-annually, and 4 percent evaluated them every three years on a formal written basis. Two percent of the respondents never did a formal written evaluation of secondary principals, while 1 percent of the respondents indicated that a formal written evaluation was on-going. Most of the division superintendents held a conference after they evaluated secondary principals. Ninety-three percent of the respondents held a conference, while only 7 percent did not.

SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The results of division superintendents' responses were presented in this chapter, and the data were obtained through the administration of a questionnaire. The methods employed

TABLE 14

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of How Often
a Formal Written Evaluation Is Done in School Divi-
sions and Whether a Conference Is Held After Evalu-
ation Has Been Completed in Virginia
(N=105)

How often is a formal written evaluation of second- ary principals done?		
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Annually	86	82
Semi-annually	12	11
Quarterly	0	0
Every three years	4	4
Never	2	2
On-going	1	1
Is a conference held after evaluation has been com- pleted?		
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes	98	93
No	7	7

to analyze these data obtained were distributions containing frequencies and percentages.

The one-way analysis of variance, a statistical procedure, was employed to determine if significant differences existed between groups, and the Scheffé test was also used to determine which group means significantly differed. Division superintendents' write-in responses were included as pertinent comments regarding principals' evaluations, and the analysis of demographic and evaluation data was also included.

Two sets of evaluation criteria were presented in this chapter that were employed in Virginia to assess the performance of secondary public school principals. The "Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria were those which were set forth by Virginia's General Assembly and implemented by the State Department of Education and school divisions in Virginia. The non-SOQ evaluation criteria were those other criteria which division superintendents also employed to evaluate the performance of secondary principals.

Of the thirty-seven SOQ evaluation criteria, nine were rated very important by the division superintendents. They tended to rate highest the criteria which involved the principal in a supervisory role. Of the fifteen non-SOQ evaluation criteria, seven were rated very important. However, the superintendents rated those criteria which related to business and finance highest.

Division superintendents rated the procedure employed for gathering data to make principals' evaluations, "making personal visits to the school (superintendent)," very important. Also, the procedures that were employed to assess the work performance of secondary principals were very important for gathering data to make principals' evaluations.

The most important and least important purposes for the evaluation of secondary principals were determined by employing the highest and lowest mean ratings. The highest mean rating was used to determine the most important purpose, and the lowest mean rating was used to determine the least important purpose of evaluating the principals. Superintendents rated the most important purpose of the evaluation of secondary principals as being, "to improve task performance," and they rated the least important purpose as being, "to grant merit or performance pay." The most important purpose that the superintendents rated was substantiated in the review of literature.

The importance of the overall evaluation process was not determined to be essential. Superintendents did not regard the overall evaluation process as being very important. Fifty-four percent of the superintendents perceived the overall evaluation process to be very important.

The sub-questions that sought to determine if differences existed between demographic variables and the criteria

and procedures variables were analyzed by employing the one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffé test. Significant differences were found between: (1) school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the cooperative evaluation program evaluation criteria; (2) school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the professional qualities and growth evaluation criteria; (3) school division size (enrollment) and assessing the principals' accomplishment of pre-determined administrative objectives evaluation procedure; and (4) school division size (enrollment) and assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff evaluation procedure. There was a less than 5 percent chance that responses made on these items occurred simply by chance.

Most of the superintendents who participated in this study were employed in county school divisions. They made up 71 percent of the total population, and the sizes of the school divisions ranged in the very small to very large categories. However, the small to medium sized school divisions comprized the majority of the school divisions in the study.

Division superintendents who have been employed the shortest period of time, 0-4 years, made up the largest percent of superintendents in this study. They consisted of 36 percent of the total population, while only 18 percent have been employed 13 or more years.

Of the various types of instruments that division superintendents employed to evaluate secondary principals, the majority of them used both a checklist and a narrative summary. Also, the checklist alone was used by 22 percent of the superintendents to formally evaluate secondary principals. Most of the superintendents preferred to evaluate the principals annually and hold a conference after the evaluation was completed.

Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter five summarizes this study, which pertains to the importance of the evaluation criteria, procedures employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations, and purposes of evaluating secondary public school principals in Virginia. Contained in this chapter are the following sections: (1) the problem, (2) summary of procedures, (3) summary of findings, (4) conclusions, (5) discussion, (6) implications, and (7) recommendations.

THE PROBLEM

This study was designed to present the criteria and procedures employed in the formal evaluation of secondary public school principals in Virginia and to determine the perceptions of the superintendents regarding the importance of each in assessing their performance. Further inquiries were made to determine the purposes of evaluating secondary public school principals and to answer the eight sub-questions relative to the evaluation process:

1. What formal criteria are employed by division superintendents in Virginia to evaluate secondary public school principals, and how important are these criteria?

2. What procedures are considered very important by division superintendents for gathering data to evaluate secondary

public school principals?

3. What is the most important purpose and what is the least important purpose for the evaluation of secondary public school principals as identified by division superintendents?

4. Overall, how important is the evaluation process regarding secondary public school principals according to perceptions held by division superintendents?

5. Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria that are employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

6. Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

7. Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

8. Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures that are employed to gather data to assess

the performance of secondary public school principals?

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES

The Population and Procedures

The population of this study consisted of one hundred and thirty-two division superintendents who were listed in the Virginia Educational Directory for the 1980-81 school year. Of the population surveyed, one hundred and fifteen division superintendents responded to the preliminary survey, and one hundred and five responded to the second (major) survey that was employed to gather data for the study.

The completion of this study was accomplished in four stages which consisted of: (1) an intense review of literature to serve as background information; (2) a preliminary survey of division superintendents in Virginia to determine the evaluation process and basis for arriving at secondary principals' evaluations; (3) a major survey to gather data for the study was conducted to determine the importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures that were employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals and to determine purposes of the evaluation of the principals; and (4) the extraction of pertinent findings relative to the two surveys.

Development of the Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were employed to gather data for this study. The preliminary survey questionnaire (appendix A) was developed through a review of literature and counsel with the major and research advisors. The purpose of the preliminary survey was to determine the evaluation process which best described those employed in Virginia school divisions and the basis for arriving at the results of secondary principals' evaluations. Some of the evaluation procedures derived from the preliminary survey were employed to construct the procedures section of the major survey questionnaire.

The major survey questionnaire (appendix C) was developed from: (1) a review of literature with emphasis on administrative evaluation; (2) the SOQ evaluation criteria; (3) evaluation data received from the preliminary survey; and (4) counsel with the major advisor and graduate committee. The questionnaire was submitted to a review panel for the purpose of refining and validating the instrument. All suggestions, comments, and/or recommendations were incorporated into the final draft, which contained four sections. The first section was concerned with collecting demographic data. Section two sought to determine pertinent data relative to the principals' evaluations and purposes of principals' evaluations. The third section sought to determine the importance of the evaluation criteria that were employed to

assess the performance of secondary public school principals. The respondents were asked to rate the evaluation criteria by checking one response for each item on the four-point Likert Scale. The fourth and final section of the questionnaire sought to determine the procedures that were important for gathering data to make principals' evaluations. A four-point Likert Scale was employed again so that respondents could rate the evaluation procedures according to their perceptions regarding the degrees of importance.

Data Treatment and Statistical Analysis

A frequency distribution table was constructed for each section of responses afforded by division superintendents relative to the importance of the evaluation criteria, the evaluation process, and procedures employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. Sub-questions one, two, and four were analyzed by employing very important responses which exceeded 60 percent. The most important and least important purposes of the evaluation of secondary principals were determined by employing the highest and lowest mean ratings respectively.

All data were coded, transferred to optical scanner sheets, key punched, and processed by the computer through employment of The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were employed to analyze data relative to sub-questions one,

two, and four, and the one-way analysis of variance was employed to determine if significant differences existed at the .05 alpha level between demographic variables and responses of groups of division superintendents to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures (subquestions five through eight). The Scheffé test was employed to determine which groups significantly differed at the .05 alpha level. Comments regarding the evaluation criteria, procedures, purposes, and process were reported. Also, a descriptive analysis of demographic and evaluation data was done.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Preliminary Survey

Results were obtained from the preliminary survey of responses from one hundred fifteen of the total one hundred thirty-two division superintendents in Virginia. The respondent superintendents employed the evaluation process as follows:

1. Forty-five percent employed formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards.
2. Sixteen percent employed formal evaluation determined by tasks performed.

3. Fourteen percent employed informal evaluation.
4. Fifteen percent employed formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards and tasks performed.
5. Four percent employed formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards and informal evaluation.
6. Four percent employed formal evaluation determined by predetermined objectives.
7. Three percent employed formal evaluation determined by predetermined standards, tasks performed, and informal evaluation.

The basis used for arriving at the results of the evaluation of secondary principals as reported by division superintendents was as follows:

1. Seventy-nine percent employed personal observations.
2. Two percent employed principals' interaction with the superintendent, central office staff, and the general public.
3. Two percent employed accomplishments of objectives performance based, student and staff input.
4. Three percent employed accomplishments of predetermined objectives.
5. Three percent employed personal observations by the superintendent and assistant superintendent.
6. Nine percent employed personal observations by the superintendent and a survey of teachers.

7. Three percent employed personal observations by the superintendent and central office input.

Results were obtained from the major survey conducted by means of employing the questionnaire, and these findings pertained to the problem and sub-questions one through eight. Questionnaires were completed by one hundred five of one hundred thirty-two division superintendents surveyed in Virginia.

Summary of Sub-Question One

What formal criteria are employed by division superintendents in Virginia to evaluate secondary public school principals, and how important are these criteria?

In rating the importance of the SOQ evaluation criteria that were employed to evaluate secondary public school principals, division superintendents rated several very positive. Of the thirty-seven SOQ evaluation criteria, nine received positive ratings. The evaluation criteria that were rated very important were as follows:

1. Annual School Plan item "a": The secondary principal makes the annual school plan consistent with the school district-wide plan. Item "b": The secondary principal implements the annual school plan.

2. Handbook of Policies and Procedures item "c": The secondary principal uses the handbook after its completion.

3. Coordinating Services of Persons Working in the School item "d": The secondary principal inducts new employees into the school. Item "e": The secondary principal resolves work problems. Item "f": The secondary principal monitors work performance.

4. Instructional Supervision and Assistance to Teachers item "g": The secondary principal develops a plan of supervision. Item "h": The secondary principal allocates time for supervision.

5. Cooperative Evaluation Program item "i": The secondary principal coordinates evaluation and supervision.

Division superintendents rated several of the non-SOQ evaluation criteria that were employed to evaluate secondary public school principals as being essential. Of the fifteen non-SOQ evaluation criteria, seven received positive ratings. The evaluation criteria that were rated very important were as follows:

1. Business and Finance item "a": The secondary principal follows the school division's guidelines in the management of school monies. Item "b": The secondary principal ensures that systematic and auditable records are kept of all funds over which the school has custody. Item "c": The secondary principal allocates budget funds based on evaluation of existing programs, expressed program needs, and budget limitations.

2. School Plant item "d": The secondary principal interprets and enforces the school's policies and regulations regarding use of the building.

3. School Community Relations item "e": The secondary principal provides opportunities which strengthen the lines of communication between home and school. Item "f": The secondary principal interprets the school program and policies and regulations to the community. Item "g": The secondary principal is receptive to inquiries from parents regarding the school program.

The findings relative to the importance of the SOQ and non-SOQ evaluation criteria seemed to support the findings reported in MacQueen's (1969) doctoral dissertation, which dealt with establishing the importance of various criteria that were employed to assess the performance of a high school principal. He found in his survey of a cross-section of school districts in the United States that superintendents rated highly the importance of seventy criteria. Therefore, it appeared that superintendents in the U.S. perceived the criteria that were employed to evaluate secondary principals to be important and superintendents in Virginia perceived certain evaluation criteria employed to evaluate secondary principals to be very important.

Summary of Sub-Question Two

What procedures are considered very important by division superintendents for gathering data to evaluate secondary public school principals? The computation of percentages regarding procedures that were considered important for gathering data to evaluate secondary principals revealed that four procedures were rated very important. Data are gathered to make principals' evaluations by:

- "a": making personal school visits (superintendent).
- "b": assessing the principals' accomplishment of pre-determined administrative objectives.
- "c": assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff.
- "d": assessing the principals' performance in supervising business and finance.

The finding in this study regarding item "a", data are gathered to make principals' evaluations by making personal school visits (superintendent), was rated very important. However, Deal (1977) suggested that visits to the school by the superintendent should not be the final stage of an evaluation of principals, but the visit should be followed with continuing discussions of strengths and weaknesses.

Summary of Sub-Question Three

What is the most important purpose and what is the least important purpose for the evaluation of secondary

public school principals as identified by division superintendents?

The following item was identified as the most important purpose for the evaluation of secondary public school principals as identified by division superintendents:

Item "a": To improve task performance.

The following item was identified as the least important purpose for the evaluation of secondary public school principals:

Item "j": To grant merit or performance pay.

Improving task performance was found to be the most important purpose for evaluating secondary public school principals. This finding was relative to one purpose set forth in Virginia's Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives, 1972, to improve performance. Also, the finding was relative to studies completed by Gaslin (1974), Jacobson and others (1973), Armstrong (1973), and Palucci (1978).

To grant merit or performance pay was found to be the least important purpose for evaluating secondary principals. However, studies completed by Castetter and Haisler (1971), and Hunt and Buser (1977) did not reveal that this was the least important purpose for evaluating secondary principals, but evaluation might well be a purpose for establishing recommendations for salary compensation and increments.

Summary of Sub-Question Four

Overall, how important is the evaluation process regarding secondary public school principals according to perceptions held by division superintendents?

The overall evaluation process of secondary public school principals was not rated as being very important by the division superintendents.

Summary of Sub-Question Five

Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria that are employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

Statistical significant differences were found at the .05 alpha level between group means through the employment of the one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffé test. There were significant differences found between school division size (enrollment) demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the "cooperative evaluation program" evaluation criteria and the "professional qualities and growth" evaluation criteria that were employed to assess the performance of secondary principals.

1. There was a statistical significant difference between school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the "cooperative evaluation program" evaluation criteria at the

.05 alpha level. An F-ratio of 2.68 was obtained (0.04) at the .05 alpha level.

The Scheffé test revealed that group means were significantly different at the .05 alpha level. Group means of superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained an enrollment of 1,000-3,499 students differed from those who were employed in school divisions that contained enrollments of 0-999 students, 3,500-9,999 students, 10,000-30,000 students, and 30,001 or more students respectively. Those superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained an enrollment of 1,000-3,499 students rated the importance of the SOQ "cooperative evaluation program" evaluation criteria higher than other groups of superintendents. Group means of superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained enrollments of 0-999 students, 3,500-9,999 students, 10,000-30,000 students, and 30,001 or more students were essentially the same regarding their rating of the importance of the SOQ "cooperative evaluation program" evaluation criteria.

There was a statistical significant difference between school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the non-SOQ "professional qualities and growth" evaluation criteria at the .05 alpha level. An F-ratio of 3.52 was obtained (0.00) at the .05 alpha level.

The Scheffé test revealed that group means were significantly different at the .05 alpha level. Group means of superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained an enrollment of 10,000-30,000 students differed from those who were employed in school divisions that contained 0-999 students, 1,000-3,499 students, 3,500-9,999 students, and 30,001 or more students respectively. Those superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained an enrollment of 10,000-30,000 students rated the importance of the non-SOQ "professional qualities and growth" evaluation criteria higher than other groups of superintendents. Group means of superintendents who were employed in school divisions that contained enrollments of 0-999 students, 1,000-3,499 students, 3,500-9,999 students and 30,001 or more students were essentially the same regarding their rating of the importance of the "professional qualities and growth" evaluation criteria. Other findings that related to school division size (enrollment) demographic variables and responses of division superintendents to the evaluation criteria variables were not found to be significantly different.

Summary of Sub-Question Six

Are there differences between school division enrollment demographic variables and responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures employed to assess the

performance of secondary public school principals?

There were statistical significant differences found at the .05 alpha level between group means through employment of the one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffé test regarding school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of two evaluation procedures: (1) "assessing the principals' accomplishment of predetermined administrative objectives" and (2) "assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff."

1. A statistical significant difference was found at the .05 alpha level between school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the procedure, "assessing the principals' accomplishment of predetermined administrative objectives," employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. An F-ratio of 3.21 was obtained (0.01) at the .05 alpha level. The F was significant, but the Scheffé, a more stringent test revealed that there were no significant differences between the groups of superintendents.

2. There was a statistical significant difference found at the .05 alpha level between school division size (enrollment) and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the procedure, "assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff," evaluation

procedure employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations. An F-ratio of 2.54 was obtained (0.04) at the .05 alpha level. The F was significant, but the Scheffé, a more stringent test, revealed that there were no significant differences between the groups of superintendents. Other findings that related to the school division size (enrollment) and demographic variables and responses to the procedures employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations were found not to be significantly different.

Summary of Sub-Question Seven

Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

There were no statistical significant differences found at the .05 alpha level between the variable regarding years of service of division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals. Therefore, years of service do not affect the importance that superintendents place upon the evaluation criteria employed to assess secondary principals' performance.

Summary of Sub-Question Eight

Are there differences between demographic variables regarding years of service of the division superintendents and their responses to the degrees of importance of the evaluation procedures that are employed to gather data to assess the performance of secondary public school principals?

There were no statistical significant differences found at the .05 alpha level between the variable regarding years of service and division superintendents' responses to the degrees of importance of the procedures that were employed to gather data to assess the performance of secondary public school principals. Therefore, years of service do not affect the importance that superintendents place upon the evaluation procedures employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations.

This section of the chapter reports the conclusions based upon the findings and analysis of data relative to the problem.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The SOQ evaluation criteria that pertained to the annual school plan, handbook of policies and procedures, coordinating services of persons working in the school, instructional supervision and assistance to teachers, and the cooperative evaluation program were very important to the formal

evaluation process of secondary public school principals. Also, the non-SOQ evaluation criteria that pertained to business and finance, school plant, and school community relations were very important to the formal evaluation process of secondary public school principals.

2. The procedures that were employed to gather data to assess the principals' work performance were very important. Also, making personal visits to the school by the superintendent was a very important procedure to the formal evaluation process of secondary public school principals.

3. The most important purpose of the evaluation of secondary principals was to improve task performance and the least important purpose was to grant merit or performance pay for secondary public school principals.

DISCUSSION

1. It can be concluded that of the thirty-seven "Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria that were employed in Virginia to assess the performance of secondary public school principals, only nine were very important to the division superintendents for making principals' evaluations. However, included in the nine positive rated evaluation criteria were those in which the superintendents rated highest. It was evident that those criteria which were relevant to the principals' supervisory role were afforded the highest rating,

and they were very important for assessing principals' performance. Those evaluation criteria were, the secondary principal: (1) allocates time for supervision; (2) develops a plan of supervision; (3) monitors work performance; and (4) coordinates evaluation and supervision.

2. It was evident from the findings that of those fifteen "non-Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria that were employed to evaluate the performance of secondary public school principals, seven criteria were essential for assessing the performance of secondary principals. Those evaluation criteria that related to business and finance received the highest positive ratings, and they were the secondary principal: (1) insures that systematic and auditable records are kept; (2) follows the school division's guidelines in the management of school monies; and (3) allocates budget funds based on evaluation of existing programs, expressed program needs, and budget limitations.

3. It can be concluded from the findings that the procedure that was very important for gathering data to make principals' evaluations was the one that involved the superintendent in making personal visits to the school, and those procedures that were used to assess the work performance of secondary public school principals. They were: (1) assessing the principals' accomplishment of predetermined administrative objectives; (2) assessing the principals' proficiency

in supervising the school staff; and (3) assessing the principals' performance in supervising business and finance.

4. It can be concluded from the findings that the overall evaluation process regarding secondary public school principals was not very important.

5. It can be concluded that a large number of superintendents use established evaluation criteria and procedures.

6. It can be concluded that the State evaluation procedures need to be looked at.

IMPLICATIONS

At the inception of this study, several questions were raised regarding principals' evaluations. This study has reported the answers relative to the evaluation criteria, procedures, purposes, and process. The conclusions of this study have warranted the following implications:

1. The various "Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria that were rated highly by division superintendents including the annual school plan, handbook of policies and procedures, coordinating services of persons working in the school, instructional supervision and assistance to teachers, and the cooperative evaluation program should continue to be employed to evaluate the performance of secondary public school principals since these criteria were very important to the formal evaluation process of secondary public school principals.

2. The various "non-Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria that pertained to business and finance, school plant, and school community relations should continue to be employed to evaluate the performance of secondary public school principals since these criteria were very important to the formal evaluation process of the principals. However, the Legislature ought to consider incorporating into the "Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria these "non-Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria in as much as they are used and are important.

3. The very important evaluation procedures that were relative to personal school visits made by the superintendents, and those procedures that were employed to assess the work performance of secondary principals should continue to be employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations since they were important to the formal evaluation process of secondary principals.

4. From the conclusions drawn from this study, the most important purpose of the evaluation of secondary public school principals was to improve task performance and the least important purpose was to grant merit or performance pay. Division superintendents should be cognizant of the overall opinions regarding these purposes of the evaluation of principals and consider the feasibility of using or not using them as those purposes that they set forth in their evaluation goals or guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of findings and conclusions drawn from this study warrant certain recommendations.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based upon the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations relative to this study are offered for further research:

1. Several questions have been answered regarding this study, and several have been disclosed; for example:

Why were only nine of the thirty-seven "Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria and seven of fifteen, almost one-half, of the "non-Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria very important for assessing the performance of secondary public school principals? Also, why were the highest rated "Standards of Quality" and "non-Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria those which dealt with the supervisory role of the principal and business and finance respectively for the evaluation of principals' performance? A study needs to be done now to investigate why certain SOQ and non-SOQ evaluation criteria are important for assessing secondary principals' performance.

2. Those SOQ and non-SOQ evaluation criteria to which superintendents gave positive ratings should be continuously employed to evaluate the performance of secondary principals,

and emphasis should be placed on the use of the criteria since they are important. Those criteria to which superintendents did not give positive ratings should be investigated to determine why they are not important for evaluating secondary public school principals.

3. The four evaluation procedures that are very important should be employed to gather data to make principals' evaluations; however, a study should be done to determine why several procedures were not very important to the formal evaluation process of secondary public school principals. The procedures are: (1) employing central office personnel input; (2) employing principals' input (self-evaluation); (3) assessing the annual appearance of the school; (4) assessing the principals' general personality; (5) assessing the principals' proficiency to communicate with parents; and (6) using data collected through observations of the superintendent and assistant superintendent.

4. A preliminary survey should be done to determine which school systems use the purpose, "to improve task performance," in evaluation guidelines as the purpose for evaluating secondary principals. A major study should then be done to determine if the employment of this purpose in evaluation guidelines has made a difference in the improvement of task performance of secondary public school principals in the school system of Virginia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bent, Rudyard K., and Lloyd E. McCann. Administration of Secondary Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Campbell, Roald, and Russell T. Gregg. Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Corwin, Ronald G. A Sociology of Education: Emerging Patterns of Class, Status, and Power in the Public Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1965.
- Demeke, H. J. Performance Evaluation of the Educational Leader. Tempe: Arizona State University, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, 1972.
- Educational Research Service. Evaluating Administrative Performance. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1968.
- _____. Evaluating Administrative/Supervisory Performance. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1971.
- Elicker, Paul E. The Administration of Junior and Senior High Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Goldman, Samuel. The School Principal. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Green, Robert E. Administrative Appraisal: A Step to Improved Leadership. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1972.
- Harris, Ben M., Kenneth E. McIntyre, Vance C. Littleton, and Daniel F. Long. Personnel Administration in Education: Leadership for Instructional Improvement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.
- Hipple, Theodore W. Crucial Issues in Contemporary Education. California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Jacobson, Paul B., James D. Logsdon, and Robert R. Weigman. The Principalsip: New Perspectives. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kimbrough, Ralph B., and Michael Y. Nunnery. Educational Administration: An Introduction. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.
- Morehead, Philip D. The New American Roget's College Thesaurus in Dictionary Form. New York: The New American Library Inc., 1978.
- Mosher, Ralph L. and David L. Purpel. Supervision: The Reluctant Profession. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972.
- Nie, Norman H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Nygaard, Deborah. Evaluating Administrative Performance: An E.R.S. Report. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1974.
- Trump, Lloyd J. A School for Everyone. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1977.
- Virginia State Department of Education. Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia (1972).
- Virginia State Department of Education. Virginia Educational Directory 1980-81. Richmond, Va.: Virginia State Department of Education.

Articles

- Adams, Velma A. "In West Hartford It's the Kids That Count." School Management, XV:19-25, September, 1971.
- Andersen, Hans O. "Supervisor as a Facilitator of Self-Evaluation." School Science and Mathematics, 72:603-616, October, 1972.
- Armstrong, Harold R. "Performance Evaluation." The National Elementary Principal, 52, 5:51-55, February, 1973.

- Christensen, Douglas D. "The Professional Performance File." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 62, No. 422:32-33, December, 1978.
- Deal, Terrence E. "Villains as Victims: Evaluating Principals." Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 4, 273-74, December, 1977.
- "Evaluation of Teachers and Other Employees." Tentative Report: Evaluation of Personnel, State Department of Education, Richmond, Va., 1972.
- Gaslin, William L. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance by a School's Teaching Staff." NASSP Bulletin Vol. 58, 386:72-81, December, 1974.
- Goldman, Harvey. "Evaluation of Administrative Behavior at the Building Level." NASSP Bulletin, 54, 347:71-79, September, 1970.
- Heier, W. D. "Implementing an Appraisal-By-Results Program." Personnel, 47:24-32, November-December, 1970.
- Herman, Jerry J. "An Up-Front Approach to Administrative Evaluation." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 62, 421:34-42, November, 1978.
- Hersey, Paul. "How School Systems are Evaluating Their Principals." The American School Board Journal, 163:24-25, July, 1976.
- Howsam, Robert B., and John M. Franco. "New Emphasis in Evaluation of Administrators." National Elementary Principal, 44:36-40, April, 1975.
- Hunt, John and Robert Buser. "Evaluating the Principal--Partnership or Paternalism?" NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 61, 413:10-15, December, 1977.
- Marcotte, Donald G. "Evaluation--The Purpose is Communication." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 62, 422:62, December, 1978.
- McCarty, Donald J. "Evaluating Your Superintendent." School Management, 15:38-39, July, 1971.
- McCleary, Lloyd. "Evaluation of Principals." Theory Into Practice, Vol. 18:45-49, February, 1979.
- McDonald, Milton S. "Administrator Evaluation: A Look at Georgia and the Nation." Georgia Standards Commission--Issues for Education Series, 1979, pp. 32-33.

Nicholson, Everett W. "The Performance of Principals in the Accountability Syndrome." NASSP Bulletin, 56:94-102, May, 1972.

Pharis, William L. "The Evaluation of School Principals." The National Elementary Principal, 52:36-38, February, 1973.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel." The National Elementary Principal, 52:39-44, February, 1973.

Redfern, George B. "Evaluating Administrative Productivity." The School Administrator, The American Association of School Administrators, March, 1974, pp. 6-9.

_____. "Legally Mandated Evaluation." The National Elementary Principal, February, 1973, pp. 45-50.

_____. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How?" NASSP Bulletin, 56:85-93, May, 1972.

Rentsch, George J. "Assessing Administrative Performance." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 60, 401:77-83, September, 1976.

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

_____. "The Values of School Principal Evaluation." Education, 91:212-214, February/March, 1971.

Sroufe, Gerald E. "Evaluation and Politics in Education." The Education Digest, Vol. XLIII, 4:20, December, 1977.

ERIC Documents

Abbott, Max G. Evaluating School Administrators: Perspectives for an On Administrator Evaluation. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 151 907, 1975.

Bolton, Dale L. Problems and Issues in the Evaluation of Administrative Performance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 151 907, 1975.

- Castetter, William B., and Richard S. Haisler. Appraising and Improving the Performance of School Administrative Personnel. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 060 504, 1971.
- Culbertson, Jack A. Evaluation of Middle-Administrative Personnel: A Component of the Accountability Process. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 051 543, February, 1971.
- Fiedler, Fred. Contingency Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, Clearinghouse on Educational Management, No. 12, September, 1980.
- Gaynor, Alan K. The Role of the School Administrator: Perspectives for a Conference on Administrator Evaluation. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 151 907, 1975.
- Gephart, William J. The Evaluation of Administrative Performance: Parameters, Problems, and Patterns. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 151 907, 1976.
- Lipham, James. The Evaluation of Administrative Performance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 151 907, 1975.
- Melton, George E. The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 040 492, 1975.
- Plummer, Franklin P. Supervising the Principal. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 130 458, 1976.
- Pol, Gaston. Evaluation of Principals: A Competency-Based Methodology with Community Participation. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 127 668, July, 1976.
- Saif, Philip S. Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 133 371, September, 1976.
- Sullivan, Daniel. Case Study Number Three: Lake Washington School District, Washington. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 151 914, 1975.

Dissertations and Unpublished Materials

- Ellinger, William B. "A Study of the Procedures Used to Evaluate Professional School Personnel in the Public Schools of the State of Maryland." Ed.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1968.
- Grill, Stephen G. "A Study of the Evaluation Process of School Superintendents in North Carolina." Ed.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1978.
- Kostes, Tom P. "An Analysis of the Process of Evaluating Elementary School Principals in Selected School Districts, Cook County, Illinois." Ed.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1979.
- MacQueen, Warren F. "Evaluating the Job Performance of the Public High School Principal." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1969.
- Mangione, Eric J. "The Evaluation of the Public School Principal Throughout the State of Florida." Ed.D. dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 1978.
- Metzger, Melvin A. "Identification and Analysis of the Current Methods of Evaluating Principals in the Public Schools of the State of Maryland." Ed.D. dissertation, The George Washington University, 1976.
- Palucci, A. "An Analysis of the Art of Evaluating Public School Principals Between 1968 and 1978 in Selected Public School Districts in Lake County, Illinois." Ed.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1978.
- Ruocco, Anthony Francis. "Evaluation of Elementary Principals in New York State." Ed.D. dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1976.
- Towns, Robert M. "A Survey of the Procedures for Evaluating the Performance of Secondary Public School Principals in Michigan." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO DIVISION SUPERINTENDENTS
REGARDING THE PRELIMINARY SURVEY

AND

THE PRELIMINARY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

February 11, 1981

Dear Superintendent:

I am a graduate student in Educational Administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. Presently, I am collecting preliminary data for a study of the evaluation process of secondary public school principals in Virginia. The purpose of collecting these data is to determine the process that is used to evaluate public school principals.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire, and return it with a copy of the instrument that you use to evaluate secondary principals in the enclosed pre-addressed postage-paid envelope as soon as possible. No attempt will be made to identify the responses of participants for publicity purposes. The full right to personal privacy shall be respected.

Thank you for your assistance, time, and cooperation.

Very sincerely,

James E. Rountree
Graduate Student

Glen I. Earthman
Associate Professor
Educational Administration

GIE/lrs

Enclosure

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check the categories that apply to your school division and return this questionnaire in the envelope provided as soon as possible.

1. Which evaluation process best describes the one used in your school division?

- ☐ a. Formal evaluation based on predetermined standards.
- ☐ b. Formal evaluation based on tasks performed.
- ☐ c. Informal evaluation.
- ☐ d. Other; (specify) _____

2. Evaluation of secondary principals is based on:

- ☐ a. Survey of teachers.
- ☐ b. Personal observations by the superintendent.
- ☐ c. Survey of pupils.
- ☐ d. Other; (specify) _____

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO DIVISION SUPERINTENDENTS
REGARDING THE INSTRUMENT



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

June 12, 1981

Dear Superintendent;

I am appreciative of your response to my preliminary survey that pertained to the evaluation process of secondary public school principals that was done in February, 1981. Presently, I am continuing to collect data for the same research study, which is entitled "The Evaluation Criteria and Procedures Employed to Assess the Performance of Secondary Public School Principals in Virginia".

The enclosed questionnaire, which is being sent to all division superintendents is designed to generate data relative to the evaluation process of secondary public school principals in Virginia. The study is designed to determine the importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures that are used to assess the performance of secondary public school principals.

Your cooperation, time, and assistance in completing this questionnaire are vital in order for this study to be a success. I am cognizant of the many demands that are placed on your time, and I am grateful to you for participating in this study. Time is a critical factor; therefore, please complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and forward it in the pre-addressed postage-paid return envelope.

Thank you for your time, assistance, and cooperation.

Very sincerely,

James E. Rountree
Graduate Student

Glen I. Earthman
Associate Professor
Educational Administration

/pb

Enclosures

APPENDIX C

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please try to answer all questions. Those which may not correspond directly to your school division may be answered by selecting the alternative that comes closest.

Results attained from data in the study will be reported in summaries of responses and, in no case, will identity of an individual or school division be divulged.

PART I--Demographic Data

Directions: Please check (✓) the appropriate item.

1. In which type of administrative school division are you employed?

_____ a. County _____ b. City _____ c. Other

(If c, specify) _____

2. How many students are enrolled in your school division?

_____ a. 0 - 999

_____ b. 1,000 - 3,499

_____ c. 3,500 - 9,999

_____ d. 10,000 - 30,000

_____ e. 30,001 and over

3. How many years have you served as division superintendent of schools in Virginia?

_____ a. 0 - 4

_____ b. 5 - 8

_____ c. 9 - 12

_____ d. 13 or more

PART II--Evaluation Data

Directions: Please check (✓) the appropriate item.

4. What type of instrument is employed to evaluate secondary principals?
- _____ a. A checklist
- _____ b. A narrative summary
- _____ c. Both, a checklist and a narrative summary
- _____ d. Other (specify) _____
5. Who formally evaluates the secondary principals in your school division?
- _____ a. Superintendent
- _____ b. Assistant Superintendent
- _____ c. Other (specify) _____
6. How often is a formal written evaluation of secondary principals done?
- _____ a. Annually
- _____ b. Semi-annually
- _____ c. Quarterly
- _____ d. Other (specify) _____
7. Is a conference held after the evaluation has been completed?
- _____ Yes _____ No
8. Please rank the purposes for the evaluation of secondary principals in your school division. Use numbers one through ten (1-10). One (1) should represent the most important purpose and ten (10) should represent the least important purpose.

- _____ a. Improve task performance.
- _____ b. Screen principals for promotion or demotion.
- _____ c. Eliminate those who are incompetent.
- _____ d. Differentiate administrative assignments.
- _____ e. Grant merit or performance pay.
- _____ f. Decide on tenure or permanent appointment.
- _____ g. Increase productivity of the individual, the total management team, and the school division.
- _____ h. Let the principal know exactly what is expected and how well the superintendent feels that expectations are met.
- _____ i. Provide information related to the strengths and weaknesses of the principal in order to develop in-service and job upgrading programs.
- _____ j. Provide informational input upon which wise management decisions can be made.

PART III--Questionnaire Regarding Criteria

Directions: The purpose of this part of the questionnaire is to determine the importance of the criteria employed to evaluate secondary public school principals. Please indicate the degree of importance that you perceive these criteria to be by checking (✓) one response for each item at the right of each statement on the rating scale.

Scale: VI = Very Important
I = Important
SI = Slightly Important
NI = Not Important

	VI	I	SI	NI
9. <u>Annual School Plan in the Individual School Building</u>				
The secondary principal:				
a. Assesses the current status of the annual school plan	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Determines the content of the annual school plan	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Makes the annual school plan consistent with the school district-wide plan	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Involves staff and community in the development of the annual school plan	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Evaluates the annual school plan	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Implements the annual school plan	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. <u>Handbook of Policies and Procedures in the School</u>				
The secondary principal:				
a. Determines the content of the handbook	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Develops a school handbook	_____	_____	_____	_____

	VI	I	SI	NI
10. (continued)				
c. Decides whom to involve in preparing the handbook	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Uses the handbook after its completion	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. <u>Coordinating Services of Persons Working in the School</u> The secondary principal:				
a. Inducts new employees into the school	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Develops job descriptions for clarification	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Establishes work schedules	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Resolves work problems	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Develops an organizational chart	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Monitors work performance	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. <u>Usage of Instructional Materials and Equipment</u> The secondary principal:				
a. Keeps abreast of trends in availability of materials and equipment	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Secures materials and equipment	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Distributes materials and equipment	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Monitors the use of materials	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. <u>Assignment of Pupils to Classes, Programs, and Activities</u> The secondary principal:				
a. Assesses strengths and weaknesses of pupils	_____	_____	_____	_____

	VI	I	SI	NI
13. (continued)				
b. Responds to wishes of pupils and parents	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Balances curricular and co-curricular assignments	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Takes care of pupils with learning disabilities	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. <u>Evaluation of Pupil Programs and Instructional Effectiveness</u> The secondary principal:				
a. Designs realistic pupil evaluation procedures	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Monitors teacher practices in pupil evaluation	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Analyzes causes of pupil failure	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Reduces incidence of pupil failure	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. <u>Instructional Supervision and Assistance to Teachers</u> The secondary principal:				
a. Develops a plan of supervision	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Allocates time for supervision	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Coordinates school level supervision with services from the central office	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Relates supervision to standards for classroom planning	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. <u>Cooperative Evaluation Program</u>				
a. Determines rationale for an evaluation program	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Develops evaluation procedures	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Applies evaluation procedures	_____	_____	_____	_____

	VI	I	SI	NI
16. (continued)				
d. Relates evaluation procedures to standards for classroom planning and management	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Coordinates evaluation and supervision	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. <u>Business and Finance</u> The secondary principal:				
a. Follows the school division's guidelines in the management of school monies	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Ensures that systematic and auditable records are kept of all funds over which the school has custody	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Allocates budget funds based on evaluation of existing programs, expressing program needs, and budget limitations	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. <u>School Plant</u> The secondary principal:				
a. Interprets and enforces the school's policies and regulations regarding use of buildings	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Works with appropriate departments to ensure a neat and attractive school plant	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Evaluates regular conditions of the school plant and submits request for repairs, improvements, etc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Plans with the custodial staff for the efficient operation of the school plant	_____	_____	_____	_____

VI	I	SI	NI
----	---	----	----

19. School Community Relations

The secondary principal:

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| a. Provides opportunities which strengthen the lines of communication between home and school | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Interprets the school program and the policies and regulations to the community | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c. Develops systematic plans for involving pupils, parents, staff, and others in curricular and instructional planning | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| d. Is receptive to inquiries from parents regarding the school program | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

20. Professional Qualities and Growth

The secondary principal:

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| a. Seeks opportunities for professional growth | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Accepts constructive criticism | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c. Is responsive to new ideas | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| d. Demonstrates a sympathetic understanding of problems of others | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

PART IV--Questionnaire Regarding Procedures

Directions: The following are some procedures that are employed to gather data in order to determine if principals meet the evaluation criteria listed in the previous section of the questionnaire. Please indicate the degree of importance that you perceive these procedures to be by checking () one response for each item at the right of each statement on the rating scale.

Scale: VI = Very Important
 I = Important
 SI = Slightly Important
 NI = Not Important

21. Data are gathered to make principals' evaluation by:

	VI	I	SI	NI
a. Making personal school visits (superintendent)	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Employing central office personnel input	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Employing the principals' input (self evaluation)	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Assessing the annual appearance of the school	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Assessing the principals' general personality	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Assessing the principals' accomplishment of predetermined administrative objectives	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Assessing the principals' proficiency to communicate with parents	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Assessing the principals' performance in supervising business and finance	_____	_____	_____	_____

VI	I	SI	NI
----	---	----	----

21. (continued)

i. Using data collected through observations of the superintendent and assistant superintendent _____

j. Assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff _____

22. Overall, how important is the evaluation process of secondary principals in your school division?

_____ Very Important

_____ Important

_____ Slightly Important

_____ Not Important

23. If there are comments that you wish to make regarding the evaluation criteria and procedures employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals, please indicate below.

24. If you are interested in receiving a summary of this study, please check below.

_____ Yes

_____ No

Reminder: Please return the Questionnaire in the pre-addressed postage-paid envelope as soon as possible.

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO REVIEW PANEL

Martinsville, Virginia
May, 1981

Dear

I am a doctoral student in Educational Administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. Presently, I am engaged in a research study that pertains to evaluation criteria and procedures employed to assess the performance of secondary public school principals in Virginia. The school division superintendent population has been selected to participate in this research study.

Your assistance as a member of the "Review Panel" is needed to refine and validate these criteria that are employed as items on the questionnaire. The "Panel" consists of three university professors, one division superintendent, and two high school principals.

Enclosed please find the questionnaire. You are encouraged to make suggestions, comments, and/or recommendations on any part of the questionnaire, as your responses will be reflected in the final version. Please return the questionnaire to me as soon as possible in the pre-addressed postage-paid envelope.

Thank you for your assistance, time, and cooperation.

Very sincerely,

James E. Rountree
Graduate Student

Enclosure

APPENDIX E

ROSTER OF PANEL MEMBERS

ROSTER OF PANEL MEMBERS

, Superintendent
Salem City Schools
Salem, VA 24153

, Assistant Professor
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060

, Assistant Professor
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060

, Principal
Bassett High School
Bassett, VA 24055

, Associate Professor
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060

, Principal
Laurel Park High School
Martinsville, VA 24112

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP LETTER



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

June 19, 1981

Dear Superintendent:

If you have not completed and returned the questionnaire that I sent to you June 4, 1981, which pertains to the "Evaluation Criteria and Procedures Employed to Assess the Performance of Secondary Public School Principals in Virginia," please do so now. I need your assistance and cooperation very much to make the study a success.

Another questionnaire and a pre-addressed postage-paid return envelope are enclosed for your consideration. Your assistance in completing and returning it will be sincerely appreciated, and your responses will contribute to determining the importance of the evaluation process of secondary public school principals in Virginia.

Thank you for your time, assistance, and cooperation.

Very sincerely,

James E. Rountree
Graduate Student

Enclosure

APPENDIX G

TABLES CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES
AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES
REGARDING THE SOQ EVALUATION
CRITERIA

TABLE 15

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance
of the Annual School Plan in the Individual School Building Evaluation Criteria
as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Annual School Plan The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Assesses the current status of the annual school plan	49 47%	51 49%	5 5%	0 0%
b. Determines the content of the annual school plan	41 39%	55 52%	9 9%	0 0%
c. Makes the annual school plan consis- tent with the school district-wide plan	65 62%	35 33%	5 5%	0 0%
d. Involves staff and community in the development of the annual school plan	59 56%	40 38%	4 4%	2 2%
e. Evaluates the annual school plan	56 53%	44 42%	5 5%	0 0%
f. Implements the annual school plan	71 68%	31 30%	3 3%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal
100%.

TABLE 16

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance
of the Handbook of Policies and Procedures in the School Evaluation Criteria
as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Handbook of Policies and Procedures The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Determines the content of the handbook	48 46%	48 46%	9 9%	0 0%
b. Develops a school handbook	52 50%	47 45%	6 6%	0 0%
c. Decides whom to involve in preparing the handbook	42 40%	52 50%	10 10%	1 1%
d. Uses the handbook after its completion	72 69%	31 30%	2 2%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

TABLE 17

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of Coordinating Services of Persons Working in the School Evaluation Criteria as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Coordinating Services of Persons Working in the School The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Inducts new employees into the school	64 61%	39 37%	2 2%	0 0%
b. Develops job descriptions for clarification	43 41%	50 48%	11 10%	1 1%
c. Establishes work schedules	57 54%	44 42%	4 4%	0 0%
d. Resolves work problems	70 67%	34 32%	1 1%	0 0%
e. Develops an organizational chart	33 31%	49 47%	22 21%	1 1%
f. Monitors work performance	77 73%	26 25%	2 2%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

TABLE 18

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
Ensuring the Effective Usage of Instructional Materials and Equipment
Evaluation Criteria as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Ensuring the Effective Usage of Instructional Materials and Equipment The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Keeps abreast of trends in availability of materials and equipment	34 32%	61 58%	9 9%	1 1%
b. Secures materials and equipment	25 24%	61 58%	18 17%	1 1%
c. Distributes materials and equipment	25 24%	49 47%	25 24%	6 6%
d. Monitors the use of materials	29 28%	50 48%	23 22%	3 3%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

TABLE 19

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
Assigning Pupils to Classes, Programs, and Activities Evaluation Criteria
as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Assigning Pupils to Classes, Programs, and Activities The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Assesses strengths and weaknesses of pupils	49 47%	42 40%	13 12%	1 1%
b. Responds to wishes of pupils and parents	30 29%	55 52%	18 17%	2 2%
c. Balances curricular and co-curri- cular assignments	49 47%	54 51%	2 2%	0 0%
d. Takes care of pupils with learning disabilities	39 37%	59 56%	5 5%	2 2%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal
100%.

TABLE 20

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
the Evaluation of Pupil Progress and Instructional Effectiveness Evaluation Criteria
as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Evaluation of Pupil Progress and Instructional Effectiveness The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Designs realistic pupil evaluation procedures	53 50%	44 42%	8 8%	0 0%
b. Monitors teacher practices in pupil evaluation	53 50%	50 48%	2 2%	0 0%
c. Analyzes causes of pupil failure	56 53%	44 42%	5 5%	0 0%
d. Reduces incidence of pupil failure	45 43%	49 47%	9 9%	2 2%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

TABLE 21

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
Instructional Supervision and Assistance to Teachers Evaluation Criteria
as Reported by Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Instructional Supervision and Assistance to Teachers The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Develops a plan of supervision	80 76%	24 23%	0 0%	0 0%
b. Allocates time for supervision	82 78%	23 22%	0 0%	0 0%
c. Coordinates school level supervision with services from the central office	57 54%	44 42%	4 4%	0 0%
d. Relates supervision to standards for classroom planning	57 54%	46 44%	2 2%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

TABLE 22

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
a Cooperative Evaluation Program Evaluation Criteria as Reported by
Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Cooperative Evaluation Program The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Determines the rationale for an evaluation program	35 33%	61 58%	9 9%	0 0%
b. Develops evaluation procedures	40 38%	55 52%	10 10%	0 0%
c. Applies evaluation procedures	56 53%	46 44%	3 3%	0 0%
d. Relates evaluation procedures to standards for classroom planning and management	50 48%	52 50%	3 3%	0 0%
e. Coordinates evaluation and super- vision	66 63%	37 35%	2 2%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

APPENDIX H

TABLES CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES
AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES REGARDING
THE NON-SOQ EVALUATION CRITERIA

TABLE 23

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
Business and Finance Evaluation Criteria as Reported by Division
Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Business and Finance The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Follows the school division's guidelines in the management of school monies	81 77%	22 21%	2 2%	0 0%
b. Ensures that systematic and audit-able records are kept of all funds over which the school has custody	83 79%	21 20%	1 1%	0 0%
c. Allocates budget funds based on evaluation of existing programs, expressed program needs, and budget limitations	76 72%	29 28%	0 0%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

TABLE 24

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
School Plant Evaluation Criteria as Reported by
Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

School Plant The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Interprets and enforces the school's policies and regulations regarding use of the building	63 61%	40 38%	2 1%	0 0%
b. Works with appropriate departments to ensure a neat and attractive school plant	59 56%	45 43%	1 1%	0 0%
c. Evaluates regular conditions of the school plant and submits requests for repairs, improvements, etc.	55 52%	47 45%	3 3%	0 0%
d. Plans with the custodial staff for the efficient operation of the school plant	54 51%	48 46%	3 3%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

TABLE 25

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
School Community Relations Evaluation Criteria as Reported by
Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

School Community Relations The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Provides opportunities which strengthen the lines of communi- cation between home and school	78 74%	27 26%	0 0%	0 0%
b. Interprets the school program and the policies and regulations to the community	71 68%	34 32%	0 0%	0 0%
c. Develops systematic plans for in- volving pupils, parents, staff, and others in curricular and instruc- tional planning	56 53%	46 44%	3 3%	0 0%
d. Is receptive to inquiries from parents regarding the school program	67 64%	37 35%	1 1%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal
100%.

TABLE 26

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
Professional Growth Evaluation Criteria as Reported by
Division Superintendents in Virginia
(N = 105)

Professional Qualities and Growth The secondary principal:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Seeks opportunities for professional growth	51 49%	52 50%	2 2%	0 0%
b. Accepts constructive criticism	58 55%	47 45%	0 0%	0 0%
c. Is responsive to new ideas	53 50%	51 49%	1 1%	0 0%
d. Demonstrates a sympathetic understanding of problems of others	59 56%	42 40%	4 4%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

APPENDIX I

TABLE CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES
REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROCEDURES EMPLOYED
TO GATHER DATA TO MAKE PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS

TABLE 27

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of
Procedures Employed to Gather Data to Make Secondary
Principals' Evaluations in Virginia
(N = 105)

21. Data Are Gathered to Make Principals' Evaluations by:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
a. Making personal school visits (superintendent)	67 64%	31 30%	6 6%	1 1%
b. Employing central office personnel input	37 35%	63 60%	4 4%	1 1%
c. Employing the principals' input (self-evaluation)	55 52%	41 39%	5 5%	4 4%
d. Assessing the annual appearance of the school	24 23%	75 71%	6 6%	0 0%
e. Assessing the principals' general personality	20 19%	56 53%	28 27%	1 1%
f. Assessing the principals' accomplishment of predetermined administrative objectives	67 64%	34 32%	4 4%	0 0%

TABLE 27 - Continued

21. Data Are Gathered to Make Principals' Evaluations by:	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
g. Assessing the principals' proficiency to communicate with parents	61 58%	43 41%	1 1%	0 0%
h. Assessing the principals' performance in supervising business and finance	68 65%	36 34%	1 1%	0 0%
i. Using data collected through observations of the superintendent and assistant superintendent	57 54%	45 43%	3 3%	0 0%
j. Assessing the principals' proficiency in supervising the school staff	83 79%	22 21%	0 0%	0 0%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentage.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

APPENDIX J

TABLE CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES
REGARDING THE PURPOSES OF THE EVALUATION
OF SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

TABLE 28

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Division Superintendents'
 Ranking of Purposes for the Evaluation of Secondary Public
 School Principals in Virginia
 (N = 105)

Purposes	Ranks of Responses									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
* Improve task performance	53 50%	18 17%	19 18%	4 4%	8 8%	0 0%	0 0%	1 1%	2 2%	0 0%
Screen principals for promotion or demotion	0 0%	0 0%	2 2%	1 1%	4 4%	12 12%	34 32%	29 28%	18 17%	4 4%
Eliminate those who are incom- petent	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%	5 5%	11 10%	21 20%	20 19%	14 13%	18 17%	12 11%
Differentiate administrative assignments	0 0%	1 1%	0 0%	2 2%	7 7%	28 27%	18 17%	16 15%	27 26%	6 6%
** Grant merit or performance pay	0 0%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	2 2%	3 3%	3 3%	8 8%	15 14%	70 67%
Decide on tenure or permanent appointment	0 0%	3 3%	1 1%	1 1%	6 6%	17 16%	22 21%	24 23%	22 21%	9 9%
Increase productivity of the individual, the total manage- ment team, and the school division	34 32%	34 32%	14 13%	13 12%	6 6%	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%

TABLE 28 - Continued

Purposes	Ranks of Responses									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Let the principal know exactly what is expected and how well the superintendent feels that expectations are met	11 10%	20 19%	28 27%	17 16%	17 16%	7 7%	2 2%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%
Provide information related to the strengths and weaknesses of the principal in order to develop in-service and job upgrading programs	4 4%	16 15%	27 26%	36 34%	14 13%	2 2%	2 2%	3 3%	0 0%	1 1%
Provide information input upon which wise management decisions can be made	2 2%	10 10%	12 11%	24 23%	30 29%	16 15%	3 3%	6 6%	1 1%	1 1%

First entry in column represents frequency.

Second entry in column represents percentages.

Percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number and may not equal 100%.

* Denotes the most important purpose for the evaluation of secondary public school principals.

** Denotes the least important purpose for the evaluation of secondary public school principals.

APPENDIX K

TABLE CONTAINING ALL FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES
OF RESPONSES REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF
THE OVERALL EVALUATION PROCESS

TABLE 29

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Regarding the Importance of the
Overall Evaluation Process of Secondary Public School Principals in Virginia
(N = 105)

Question	Type of Response			
	Very Important	Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
Overall, how important is the evaluation process of secondary public school prin- cipals?	57 54%	47 45%	1 1%	0 0%

APPENDIX L

TABLES CONTAINING ALL NON-SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS
RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION FIVE

TABLE 30

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Importance of the Annual School Plan in the Individual School Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	50.48	12.62	1.90	0.11
Within Groups	100	661.74	6.61		
Total	104	712.22			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 31

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Importance of the Handbook of Policies and Procedures in the School Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	7.13	1.78	0.51	0.72
Within Groups	100	345.91	3.45		
Total	104	353.04			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 32

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Importance of the Coordinating Services of Persons Working in the School Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	41.92	10.48	1.76	0.14
Within Groups	100	593.64	5.93		
Total	104	635.56			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 33

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Importance of Ensuring Effective Usage of Instructional Materials and Equipment Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	23.20	5.80	1.05	0.38
Within Groups	100	550.36	5.50		
Total	104	573.56			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 34

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Importance to the Assignment of Pupils to Classes, Programs, and Activities Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	9.15	2.28	0.78	0.54
Within Groups	100	292.98	2.92		
Total	104	302.13			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 35

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Importance of Evaluation of Pupil Progress and Instructional Effectiveness Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	20.25	5.06	1.45	0.22
Within Groups	100	347.59	3.47		
Total	104	367.84			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 36

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Business and Finance Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	1.96	0.49	0.32	0.86
Within Groups	100	152.09	1.52		
Total	104	154.05			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 37

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the School Plant Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	9.06	2.26	0.62	0.64
Within Groups	100	365.56	3.65		
Total	104	374.62			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 38

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Importance of Instructional Supervision and Assistance to Teachers Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	9.30	2.32	0.91	0.45
Within Groups	100	254.54	2.54		
Total	104	263.84			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 39

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the School Community Relations Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	16.75	4.19	1.91	0.11
Within Groups	100	219.21	2.19		
Total	104	235.96			

Alpha Level = .05

APPENDIX M

TABLES CONTAINING ALL NON-SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS
RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION SIX

TABLE 40

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Making Personal School Visits (Superintendent) Evaluation Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	0.41	0.10	0.23	0.91
Within Groups	100	43.43	0.43		
Total	104	43.84			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 41

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Employing the Central Office Personnel Input Evaluation Procedure Used to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	0.61	0.152	0.43	0.78
Within Groups	100	35.23	0.352		
Total	104	35.84			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 42

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Employing Principals' Input (Self-Evaluation) Evaluation Procedure Used to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	4.73	1.18	2.17	0.07
Within Groups	100	54.46	0.54		
Total	104	59.19			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 43

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Assessing the Annual Appearance of the School Evaluation Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	0.25	0.06	0.23	0.91
Within Groups	100	26.66	0.26		
Total	104	26.91			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 44

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Assessing the Principals' General Personality Evaluation Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	1.51	0.377	0.76	0.55
Within Groups	100	49.53	0.495		
Total	104	51.04			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 45

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Assessing the Principals' Proficiency to Communicate with Parents Evaluation Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	0.74	0.18	0.69	0.60
Within Groups	100	26.97	0.26		
Total	104	27.71			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 46

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Assessing the Principals' Performance in Supervising the Business and Finance Evaluation Procedure Employed to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	1.42	0.356	1.43	0.22
Within Groups	100	24.82	0.248		
Total	104	26.24			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 47

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Using Data Collected Through Observations of the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent Procedure Employed to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	0.94	0.236	0.75	0.55
Within Groups	100	31.28	0.312		
Total	104	32.22			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 48

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years of Service and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Annual Plan Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	1.51	0.50	0.72	0.97
Within Groups	101	710.71	7.03		
Total	104	712.22			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 49

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years of Service and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Handbook of Policies and Procedures Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	14.50	4.83	1.44	0.23
Within Groups	101	338.54	3.35		
Total	104	353.04			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 50

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years of Service and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Coordinating Services of Persons Working in the School Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	18.05	6.01	0.98	0.40
Within Groups	101	617.51	6.11		
Total	104	635.56			

Alpha Level = .05

APPENDIX N

TABLES CONTAINING ALL NON-SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS
RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION SEVEN

TABLE 51

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years of Service and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Usage of Instructional Materials and Equipment Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	31.25	10.41	1.94	0.12
Within Groups	101	542.31	5.36		
Total	104	573.56			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 52

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years of Service and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Assignment of Pupils to Classes, Programs, and Activities Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	6.97	2.32	0.79	0.49
Within Groups	101	295.16	2.92		
Total	104	302.13			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 53

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years of Service and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Evaluation of Pupils' Progress and Instructional Effectiveness Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	11.47	3.82	1.08	0.35
Within Groups	101	356.37	3.52		
Total	104	367.84			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 54

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Instructional Supervision and Assistance to Teachers Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	3.80	1.26	0.49	0.68
Within Groups	101	260.04	2.57		
Total	104	263.84			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 55

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Cooperative Evaluation Program Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	10.09	3.36	0.64	0.58
Within Groups	101	524.95	5.19		
Total	104	535.04			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 56

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Business and Finance Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	4.73	1.57	1.06	0.36
Within Groups	101	149.31	1.47		
Total	104	154.05			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 57

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the School Plant Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	16.70	5.56	1.57	0.20
Within Groups	101	357.92	3.54		
Total	104	374.62			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 58

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the School Community Relations Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	5.74	1.91	0.84	0.47
Within Groups	101	230.22	2.27		
Total	104	235.96			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 59

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to the Degrees of Importance of the Professional Qualities and Growth Evaluation Criteria Employed to Evaluate Secondary Principals

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	11.22	3.74	1.15	0.33
Within Groups	101	328.62	3.25		
Total	104	339.84			

Alpha Level = .05

APPENDIX O

TABLES CONTAINING ALL NON-SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS
RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION EIGHT

TABLE 60

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Making Personal School Visits (Superintendent) Evaluation Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	1.44	0.48	1.14	0.33
Within Groups	101	42.40	0.42		
Total	104	43.84			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 61

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Employing the Central Office Personnel Input Evaluation Procedure to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	0.76	0.25	0.73	0.53
Within Groups	101	35.08	0.34		
Total	104	35.84			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 62

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Employing Principals' Input (Self-Evaluation) Evaluation Procedure Used to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	1.11	0.37	0.64	0.58
Within Groups	101	58.08	0.57		
Total	104	59.19			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 63

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Assessing the Annual Appearance of the School Evaluation Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	1.69	0.565	2.26	0.08
Within Groups	101	25.22	0.249		
Total	104	26.91			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 64

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Assessing the Principals' Accomplishment of Predetermined Administrative Objectives Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	2.23	0.74	2.41	0.07
Within Groups	101	30.97	0.30		
Total	104	33.20			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 65

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Assessing the Principals' General Personality Evaluation Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	1.53	0.51	1.04	0.37
Within Groups	101	49.51	0.49		
Total	104	51.04			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 66

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Assessing the Principals' Proficiency to Communicate with Parents Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	0.14	0.047	0.17	0.91
Within Groups	101	27.57	0.273		
Total	104	27.71			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 67

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Assess the Principals' Proficiency in Supervising the School Staff Procedure Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	1.17	0.39	2.43	0.06
Within Groups	101	16.21	0.16		
Total	104	17.39			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 68

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served and Responses to Assessing the Principals' Performance in Supervising Business and Finance Procedures Employed to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	0.14	0.048	0.18	0.90
Within Groups	101	26.10	0.258		
Total	104	26.24			

Alpha Level = .05

TABLE 69

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences in Years Served
and Responses to Using Data Collected Through Observations
of the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent Employed
to Gather Data to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	3	0.52	0.17	0.55	0.64
Within Groups	101	31.70	0.31		
Total	104	32.22			

Alpha Level = .05

APPENDIX P

TABLES CONTAINING SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS
RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION FIVE

TABLE 70

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Cooperative Evaluation Program Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	51.96	12.99	2.68*	0.04
Within Groups	100	483.08	4.83		
Total	104	535.04			

*Significant at the .05 alpha level

TABLE 71

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Division Superintendents' Responses to the Professional Qualities and Growth Evaluation Criteria

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	41.98	10.49	3.52*	0.00
Within Groups	100	297.86	2.97		
Total	104	339.84			

*Significant at the .05 alpha level

APPENDIX Q

TABLES CONTAINING SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS
RELATIVE TO SUB-QUESTION SIX

TABLE 72

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Assessing the Principals' Accomplishment of Predetermined Administrative Objectives Evaluation Procedure Employed to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	3.77	0.944	3.21*	0.01
Within Groups	100	29.42	0.294		
Total	104	33.19			

*Significant at the .05 alpha level

TABLE 73

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Differences Between School Division Size (Enrollment) and Assessing the Principals' Proficiency in Supervising the School Staff Evaluation Procedure Employed to Make Principals' Evaluations

Source of Variance	DF	SS	MS	F	p
Between Groups	4	1.60	0.40	2.54*	0.04
Within Groups	100	15.79	0.15		
Total	104	17.39			

*Significant at the .05 alpha level

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

THE EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES EMPLOYED
TO ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF SECONDARY PUBLIC
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN VIRGINIA

by

James Earl Rountree

(ABSTRACT)

Advisor: Dr. Glen I. Earthman

Problem

The problem of this study was to ascertain the answer to the following question: What are the criteria and procedures used in the formal evaluation of secondary public school principals' performance in Virginia, and how important are these to the process? Further inquiries were made to determine the purposes of evaluating secondary public school principals.

Procedures

A four-point scale was employed in the questionnaire to assess the opinions of division superintendents regarding the importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures employed to evaluate the performance of secondary public school principals. The Likert four-point scale was used to allow respondents to indicate for each statement relative to the evaluation criteria and procedures a choice of one of four

degrees of responses: very important, important, slightly important, or not important.

Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were employed to analyze data relative to the problem, and the one-way analysis of variance was employed to determine if differences existed between demographic variables and responses of groups of division superintendents to the degrees of importance of the evaluation criteria and procedures. The Scheffé test was employed to determine which groups differed significantly at the .05 alpha level.

Population

Data were sought for the major survey from the population of division superintendents in 132 school divisions in Virginia. One hundred and five division superintendents completed and returned the major survey questionnaire. Division superintendents were chosen as the population to supply data for this study because they were the ones who legally were responsible for the evaluation of principals.

Conclusions

1. The "Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria that pertained to the annual school plan, handbook of policies and procedures, coordinating services of persons working in the school, instructional supervision and assistance to teachers, and the cooperative evaluation program were very important

to the formal evaluation process of secondary public school principals. Also, the "non-Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria that pertained to business and finance, school plant, and school community relations were very important to the formal evaluation process of secondary public school principals.

2. The procedures that were employed to gather data to assess the principals' work performance were very important. Also, making personal visits to the school by the superintendent was a very important procedure to the formal evaluation process of secondary public school principals.

3. The most important purpose of the evaluation of secondary principals was to improve task performance and the least important purpose was to grant merit or performance pay.

Recommendation

The "Standards of Quality" and "non-Standards of Quality" evaluation criteria and procedures that division superintendents rated very important to the formal evaluation process of secondary public school principals should be continuously employed to evaluate the principals in Virginia. Specific findings, implications, and recommendations were offered.