University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

1981

A descriptive survey of evaluation methods of high school principals

Barry Robert Reese
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

A descriptive survey of evaluation methods of high school principals

Abstract

The concept of formal evaluation of high school administrators has been afforded increased attention in recent years. With demands for accountability from the public sector and increasing pressures from within the profession, varying methods and practices have been sought to encapsulate this area. Even so, at the present time there is less than a clear picture of what, if anything, the public schools are doing in a systematic fashion in evaluating the performance of the secondary administrators, namely high school principals.

A Descriptive Survey of Evaluation Methods

of High School Principals

A Research Paper

Presented to

the Department of School Administration

and Personnel Services

University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

by

Barry Robert Reese

July 1981

This Research Paper by: Barry Robert Reese

Entitled: A Descriptive Survey of Evaluation Methods of High

School Principals

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the

Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

Donald L. Hanson

July 17, 1981

Date Approved   Director of Research Paper

Donald L. Hanson

July 17, 1981

Date Received   Graduate Faculty Adviser

Donald L. Hanson

July 17, 1981

Date Received   Head, Department of School
                                       Administration and Personnel
                                       Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The concept of formal evaluation of high school administrators has been afforded increased attention in recent years. With demands for accountability from the public sector and increasing pressures from within the profession, varying methods and practices have been sought to encapsulate this area. Even so, at the present time there is less than a clear picture of what, if anything, the public schools are doing in a systematic fashion in evaluating the performance of the secondary administrators, namely high school principals.

This has started a different direction in the area of performance, evaluation and accountability in education as some of the attention originally focused upon classroom teachers has shifted to the principal. The principal has been identified as being a key figure in the development and promotion of teacher performance in the school. Recently developed interest and concern indicated that the performance of the principal cannot be taken for granted and like the classroom instructor, evaluations have been seen as being a necessary component of the school's program.

The Management by Objectives (M.B.O.) approach (Knezevich, 1974) and assessment (Reutsch, 1974) have been attempted as methods of evaluation. However, this area, although under increasing scrutiny, has yet to yield sufficient data to satisfy many secondary administrators or the general public.

1

Inreased demands have been placed upon the public school both from within the school infrastructure and from the general community. Increasing complexity in the school unit in the form of special programs, social problems, declining enrollments, and fewer tax dollars for education have contributed to the problem. Greater pressures for increased evaluation and accountability from public school officials has resulted due to gains in various aspects of human knowledge, needs, control systems, and personnel performance. The focus of public scrutiny has shifted from the teacher in the classroom to the instructional and administrative leader of the school unit. In theory, evaluation should be simple, yet at times evaluation of principals at best has been misleading; at worst, it has been damaging because evaluation has meant many things. What makes a principal effective and how those ideas, standards, and measuring devices are constructed and employed have a wide variance. "What makes a principal effective and how can that be determined? No one knows for sure." (ERIC Research Action Brief #12)

Purpose of the Study

It was then in the context of these stated concerns that this study was originated. The problem that has been indicated was to give a foundation for the purpose of the study. First, the study was to investigate current practices in Iowa high schools and determine what methods of formal evaluation of principals were used. Secondly, the study was to indicate who conducted these evaluations and the number of times each year they occurred. Thirdly, the study was to determine the types of concerns that the evaluation covered and the purposes for which the evaluations were held. The purpose was to

describe the existing evaluation methods used for randomly selected
high school principals in the state of Iowa in 1980.

Procedure

Based on a preliminary review of related literature, a
questionnaire was developed and distributed the fall of 1980 to fifty
randomly selected superintendents in Iowa. The school districts
selected were divided by size of enrollments into three groups:
(1) to 799, (2) 800 to 1,999, and (3) 2,000 to 11,241 students.

Limitations of the Study

Although the study sample of fifty school districts was
selected at random from the total number of 433 districts in Iowa,
it is possible that the results were not universally characteristic
of the total population. A second factor that may have presented
some limitations to the application of findings was the unequal
percent of school districts from among the three enrollment
classifications that were selected for inclusion in the study.

Definition of Terms

Accountability--the product of a process when moving from a
premise to a performance standpoint. (Nicholson, Barrileaux, 1972)

Evaluation--the process of ascertaining or judging value or
amount of something by use of a standard of appraisal. (Good, p.220)

Management by Objectives (M.B.O.)--a system of operation that
enables the organization and its personnel to lock onto objectives
as well as to manage more effectively for desired results.
(Knezevich, 1973, p. 5)

N.A.S.S.P.--National Association of Secondary School Principals.

P.E.E.L.--Performance Evaluation of the Educational Leader. (Demeke, 1972)

R.O.M.E.--Results Oriented Management in Education: Georgia Project located in Thomas County 1977, an individual administrator evaluation system.

Secondary Administrator--principal of either a ninth through twelfth or tenth through twelfth grade attendance center.

S.P.A.R.--Self Performance Achievement Record: a comprehensive management by objectives approach.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Historically, the evaluation of educational personnel has dated back to 1642. It was conducted on a yearly basis by the local clerical leader in the community. In the mid-eighteenth century that task was adopted by the school headmaster. The evaluation then passed to the superintendent and principal in the late nineteenth century. The majority of evaluation plans and programs were developed for local use as the educational foundations were primarily a local concern. During the era 1900-1930 the concerns of controlled behaviors, leadership behaviors and descriptions were listed as observable characteristics by the evaluators.

Since 1945 education has borrowed heavily from business, industry and management in evaluation areas. A basic trend in administrator evaluation in modern times has been away from evaluation solely for contract renewal to evaluation for development of self-improvement and competence specification. (McDonald, 1979, p. 8)

Compared with business, education has had relatively little experience with formal administrator evaluation. It has been largely an isolated process based primarily on the supervisor's individual style and the personal characteristics of the evaluatee. In the last decade, proponents of new and innovative evaluation procedures have advanced optimistic ideas for effective evaluation of administrative and organizational performance. Others have expressed doubts about the appropriateness of the application of those procedures in education.

5

Questions of purpose and effectiveness raised in the past decade remain. McDonald (1979, p. 11) indicated three commonly expressed concerns: (1) to what extent should each participant be held responsible for results; (2) to whom should they be responsible; (3) how should the results be defined and measured.

E.R.S. (Educational Research Service) reported related concerns: "The most important goal of principal evaluation programs is to find out if the principal is an effective leader. Who will evaluate? What will they evaluate? How will the evaluation be carried out?"

Robinson (1974, p. 3) identified two purposes for evaluation. Evaluation as a end resulted in a specific culminative judgment that regarded administrative performance. The evaluation process has fulfilled its function as soon as the judgment was reached. The focus on the individual's performance was used for merit salary increases, promotion, demotion, and transfer.

Evaluation as a means functioned as an ongoing communicative feedback, adjustment and assistance process. The focus was on improvement of the educational system.

The literature was clear on one point. Evaluation was a productive process when the process was valid and reliable. The processes themselves were then examined.

Halpin and Croft (1963) concluded:

> There was strong and convincing evidence that many of the measures which have been used in education as proposed indices of a school's 'effectiveness,' or of an administrator's 'effectiveness,' do not justify the blind confidence placed in them.

Regarding the rating of principals by their superintendents, which has been the customary method of evaluation, Halpin and Croft stated

that ". . . serious questions can be raised about both the relevance
and dependability of such ratings."

The purpose for administrator evaluation has been expressed in
the literature. However, how widely expressed has the concern been on a
national scale? Seal (1977) found that in a 1971 N.A.S.S.P. study
fifty schools in 1964, sixty-two in 1968, and eighty-four in 1971 stated
they used a formal evaluation procedure for administrators. Large
systems were found more likely to have a formalized evaluation program
than smaller systems.

Educational Research Service reported there had been an increase
from 40 percent in 1968 to 54 percent in 1971 of formal evaluation of
administrators in districts of 25,000 or more. In 1977 the A.A.S.A.
(American Association of Secondary Administrators) adopted this
resolution:

> The A.A.S.A. believes the evaluation of administrators should
> be encouraged. The A.A.S.A. urges boards of education to
> adopt systems of evaluation of administrators to assume their
> responsibility for the evaluation of the superintendent of
> schools. The A.A.S.A. further urges superintendents and
> other administrators to assume responsibility for the
> evaluation of all other administrators. (McDonald, 1979, p. 8)

The literature suggested a trend in the direction of
instituting more procedures for demonstrating that educational adminis-
trators are contributing to the success of the public school enterprise.
More systematic appraisal programs for teachers, a broader definition of
accountability, and the increasing need for school systems to justify
the increasing costs of education have moved the role and functions of
the educational administrator to the forefront.

In 1974 Robinson indicated the evaluation process was used both
as a means and as an end. McCleary (1979, pp. 45-46) stated that the

evaluation process was the heart of the appraisal system. Evaluation was emotional and personal and required subjective judgments. Evaluation was needed at five levels in a school system: (1) institutional, (2) program, (3) administrator performance, (4) staff performance, and (5) student performance. All five levels were part of a system; each individual level in itself was a process. The major purpose of evaluation was to establish a basis for change in individual behavior for improvement. McCleary compared the summative-formative approach in evaluation to the ends-means concept. Summative evaluation was viewed as the aggregate or recapitulation of events viewed at one time in order to make a judgment. Formative evaluation was viewed as ongoing and continuing judgment.

There have been varied reasons advanced for evaluation of administrators. An Educational Research Service survey in 1971 found four major features: (1) to identify areas needing improvement; (2) to measure current performance against prescribed standards; (3) to establish documentation for possible dismissal of administrators; (4) to enable an individual to formulate realistic performance objectives for himself or herself. (Educational Research Service, 1979, p. 26)

Nationally in the early 1970's, there were nine states on record that had supported the importance of administrator evaluation. Those states were Florida, Washington, Oregon, California, Virginia, Connecticut, Nevada, Kansas and Hawaii. (Educational Research Service, 1979, p. 21) Poliakoff (1973) indicated as an example the Stull Bill in California as a mandated program of evaluation. There were four main areas to the Stull Bill:

1. The establishment of standards of expected student progress in each area of study and techniques for the assessment of that progress;

2. Assessment of certified personnel competence as it relates
    to the established standards;
3. Assessment of other duties normally required to be performed
    by certificated employees as an adjunct to their regular
    assignments; and
4. The establishment of procedures and techniques for ascer-
    taining that the certificated employee was maintaining
    proper control and was preserving a suitable learning
    environment.   (Robinson, 1974, p. 23)

McCleary (1979) listed five processes for the performance

evaluation of principals used in recent years: (1) informal annual

evaluation, (2) rating scales, (3) performance contract, (4) Q.A.M.--

Quadrant Assessment Model, and (5) standardized assessment. The key

features for the above were as follows:

1. Periodic meetings; written descriptions of principal's
    work submitted as a report to the board; quality of
    planning and character of evaluation determined the
    results.
2. Used as indicators, not absolutes; interpretation seen
    as the key feature; superior and subordinate measure
    performance stated in important behavior terms.
3. An M.B.O. approach; most comprehensive form was the
    S.P.A.R. (Self Performance Achievement Record)--a
    planning guide that related individual administrator
    activity to school improvement through objectives.
4. An open-ended process which used 'ideal' profiles
    related to 'actual' problems; a Likert scale structure
    that developed discrepancy analyses; the purpose was
    viewed as identifying role ambiguity, clarifying tasks.
5. G.P.A.S.--Georgia Principal Assessment System was
    completed by principals, teachers, external observers,
    and superintendent or central office personnel.

Redfern (1978) listed four components of a conventional

evaluation program: (1) checklists, (2) report cards, (3) minimal

emphasis on performance objectives, and (4) identification of "dead-

wood" for dismissal purposes.

Educational Research Service (1979, pp. 27-28) listed twelve

basic types of evaluations that were identified in the 1971 study. The

twelve fell into two broad areas. The first category included systems

that used predetermined performance standards that were numerically

coded or written comments that were suggested for improvements.

Category one included:

1. Unilateral evaluation by the evaluator; no evaluation conferences; no notification of evaluation outcome to evaluatee unless unsatisfactory rating was given.
2. Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; no evaluation conferences; but evaluatee was shown or given a copy of the completed form.
3. Unilateral evaluation by evaluator based on conference(s) between evaluator and evaluatee; no post-evaluation conference was held, but evaluatee was shown or given a copy of the completed form.
4. Unilateral evaluation by evaluator; post-evaluation conference to discuss rating received; evaluatee was given or shown a copy of the completed form.
5. Evaluations were conducted by teams of educators; chairman summarized evaluation and held post-evaluation conference with evaluatee and discussed ratings.
6. Evaluator and evaluatee agreed on major areas of responsibility for evaluatee; evaluator rated evaluatee on his performance in each area; post-evaluation conference was held to discuss the evaluation.
7. Evaluatee rated himself and evaluator rated evaluatee; in the conference only the evaluator's rating, which could have been modified as a result of the conference, appeared on the completed form.
8. Evaluatee rated himself and evaluator rated evaluatee; both evaluations were discussed in conference; both appeared on the completed form.

The second category--job performance goals--included programs

that tailored the objectives to the individual being assessed:

1. Evaluatee completed a self-evaluation form including goals that were established for the next evaluation period; the completed form was submitted to evaluator, who added his comments to the accuracy of the evaluatee's evaluation. Post-evaluation conference was held to discuss completed form.
2. Evaluator and evaluatee in conference established mutually agreed upon performance goals for evaluatee with his major areas of responsibility; evaluator rated evaluatee on his accomplishment of performance goals and performance in areas of responsibility; post evaluation conference was held to discuss the evaluation.
3. Same as Number 2 except the evaluatee completed a self-evaluation prior to conference with evaluator; evaluator placed his evaluation on the evaluatee's form; both evaluations were discussed in post-evaluation conference.
4. Same as Number 3 except the evaluator consulted with other individuals: the evaluatee's peers, staff, students,

and parents before the form was completed; only the evaluator's evaluation appeared on the completed form.

A major effort in recent years in administrator evaluation has been the M.B.O. (Management by Objectives Approach). This was designed as a part of the competency based movement in education. M.B.O. was an approach to management as an evaluation technique. Odioine defined M.B.O. as:

> The system of management by objectives can be described as a process whereby the superior and subordinate jointly identify goals, define individual major areas of responsibility in terms of results expected of him, and use of these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members. (Knezevich, 1973, p. 4)

Morrissey defined M.B.O. as a management approach that determined: (1) what must be done, (2) how it was done, (3) when it must be done, (4) what was the cost, (5) what constituted satisfactory performance, (6) how much progress was being achieved, and (7) when and how to take corrective action. Steps one through four represented a planning function, steps five through seven represented a controlling function. (Knezevich, p. 5) M.B.O. as a total systems approach has been applied in administrative functions of planning, supervising, budgeting, and evaluation.

Finch (1974) identified the M.B.O. approach to evaluation as based upon assumptions of supervision that included:

1. The focus of evaluation was on continuous growth and improvement.
2. Priorities were set so that the most important responsibilities were evaluated.
3. Lack of defined priorities resulted in a dissipation of resources.
4. The administrator and supervisor may have had different perceptions of administrative responsibilities unless they were specified.
5. Dialogue between the administrator and supervisor concerned agreed-upon priorities productive to both

> the efficiency of the organization and the psychological well being of the individual.

An example of the competency based movement was the 1977 Thomas County Georgia Project, R.O.M.E. (Results Oriented Management in Education). R.O.M.E. was actively involved in the identification and development, professional verification and adaptation of competencies and performance indicators for building level administrators in Georgia. R.O.M.E. cross-sectioned urban, rural, elementary, and secondary classifications. It included students, teachers, principals, and central office personnel. Two of the most featured results included: (1) effectiveness of action, not frequency of action, was more important for the principal and (2) teacher ratings of the principal were the most valid; principal self-ratings were the least valid. (Educational Research Service, 1980)

The R.O.M.E. project included a field-tested comprehensive competency based assessment system, the G.P.A.S. (Georgia Principal Assessment System). The G.P.A.S. categorized thirty-nine competency statements into seven major areas. (Educational Research Service, 1980, p. 29)   They included:

```
        1.   The Principal as a Leader in the School Climate
    (tie).   The Principal as a Leader in Community Relations
        3.   The Principal and Staff Relations
        4.   Instructional Leadership
        5.   Program and Planning Ability
        6.   Management Leadership
        7.   Student Personnel Relations
```

There has been divided opinion among educators on M.B.O. evaluation approaches. Brown (1972) and Knezevich (1973) criticized M.B.O. because of the possible tendency to (1) emphasize those goals easiest to accomplish or appraise rather than those most important to the educational process, and (2) ignore other areas not covered under the M.B.O. contract.

Evaluation has been focused on results and effectiveness of strategies or specific activities rather than on the personal qualities of the administrator. Castetter (1971) and Knezevich (1973) stated that the entire system with all of structural prerequisites and inter-related processes should be implemented if M.B.O. was to realize its full potential.

There were two other approaches that were related with an M.B.O. approach. The client centered evaluation approach had the teachers rate the principals. This was part of the R.O.M.E. study. The faculty team approach had utilized M.B.O. philosophy and procedures but established the staff as the effective body for decision-making and objective setting.

The principal played a group facilitator role. The team conducted schoolwide needs assessment and established school objectives that contributed to district goals and strategies, collected evaluative data, and controlled progress. The performance of the staff was evaluated collectively and individually. Moeller and Mahan (1971, pp. 55-56) reported greater productivity and employee morale under participative management.

One additional program of guidelines for evaluation based on competence of administrators cited in the literature was P.E.E.L. In 1967 Demeke, concerned with the lack of a viable definition of the school administrator's role, defined this role as:

> To identify the areas of professional competence that the successful leader of the future must assume; then describe and carefully analyze those areas, taking care to ensure that the 'criterion' or 'definition' is stated in objective, behavioral terms. Thereafter, it would be feasible to develop procedures for collecting and evaluating data relevant to the sub-sections listed under each area of competence. (Demeke, 1972, pp. iv-v)

The P.E.E.L. definition listed the total role of the school
administrator in an era of changing pressures, needs and demands. These
were expressed in seven areas of competence.

1. Leader and director of the educational program
2. Coordinator of guidance and special educational services
3. Member of the school staff
4. Link between the community and the school
5. Administrator of personnel
6. Member of the profession of educational administration
7. Director of support management

There were five phases of the P.E.E.L. program: awareness,
training, implementation, evaluation and followup. Each phase of the
model was connected in a logical, continuous process of feedback and
recycling. The phases initiated self-evaluation as a basic goal
through the development of individual performance and profile
development. The focus was on strengths and weaknesses for educational
leadership competence. (Metzger, 1976, pp. 100-101)

The literature on administrator evaluation has continued to
be both abundant and generally supportive. As the argument for
evaluation processes to be developed has increased, a related concern
has been the legal base. The literature has reflected the need for
administrator evaluation plans to have a firm legal base. An adequate
evaluation procedure needs to have guaranteed the rights of the
individual administrator. The school was provided with a firm legal
base for its personnel decisions, including promotion, dismissal,
and other actions. Managerial and merit plans typically have suffered
from three weaknesses: (1) vagueness of standards, (2) subjectivity
and (3) inconsistency. (Educational Research Service, 1980, p. 33)

Besides the purposes of evaluation, also studied have been the
various criteria of evaluation. Nygaard (1974) proposed: (1) the

development of administrator effectiveness, (2) assessment of administrator effectiveness, and (3) accomplishment of the purposes of administrator evaluation.

Rosenberg (1973) considered the climate of the evaluation: (1) school organization, (2) instructional progress, (3) student-teacher relations, (4) staff relations, (5) community relations, (6) relations with the superintendent, (7) school plant and facility, and (8) scheduling. Natriello (1977) reported the following: (1) assignment of goals, (2) setting standards, (3) rational observations, (4) performance appraisal, (5) community appraisal, and (6) planned improvement program. An additional program criterion was advanced by Goddu: (1) organizational management, (2) resource management, (3) community relations, and (4) instructional management.

An N.A.S.S.P. study (Educational Research Service, 1980) listed twelve behavior dimensions as criteria for evaluation:

1. Problem analysis
2. Judgment
3. Organizational ability
4. Decisiveness
5. Leadership
6. Sensitivity
7. Range of interests
8. Personal motivators
9. Appropriate educational values
10. Stress tolerance
11. Oral communicative skill
12. Written communicative skill

Many approaches and theories of administrator evaluation have been advanced in the last ten to fifteen years. They have ranged in different directions of purpose, criteria, process, personnel involved and results desired.

The purpose of principal evaluation emphasized the need to guide and counsel, not to 'check up' on the evaluatee. To do this Educational

Research Service recommend the following five goal steps:

1. The principal must have evaluated his own behavior and experience.
2. A panel conducted a followup evaluation to check on the subjective interpretations supplied by the principal.
3. Criteria for both the self-evaluation and the followup evaluation centered around ". . . areas of principal performance including school organization, schedules, accounts and other management matters; relationships with students, staff, community, and superiors; facilities; and school climate."
4. Evidence was collected of the principal's performance within these areas.
5. The evaluators summarized the principal's performance in each of the areas and provided counseling action that was tailored to the specific needs of each principal.

In summary, principal evaluation ". . . should be a matching to intent of what was expected to happen with what did happen." (Principal Evaluation Research Action Brief Number Twelve, pp. 32-33) Reasons listed for the need of evaluation included those by Bennis in 1968: (1) new concepts of man based on knowledge of complex shifting needs, (2) collaboration and reason, and (3) humanism and democratic ideals.

Another report encouraged evaluators to help the principal understand better the complexities of the bureaucratic, cultural, political, legal, and fiscal environment of the school. The prime focus was to help the principal determine what changes in task priority and administrative style are likely to work better to help him gain the knowledge and skills necessary to make those changes and to provide formative feedback. (Educational Research Service, 1980, p. 32)

Different criteria on which principals have been evaluated included checklist instruments, condemned by some because they have the weakness of emphasizing past performance instead of future activity. M.B.O. approaches have led the principal to select only easily realized goals and to neglect the more complex and not so easily measurable aspects of administration.

Different personnel have evaluated the principal. Self-evaluation was seen as a positive step. Johnston and Wochner (1973) indicated the evaluatee should be involved in the evaluation. Teachers' statements and other principals' statements were included with the evaluation. (California State Legislature, 1977) Natriello (1977) equated the evaluation of the staff with the evaluation of the principal. Goldman (1970) stated that either a superintendent or an assistant superintendent and a principal constitute a two-man team in evaluation. Poliakoff (1973) indicated that even students should be involved. Losak (1975) found that the assistant superintendent evaluated the principal, the area superintendent evaluated the principal and the area coordinator evaluated the principal.

The R.O.M.E. study project listed the following results of administrator evaluation research. (Educational Research Service, 1980) Evaluation methods and techniques should be as precise as possible in reflecting the individual conditions of the school. Collective judgments from many people offset individual bias. Teachers made the best evaluators; evaluations by superintendents varied. Student evaluation was not of much value. The principals' self-evaluations were not worthless but were unreliable.

McDonald (1979, p. 13) reported that:

Effective appraisal can be conducted only in the context of the setting where the administrator functioned. Therefore, appraisal for the purpose of reemployment, professional growth, and development must reflect the administrative performance as a function of achieving specified outcomes.

The following questions were raised from the literature concerning evaluation of administrators:

1. How can the evaluation of administrators be made non-threatening?
2. Should the evaluation of administrators be for individual improvement or for a decision regarding employment status?
3. Should administrators be evaluated on process or product or both?
4. Should the techniques used to evaluate administrators be objective or subjective? (Educational Research Service, 1980, p. 32)

Numerous reasons for administrator evaluation have been expressed. A summary statement about the importance of evaluation in education was stated by Stemnock in 1968.

> As educators we have always considered evaluation one of the cornerstones of education. We tend to apply this process primarily to the student (and teacher). Just as it is essential to judge the process of students toward certain goals, so it is important that we as educational leaders move toward the larger overall goal. This, we have observed, has been a far-reaching plan of action, which in educational administration, has yet to reach to everyone's liking.

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION OF DATA

A questionnaire was mailed to the superintendent in fifty randomly selected school districts in Iowa in the fall of 1980. The questionnaire attempted to gain information concerning the purposes, criteria, and methods of evaluation of high school principals. Of the fifty surveys mailed, forty-five responses were received.

The survey population was divided into three groups based on district enrollment. Group one included enrollments up to 799 students. Group two included enrollments between 800 and 1,999 students. Group three included enrollments between 2,000 and 11,241 students. An effort was made in the presentation of data to provide information from the questionnaire based upon the three population groups.

Information obtained from the questionnaire was divided into three sections for presentation of data. Section One included information on the personal data of high school principals. Section Two referred to the processes and criteria in the methods of evaluation of the high school principal. Section Three referred to the levels of involvement of the principal in the evaluation process.

Personal Data of High School Principals

The writer did not examine in the literature the percentage of male and female high school principals. It was assumed that males would outnumber females. Forty-two of the forty-three responses reported were from males. The range in age was between 27 and 59 with the mean age of 40.78.

The data reported that most principals had been in their present position in the school system between one and three years. (TABLE I)

TABLE I

NUMBER OF YEARS OF PRINCIPAL
IN PRESENT SCHOOL SYSTEM

Years	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
1 - 3	1	2	15
4 - 6	1	-	6
7 - 10	2	1	6
11 - 15	-	-	7
16+	1	1	3

Three questions were asked that concerned the principal's experience in administrative and teaching positions prior to obtaining the position of principal. First, had the principal been an assistant or associate principal in the present school system. The data reported that most principals had not: 36 of 44. (TABLE II)

TABLE II

PRINCIPAL AS ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE
IN PRESENT SCHOOL SYSTEM

Response	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Yes	3	-	5
No	2	4	30

Second, the question asked whether or not the principal had
been an assistant or associate principal in another school system
before the present principal position. The data reported that more
principals had served in this position: 15 of 45. (TABLE III)

TABLE III

PRINCIPAL AS ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE
IN ANOTHER SCHOOL SYSTEM

Response	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Yes	1	3	11
No	4	-	26

A third question asked if the principal had been a teacher in
the present school system. The data reported that 16 of 48 had been
employed as teachers. (TABLE IV)

TABLE IV

PRINCIPAL AS A TEACHER
IN THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Response	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Yes	4	2	10
No	1	4	27

The literature did not directly inquire into the relationship
between the principal and his or her present level of education
and the competence demonstrated in that position. The survey, however,
asked what was the present level of education of the principal. The

data reported that the majority of principals had obtained a Master's

Degree in Secondary Administration as their present level of education.

Three of the five responses in Group 1 (the largest enrollments) had

earned doctorates. In Group 3 (the smallest enrollments) twenty-seven

had a Master's Degree in Secondary Administration. Eight had a Master's

Degree plus fifteen hours. (TABLE V)

TABLE V

PRESENT LEVEL OF EDUCATION
OF THE PRINCIPAL

Certification	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Temporary Certification	-	-	-
Master's Degree in Secondary School Administration	1	1	27
Master's Degree in Academic Field; School Administration Endorsement	1	1	2
Master's Degree + 15 hours	-	-	8
Ed. S (Specialist)	-	-	2
Doctorate	3	1	-

The last question in Section One asked if the principal's

attendance center was a member of the North Central Association. In

Group 1, three of three respondents reported they were members.

In Group 2, four of four respondents answered in the affirmative. In

Group 3, nine of thirty-eight respondents reported that they were

members. It appeared from the population that the larger the school

district, the more likely it was to be a member of the North Central

Association.

Process of Evaluation of the High School Principal

The literature reported that an increasing number of school districts in the United States were adopting and implementing formal evaluation procedures of administrators. It was also reported that the superintendent was the traditional evaluator of the high school principal. (TABLE VI)

TABLE VI

PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE FORMAL
EVALUATION OF THE PRINCIPAL

Evaluator	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Superintendent	2	3	35
Central Administrative Office	1	2	-
Teachers	-	-	1
School Board	-	-	8
Pupils	-	1	-
Principal--Self Evaluation	1	-	5
Building Administrative Team	-	-	-
No formal evaluation process	-	-	5
Other: * Executive Director of Secondary Education; Assistant Superintendent ** Parents (optional); Students (optional)	2*	2**	-

The majority of responses indicated that the formal evaluations occurred once a year. The evaluations conducted by the superintendents took place in the superintendents' offices in twenty-seven of the forty-five school districts. Evaluations took place in the principal's

office in ten of the school districts. Evaluations took place in the
Central Office Building in five of the school districts. Evaluations
in school board meetings constituted the other three responses.

The literature reported that formal evaluation of the principal
took place in one annual conference. The study indicated that most
formal evaluations were based on a continuous and ongoing review by
the evaluator. (TABLE VII)

TABLE VII

TIME OF FORMAL EVALUATION

Time	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Pre-employment	-	-	6
Check-points at regular intervals	-	2	6
Continuous	2	2	17
Salary review period	1	-	11
Exit interview	-	-	2
Other: *Scheduled by Executive Director	1*	-	-

Related to the formal evaluation process was the method of measurement used. The study reported that various elements were involved, primarily written and oral measurements and descriptions. (TABLE VIII)

TABLE VIII

ELEMENTS INVOLVED IN THE
EVALUATION PROCESS

Elements	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Written	-	3	12
Oral	-	3	21
Written and oral	3	4	16
Performance objectives measurement	2	4	6
Rating Scale (checklist)	3	2	7
Job description--task completion	-	3	14
Others	-	-	-

The literature stressed major purposes of administrator evaluation was to guide, to encourage, and to develop the individual's potential ability. The majority of the survey responses indicated similar intentions. The three most expressed purposes were improving, motivating and increasing the productivity of the individual principal. (TABLE IX)

TABLE IX

PURPOSES OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Improvement of principal	3	4	28
Increase productivity of principal, school district	3	4	16
Motivate principal	4	4	16
Screen for promotion/demotion	2	1	4
Screen for retention/release	2	1	4
Inform principal exactly what superordinate expects	2	2	14
Other:	-	-	1*
*Determination of salary			

The study asked the superintendent to indicate the personnel involved with the evaluation of the principal between 1975 and 1980. (TABLE X)   In comparison of the personnel who have evaluated the principal since 1975, Group 3 reported the superintendent and school board as having had the most direct influence.   Pupil evaluation and building administrative team evaluation had no reported influence in any of the three groups.

TABLE X

PERSONNEL INVOLVED WITH EVALUATION--1975-1980

Evaluators	1975-1976 Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	1976-1977 Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	1977-1978 Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	1978-1979 Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	1979-1980 Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Superintendent	1	2	24	1	2	23	1	2	24	1	2	23	2	3	24
Central Administrative Office	2	1	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	2	2	-
Teachers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
School Board	-	-	9	-	-	8	-	-	8	-	-	7	-	-	7
Pupils	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Principals (self-evaluation)	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2
Building Administrative Team	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other:	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-

*Executive Director of Secondary Education; Assistant Superintendent-- every other year

Levels of Involvement of the Principal in the Evaluation Process

The study reported that thirty-six of the thirty-nine schools had the principal participate in pre-evaluation and post-evaluation conferences. The study reported that thirty-six of thirty-nine schools had the principal participate in self-appraisal before the evaluation conference.

Written job descriptions appeared in the study to have a significant measure in evaluation. Thirty-five of thirty-eight responses indicated that the principal was expected to follow a written job description of the duties of that position.

The study asked the superintendents to rank order eleven statements of evaluative criteria concerning principal activity and performance. Number one represented the highest and eleven the lowest rating preference. The statements represented two categories. Category A represented the emphasis placed on each statement in that school district. Category B represented the emphasis the superintendent felt should be placed on each. (TABLE XIII) The superintendents numbered both categories; it was considered that the principals may have had differences in the final numbering of the statements.

TABLE XI

RATINGS BY SUPERINTENDENTS OF
EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Evaluative Statements	Ratings- Category A	Ratings- Category B
Principal's Relations with Students: stimulates good morale/maintains records	1	1
Administrative Management: cooperates in maintaining physical plant and facilities	5	5
Principal's Personal Characteristics: interpersonal skills/good humor/integrity	3	6
Principal's Management of School's Fiscal Affairs: operates within budget/ maintains records, reports/ negotiates with central office, faculty on budget concerns	9	3
Principal's Relations with Faculty and Staff: stimulates good morale/communicates effectively/sets professional example in school settings	4	11
Principal's Relations with Community: assesses community needs/ cooperates with agencies in community/involves parents in appropriate activities	8	8
Principal's Role in Instructional Leadership: displays knowledge of curriculum trends, developments/describes learning theories applicable to school/helps organize training and materials for faculty	7	7
Principal's Role in Organizational Skills: maintains clear lines of authority, responsibility/ plans technical skills needed for long/short range planning, projects/ plans school calendar for activities	11	4
Principal's Role in Supervisory Functions: maintains observation, evaluation records for faculty and staff/ maintains inventory records of school supplies, equipment	6	9

TABLE XI (CONTINUED)

RATINGS BY SUPERINTENDENTS OF
EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Evaluative Statements	Ratings-Category B	Ratings-Category B
Principal's Professional Development: attends conferences, workshops, meetings appropriate to duties; advances own education and encourages faculty to increase their professional status	10	10
Principal's Role in Scheduling: organizes classroom offerings and training to respond to school's aims, objectives/ interprets school policy to faculty for better coordination among curriculum areas	2	2

The data provided information on current methods of evaluation
of the high school principal. Most school districts contacted
reported some program of evaluation in use. The superintendent
generally was the evaluator in the majority of the districts. The
principal was to follow a written job description of his or her duties
and also participated in self-evaluation appraisal as part of the
evaluation process. The study indicated the main emphasis of the
evaluation process was to provide guidance and support for the
improvement of the principal.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The issue of administrator evaluation has gained increased
attention in recent years. Demands of accountability from the general
public and increasing pressures from within the profession itself have
contributed to this new emphasis.

The research of recent years has indicated a growing number of
school districts employing various methods of administrator evaluation.
The National Association of Secondary School Administrators in 1977
adopted a resolution that urged boards of education to adopt systems of
evaluation and to assume the responsibility of evaluation for all
administrators.

The need for evaluation has been expressed on a national scale.
States have adopted mandated programs of evaluation. Evaluations have
moved from infrequent and informal reviews to more periodic and thorough
assessments. Emphasis on developing the principal's abilities to
better provide quality leadership in the school has increased.

Various approaches to evaluation and assessment of performance
have been identified. Management by Objectives, job performance goals,
and competency-based programs have been employed. A major purpose of
these programs has been to identify written specifications for the
principal to follow.

Evaluation was viewed as a guide to assist the principal in
the execution of his duties rather than just a check on his personal

characteristics. Evaluation was productive when the process was valid
and reliable. The intent was on the improvement of the educational
system in general and the principal in particular.

In recent years education haa adopted more comprehensive
evaluation programs from business and industry. Educators have moved
away from isolated practices based on only the individual styles and
characteristics of the evaluator and evaluatee. New demands, pressures,
and issues have forced educators to consider new and innovative
approaches to administrator evaluation.

Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to identify the methods and
purposes of administrator evaluation currently in practice in Iowa high
schools. The study reported several facts concerning the personal
characteristics of the high school principal.

First, the principal was male, age 40, with between one and
three years experience in the position. Second, the principal was
more likely to have had prior administrative experience as an assistant
or associate principal in another system before the present one. Third,
the principal in a smaller system was likely to have had less advanced
degree work than a principal in a larger school system. Fourth, the
principal in the smaller system was less likely to have been in a North
Central Association member district.

The study reported that forty of forty-five districts had a
formal evaluation program of the high school principal. The
superintendents were most responsible for administering the evaluation
that occurred once a year. The evaluation was based on a continuous

review of the principal's actions structured upon written and oral reports of job description and task completion functions.

There were three major purposes of evaluation reported: improvement, motivation and increased productivity of the principal. The principal was involved directly in pre- and post-evaluation conferences with the evaluator. The principal participated frequently in self-appraisal evaluation before the formal evaluation. The principal was expected to follow both a personal goal-objective design and a written job description of his duties.

The study reported the school district's and individual superintendent's emphasis was identical on six of the eleven evaluation criteria statements. Relations with students, administrative management, relations with faculty and staff, instructional leadership, organizational skills, and professional development were rated with equal emphasis.

In conclusion, the study indicated formal evaluation programs of high school principals were in current practice. There was variance in the methods, purposes, and criteria used in the three population groups of schools contacted. The major purpose of the evaluation process was to aid and to improve the principal's performance.

Recommendations

The study was conducted in the fall of 1980 to include fifty randomly selected high schools and the evaluation methods currently employed concerning the principal. Recommendations include the following. Further investigation could have developed a larger population sample of schools with enrollments of 800 to 11,000 students. Principals themselves could have been contacted to obtain their views

and ideas concerning formal evaluation programs. A third approach
could have been to obtain written copies of evaluation checklists,
criteria, and written job descriptions since this was not done in
this study.

The literature indicated that superintendents primarily
evaluated principals. This was the approach this study used--to
contact the superintendents. Further study may include direct work
with the evaluatees. If principals are to function better with
specified job descriptions and plans of action, further study could
have been done to explore that area.

Finally, it was recommended that more study be conducted to
develop a more comprehensive and workable relationship between
evaluator and evaluatee. This has been reported to have increased the
effectiveness of the principal, the major purpose of the evaluation
process itself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barrileaux, L. "Accountability through Performance Objectives."
    National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin,
    56 (1972) 3-10.

Bennis, W. Organization Concepts and Analysis. Belmont, California:
    Dickinson Publishing, 1969.

California State Legislature. The School Principal: A Report
    Pursuant to a Resolution, Chapter 102 of 1977. Sacramento:
    (Office of Legislative Analyst), ERIC Document ED 145 540,
    1977.

Castetter, William B. and Richard S. Heisler. Appraising and Approving
    the Performance of School Administrators. Philadelphia: University
    of Pennsylvania, 1971.

Demeke, H. J. Guidelines for Evaluation: The School Administrator--
    Seven Areas of Competence. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State
    University, Department of Educational Administration, Supervision,
    1972, pp. iv-v.

Finch, Arnold. Management by Objectives in Fresno Unified School
    District. Fresno, California: Fresno Unified School District,
    February 1974.

Goddu, R. Observation Instrument for Identifying Competencies of
    Principals in Practice. Durham, New Hampshire: New England
    Teacher Education, 1977. ERIC Document ED 143 627,1977.

Goldman, H. "Evaluation of Administrators Behavior at the Building
    Level." National Association of Secondary School Principals
    Bulletin, 54 (1980), 77.

Good, C. V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Halpin, Andrew W. and Don B. Croft. The Organizational Climate of
    Schools. Chicago: The University of Chicago, Midwest
    Administration Center, 1963.

Johnston, A. R. "Evaluation of Administrators." Paper presented at a
    seminar sponsored by the American Association of University
    Administrators, Mobile, Alabama, April 1977. ERIC Document
    ED 136 868, 1977.

Knezevich, S. Management by Objectives and Results: a Guidebook for
    Today's School Executive. Arlington, Virginia: American
    Association of School Administrators, 1973.

Losak, J. "The Myth of Rational Evaluation." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Seattle, April 1975. ERIC Document ED 112 993, 1975.

McCleary, Lloyd. "Evaluation of Principals." Theory Into Practice. Vol. XVII. February 1979, pp. 45-49.

McDonald, Milton S. Administrator Evaluation: A Look at Georgia and the Nation. Georgia Professional Standards Commission Issues for Education Series. Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 1979.

Metzger, Christa. "Performance Evaluation of the Educational Leader." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 60, 1976, pp. 95-103.

Moeller, Gerald H. and David J. Mahan. The Faculty Team. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1971.

Natriello, G. and others. A Summary of the Recent Literature on the Evaluation of Principals, Teachers, and Students. Stanford, California: Stanford University (Occasional Paper No. 18), 1977. ERIC Document ED 141 407, 1977.

Nicholson, E. W. "The Performance of the Principal in the Accountability Syndrome." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 56 (1972) 94-101.

Nygaard, D. Evaluating Administrative Performance. An Educational Research Report. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1974. ERIC Document ED 095 663, 1974.

Poliakoff, E. Evaluating School Personnel Today. Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouseon Teaching, National Institute of Education. ERIC Document ED 073 045, 1973.

Principal Evaluation Research Action Brief Number Twelve. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, September 1980.

Redfern, G. B. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How?" National Association of Secondary School Principals, 56 (1972), 85-95.

_____. Evaluating Teachers and Administrators: Putting the Pieces Together. Westerville, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1978. ERIC Document ED 154 527, 1978.

Reutsch, G. V. "Assessing Administrative Performance." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 60 (1976) 77-83.

Robinson, Glenn. Evaluating Administrative Performance. Arlington Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1974.

Rosenberg, M. "How to Evaluate Your Principals Without Turning Them Off." American School Board Journal, 160, 1973, 35-36.

Seal, E. Z. Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of a Model Evaluating School Principals: Maxi-II Practicum Report. Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, 1977. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 156 679, 1977.

Stemnock, S. K. Evaluating Administrative Performance. Washington, D.C.: Education Research Service Circular No. 7, American Association of School Administrators, 1968. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 032 635, 1968.

Wochner, R. E. The Identification and Development of Administrative Competence: An Administrative Seminar in Administrative Competency/Performance based Response Materials. Tempe, Arizona: University of Arizona, 1973. ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 083 723, 1973.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENT

Box 131
Gladbrook, Iowa 50635
September 15, 1980

Recent research indicates a growing public interest in education as
demands for accountability from educators increase. Included in
interest is the topic of evaluation of educational performance.
While past efforts have focused primarily upon evaluation of teachers,
there is an increasing interest being directed toward evaluation of
high school administrators. I am gathering information on the methods
and characteristics of Iowa Public High Schools in their programs of
administrator evaluation. This is the topic selected for a research
paper being written to fulfill the requirement for a Master's Degree
in Education Administration at the University of Northern Iowa.

Your attendance center has been selected for inclusion in this study
of high school principal evaluation programs. You are being requested
to complete and return the attached questionnaire which will greatly
aid the successful completion of the study.

The questionnaire is coded to assist in completing a follow-up should
it be necessary. Neither individuals nor schools will be identified
in the study report as strict anonymity will be observed. A self-
addressed envelope is included for the prompt return of the information
requested. Your assistance and cooperation in the study is appreciated.
Thank you in advance for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Barry Reese

Enclosures

APPENDIX B

FOLLOWUP LETTER

Box 131
Gladbrook, Iowa   50635
September 29, 1980

As the school year progresses, I realize that these days, like most others, are quite busy. But in order to complete the sampling technique of this study, I am including an additional copy of the cover letter which states the purpose of the study and a copy of the questionnaire.

If you could take just a few minutes today to complete and return the instrument, you would be greatly aiding the success of the study. Once again, you can be assured of complete anonymity in your participation. Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Barry Reese

Enclosures

APPENDIX C   .

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to measure the extent and methods of
formal evaluation of Iowa Public High School Principals.

Process of Evaluation of the High School Principal

1. What personnel is involved in the formal evaluation of the principal?
    (Check all that apply.)
    ___ A. Superintendent
    ___ B. Central Administrative Office
    ___ C. Teachers
    ___ D. School Board
    ___ E. Pupils
    ___ F. Principal (the evaluatee - self-evaluation)
    ___ G. Building Administrative Team [assistant principal(s)]
    ___ H. Other (specify) _____
    ___ I. No formal evaluation process

2. How many evaluations are conducted in one school year?
    ___ A. One
    ___ B. Two
    ___ C. Three
    ___ D. Other (specify) _____

3. Where do the evaluation(s) take place? (Check all that apply.)
    ___ A. Principal's Office
    ___ B. Superintendent's Office
    ___ C. Central Administration Building
    ___ D. Other (specify) _____

4. What element(s) are involved in the process? (Check all that apply.)
    ___ A. Written
    ___ B. Oral
    ___ C. Written and Oral
    ___ D. Performance Objectives Measurement
    ___ E. Rating Scale (checklist)
    ___ F. Job Description--Task Completion
    ___ G. Other (specify) _____

5. When does the evaluation process take place?
    ___ A. Pre-employment
    ___ B. Check points during year (at regular intervals)
    ___ C. Continuous
    ___ D. Salary Review period only
    ___ E. Exit Interview
    ___ F. Other (specify) _____

6. What is the purpose(s) of the evaluation in your school? (Check all that apply.)
    ___ A. Improvement of the principal
    ___ B. Increase productivity of the individual, management team, school district
    ___ C. Motivate individual to achieve full potential
    ___ D. Screen for promotion/demotion
    ___ E. Screen for retention/release
    ___ F. Let individual know exactly what superordinate expects from him/her
    ___ G. Other (specify) _____

7. What personnel has evaluated the principal since the 1975-76 school year? Place an X in the blank at the left indicating the person(s) evaluating and place an X in the box or boxes at the right indicating the year(s) evaluated.

		75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79	79-80
___	A. Superintendent	___	___	___	___	___
___	B. Central Administrative Office	___	___	___	___	___
___	C. Teachers	___	___	___	___	___
___	D. School Board	___	___	___	___	___
___	E. Pupils	___	___	___	___	___
___	F. Principal (the evaluatee)	___	___	___	___	___
___	G. Building Administration Team	___	___	___	___	___
___	H. Other (specify)_____	___	___	___	___	___

Levels of Involvement of the principal in evaluation process:

8. Principal participates in pre-evaluation conference
    ___ always   ___ sometimes   ___ never

9. Principal participates in post-evaluation conference
    ___ always   ___ sometimes   ___ never

10. Principal participates in self-appraisal process before evaluation conference
    ___ always   ___ sometimes   ___ never

11. Principal designs personal goals/objectives for evaluation conference review
    ___ always   ___ sometimes   ___ never

12. Principal is expected to meet goals/objectives designed by other(s)
    ___ always   ___ sometimes   ___ never

13. Principal is expected to follow a written job description of position duties
    ___ always   ___ sometimes   ___ never

14. Regarding the use of Evaluation Criteria, rank order (1 high -
    11 low) each of the following according to:
    (A) the emphasis placed on each in your school district and
    (B) the emphasis you feel should be placed on each.

	A	B

Principal's Relations with Students:
stimulates good morale/maintains records

Administrative Management:
cooperates in maintaining physical plant and facilities

Principal's Personal Characteristics:
interpersonal skills/good humor/integrity

Principal's Management of School's Fiscal Affairs:
operates within budget/maintains records, reports/
negotiates with central office, faculty on budget
concerns

Principal's Relations with Faculty and Staff:
stimulates good morale/communicates effectively/sets
professional example in school settings

Principal's Relations with Community:
assesses community needs/cooperates with agencies in
community/involves parents in appropriate activities

Principal's Role in Instructional Leadership:
displays knowledge of curriculum trends, developments/
describes learning theories applicable to school/helps
organize training and materials for faculty

Principal's Role in Organizational Skills:
maintains clear lines of authority, responsibility/
plans technical skills needed for long/short range
planning, projects/ plans school calendar for
activities

Principal's Role in Supervisory Functions:
maintains observation, evaluation records for faculty
and staff/maintains inventory records of school
supplies, equipment

Principal's Professional Development:
attends conferences, workshops, meetings appropriate to
duties/advances own education and encourages faculty to
increase their professional status

Principal's Role in Scheduling:
organizes classroom offerings and training to respond
to school's aims, objectives/interprets school policy
to faculty for better coordination among curriculum
areas

Personal Data of the High School Principal

15. Age: _____

16. Sex: Male _____   Female _____

17. Number of years as high school principal in present school system:
    _____ 1-3   _____ 4-6   _____ 7-10   _____ 11-15   _____ 16-over

18. Has the principal been an assistant/associate principal in the
    present school system?
    _____ Yes
    _____ No
    _____ If yes, specify number of years.

19. Has the principal been an assistant/associate principal in another
    school system before the present school position?
    _____ Yes
    _____ No
    _____ If yes, specify number of years.

20. Has the principal previously been employed as a teacher in the
    present school system before becoming principal?
    _____ Yes
    _____ No
    _____ If yes, specify number of years.

21. Check the present level of education of the high school principal:
    _____ A. Temporary Certification for School Administration
    _____ B. Master's Degree in Secondary School Administration
    _____ C. Master's Degree in Academic Field; School Administration
              Endorsement
              Specify academic field: _____
    _____ D. Master's Degree + 15 hours
    _____ E. Ed. S (Specialist)
    _____ F. Doctorate

22. Is your attendance center a member of North Central Association?
    _____ Yes
    _____ No