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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

During the past decade, the pursuit of educational excellence emerged as the major focus for school boards across the nation. Substantial advances have been made in improvement of instruction, while overlooking the supervision and improvement of performance of the instructional leader—the principal. Performance evaluation of the principal "remains sketchy, poorly thought out, and largely ineffective" (Manatt, 1989). While a great deal of time and effort has been expended to improve classroom instruction, the performance evaluation and supervision of principals has been primarily "overlooked and ignored" (Sweeney, 1983). The main reason for the lapse is that in many areas of the country schools necessarily placed emphasis on teacher evaluation in order to meet state-mandated requirements (Manatt, 1988). "While teacher evaluation is evolving from a perfunctory or ceremonial process to an in-depth, meaningful vehicle for instructional improvement remains substantially unchanged" (Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985, p. 79).

The individual in the position to exert optimal influence on students, teachers, programs, and thus, instructional outcomes is the building principal (Sergiovanni, 1987). This is the critical person, the one who endeavors to effect school success by establishing a positive school culture, encouraging and facilitating both teaching and learning (Barth, 1990; Behling & Champion, 1984; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Dwyer, Barnett, & Lee, 1987; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Lieberman & Miller, 1984; McCurdy,
1983; Smith & Andrews, 1989). In order to increase student achievement in the 1990's, an urgent need is apparent for improved techniques of supervision which emphasize professional growth of individuals, linking principal behaviors to district goals and objectives (Manasse, 1983).

Restructuring

Recent concern for the quality of public education in America dates back to a startling report by sociologist James Coleman (1966) which concluded that the effect of social and home background was so strong, that little could be done by educators to overcome it. Since 1983 and the declaration of "a rising tide of mediocrity" in our public schools (National Commission on Education, 1983), numerous reports have affected the roles of educators, resulting in a push for reform which continues unabated. Impacting substantially on education were the reports: Tomorrow's Teachers (1986), submitted by the Holmes Group; and A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (1986) by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. The former expresses an urgent need for rethinking teacher preparation while the latter focuses on collaboration with "lead teachers" working with principals. The "second wave of reform," initiated by the National Governors' Association report, Time for Results (1986) stressed teacher preparation and the way teachers are involved in leadership and decision-making, resulting in recommendations for changing school organization, rules, and incentives (Lieberman, 1988, p. 4).

The first phase of the ensuing reform movement emphasized improvement of instruction--adding coursework and changing requirements--
resulting in increased standards for both students and teachers. "If the watchword of the first phase was 'excellence,' for the second phase it is 'restructuring'" (David, Purkey, & White, 1989, p. v). As public demands for raised test scores heightened and educators' attention became focused on outcomes, an urgent quest for accountability emerged. Added to old ideas such as nongrading, individualized instruction, and continuous progress, were newer concepts of teacher empowerment, cooperative learning, and site-based management (Goodlad, 1990). Attention shifted from that of more coursework, testing, and monitoring to the "second wave" movement of restructuring schools.

Connecting the two reform movements, Goodlad (1990) advised educators to concentrate change initiatives on the individual school, empowering teachers through increased involvement in the decision-making process. In response to the focus of attention on accountability, local school boards were forced to reconceptualize the roles of administrators, "... the question of leadership for a new age of schooling in the United States certainly is not a question of 'if,' but of 'how'" (Lewis, 1989, p. 245). As a result of the shift in attention, principal performance evaluation became acknowledged as a critical and eminent process in the drive to restructure schools.

Need for Improved Techniques of Principal Performance Evaluation

During this time of transition and quest for change, the pursuit of accountability became focused on the need for more effective evaluation of administrators (Ginsberg, 1989). The principal became recognized as the
instructional leader of the school and his or her competencies regarded as vital to increased student achievement. Educational Research Service reported in 1968 that over half of the districts which responded to its survey did not evaluate administrators; however, twenty years later, 77 percent of the states mandated requirements for principal evaluation or anticipated doing so (Peters & Bagenstos, 1988).

The individual is recognized as the key to change in the 1990's, rather than the institution (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1990). Authorities in both corporate and educational administration agree that addressing the self-growth of the individual in conjunction with improvement of performance in the workplace will effect lasting organizational change (Barth, 1990; Bennis, 1989a; Duke, 1988; Featherstone, 1977; Gardner, 1989). Within the organization, everyone, including management, must change his or her behavior, if long-term commitment to quality is to be achieved (Deming, 1986; Caldwell, 1991).

It is reasonable then, to assume that improved techniques of evaluation and supervision should support and encourage individual growth of administrators through a participatory, collaborative process. In other words, supporting and encouraging dynamic leaders to take control of their own lives, values, and beliefs, both professionally and personally, will enable them to provide effective leadership for others, thus promoting organizational growth throughout the system (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990).
Expert Systems Technology

Knowledge systems technology can serve as a tool to assist in principal performance evaluation, saving valuable time of highly trained school personnel (Bank & Williams, 1987a; Richards, 1989; Stevenson, 1987). Expert and knowledge systems provide an effective structure by which to manipulate quantified data and to resolve problems. According to Stevenson, knowledge systems technology used effectively by a school district can serve as an invaluable tool for resolving problems that require complex levels of human expertise. Trotter (1990) explains that, "The system's expertise . . . comes from the human experts who created it. But once installed on a microcomputer, the plug-in expert is always there, doesn't mind working overtime, and doesn't charge by the hour" (p. 24).

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed by this study was the absence of a knowledge system which could be utilized by school districts aspiring to develop innovative systems for the evaluation and improvement of principal performance. Subsequent to conducting an extensive review of literature on the subject of evaluation, it appeared there were few expert systems currently available to address the issue of principal performance evaluation. Consequently, testing the feasibility of developing the microcomputer-based, decision assistance system for principal performance evaluation was a major thrust of this dissertation.
Such a system for evaluating teachers has been used by numerous school districts for some time. A software package, Computer Assisted Teacher Evaluation/Supervision (CATE/S) (Manatt, et al., 1986), developed for the Iowa State University Research Foundation by the School Improvement Model (SIM) Research Team, was designed for administrators in order to speed up record-keeping and assist in the improvement of teacher performance. CATE/S is a powerful tool used by supervisors of teachers to organize evaluation data and suggest improvement strategies for the performance of prekindergarten through 12th grade teachers. The package can be customized to fit any local school system's needs (Manatt, Mitchell, Schlotfeldt, Hawana, & Stow, 1986).

Inherent within the study were dual problems. Modifying a copy of the CATE/S software from a system for storing data relevant to teacher evaluations to accommodate principal evaluations was a prerequisite. Second, it was necessary to compile a bank of professional growth plans aligned to the test site evaluation criteria to assist supervisors and principals to identify goals and procedures for the improvement of performance.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was to develop and test the feasibility of implementing a microcomputer system as a decision support tool to assist supervisors of principals in evaluation and improvement of principal performance. The intent was two-fold: to devise a user-friendly, decision support software for storage of principal evaluation data; and to develop a
bank of professional growth plans based on behaviorally specific objectives to be generated from the software and utilized in improvement of principal performance.

Since the nature of this study was exploratory, the focus of the investigation centered around finding answers to these questions: (a) Can the existing CATE/S program be modified for use as a decision-support tool in evaluation and improvement of performance of principals? (b) How can lists of principal tasks and behaviors from the available literature be categorized and prioritized to align with the test-site performance criteria, in order to coordinate a bank of professional growth plans? (c) What group can be used as expert jury to respond to a survey intended to test the feasibility of the system? (d) What questions will be asked of the expert jury? (e) What will be the cost of installing the system in a school district, both in personnel hours to enter the data and components of the evaluation system and initial cost of the software package?

Delimitations

Due to the descriptive and developmental nature of the study, generalizing from the results could be problematic. To develop the professional growth plans, complete the survey, and draw conclusions from the data gathered, procedures were used that relied heavily on experience and inductive reasoning.

Further limitations were inherent within the study. Generalizing from the results could be questionable since no attempt was made to field test or to
perform an in-depth analysis of the effects of the proposed system on the performances of the field site principals; and, because this was a snapshot, reflecting one period of time. Furthermore, the study was limited to the evaluation system of one mid-western school district, so that generalizing to other schools with differing ethnographic populations could be a problem. Another limitation exists in that members of the expert jury were not selected randomly, each having connections to some extent to Iowa State University and/or the School Improvement Model. Also, bias could exist, and generalization be limited, in that the professional growth plans were primarily developed by the researcher with the assistance of a team of educational administration, doctoral students with supportive advice of two professors, all from Iowa State University.

Basic Assumptions

This investigation was based on two well-researched assumptions: (a) that principal performance can be measured in terms of established competencies and behaviors, and (b) that principal performance can be improved through the evaluation and supervisory process. Further, it was assumed that hypothetical principal evaluations can be constructed from the field site criteria, that an expert jury of practicing administrators could be selected, that said expert jury is capable of making honest and knowledgeable assessments regarding the feasibility of the proposed evaluation system, and that there would be at least 80 percent agreement among jurors that the system is feasible. Also, it was assumed that prekindergarten through 12th grade
principals can be successfully evaluated using the same instrument; and finally, that the supervisory process is based on a participatory, collaborative process, the principal being encouraged to engage in a continuous self-improvement process in which objectives are established collaboratively with the supervisor.

### Definitions of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Accepting responsibility for equal access to instruction for all children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Any specific action or pursuit producing a desired result (Mueller, 1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifact data</td>
<td>Information serving as tangible evidence of goal accomplishment or skill performance (e.g., staff, student, and parent surveys; staff and student attendance records; letters, memos, and newsletters; newspaper clippings; rewards and recognitions; time logs) (Valentine, 1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>A process referred to as the APE Cycle in which 16 collective steps are followed to evaluate administrative performance (Manatt, 1988).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluation Cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATE/S</td>
<td>Computer Assisted Teacher Evaluation/Supervision, a software package developed by the Iowa State University Research Foundation, used by supervisors of teachers to organize evaluation data and suggest strategies for teacher performance improvement (Manatt, et al., 1986).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Cooperation on the parts of the evaluator and the evaluatee in joint planning to form objectives and strategies for the improvement of performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Descriptors of effective principal behaviors based on research studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminating Item</td>
<td>An item of criteria which elicits: (a) similar responses from members of the group rating a particular principal and (b) maximum differences among the principals being rated (Look, 1982).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluatee</td>
<td>The principal undergoing the process of having his/her performance appraised (Mueller, 1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The appraisal of performance in terms of goals, objectives, and work plan activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>The immediate supervisor responsible for making an appraisal of a subordinate's performance (Mueller, 1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert system</td>
<td>Any computer system that was developed by means of a loose collection of techniques associated with artificial intelligence research (Harmon &amp; King, 1985). The term is used in reference to large scale system (Stevenson, 1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>The capability of being done or carried out successfully. In this investigation, feasibility both fiscal and time allotments required for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative evaluation</td>
<td>The phase of the evaluation process in which the evaluator assists the principal to improve performance through feedback. It is ongoing, descriptive, developmental, and non-judgmental (Manatt, 1988).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic</td>
<td>A rule-of-thumb or other device that reduces or limits search in large problem spaces (Harmon &amp; King, 1985).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge base</td>
<td>The portion of a knowledge system that consists of facts and heuristics about a domain (Harmon &amp; King, 1985).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge system</td>
<td>A small-scale computer system, usually containing 200 rules or less within its knowledge base (Stevenson, 1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>The process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or the group (Gardner, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership behavior</td>
<td>The way a person behaves or actions taken in the leadership role (Gardner, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learner</td>
<td>&quot;... not acquiring more information, but expanding the ability to produce the results we truly want in life. ... It is a process. It is a lifelong discipline&quot; (Senge, 1990, p. 142).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth plan</td>
<td>A strategy for improvement of performance in which a goal is set and measurable, behavioral objectives are selected (Redfern, 1980).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Improvement Commitment</td>
<td>Label used by the School Improvement Model (SIM) to indicate professional growth plan. The PIC can be generated from the CATE/S software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement Model (SIM)</td>
<td>A project that developed a model for improvement of student achievement, prekindergarten through 12, based at Iowa State University, under the direction of Dr. Richard P. Manatt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems approach</td>
<td>A means to assist in the achievement of outcomes; considers interactions among the system parts in organizational planning (Kaufman, 1988).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative evaluation</td>
<td>The end-of-year critique upon which promotion, retention, or incentive pay is based. It is final, judgmental, and comparative (Manatt, 1988).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total systems approach</td>
<td>A planning model in which the school is viewed as a network of interrelated and interacting subsystems, rather than isolated, separate units (Castetter, 1971; Drake, 1980; Knezevich, 1984).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User-friendly</td>
<td>A computer system that can be implemented by an inexperienced user with little difficulty (Stevenson, 1987).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II. RELATED LITERATURE

The principal is the instructional leader of the school and his or her competencies are regarded as vital to increased student achievement. Focusing on the theme, "the principal makes a difference," it was the purpose of this research effort to develop and test the feasibility of implementing a knowledge-base microcomputer system for assisting in principal performance evaluation. A second major theme was the supervision of principals, focusing on professional growth of the individual.

A priority throughout this investigation, and thus, pervasive in the review of literature, was the rationale for a collaborative, participatory approach to the improvement of principal performance. Assuming a supportive role regarding the evaluation and supervision of principals, the superintendent can foster a sense of trust, affecting communications throughout the entire organization, and thus, impacting positively on student outcomes (Hallinger & Murphy, 1991; Hord, 1990; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Weiss, 1988).

The review of literature encompassed three major objectives: (a) to establish the rationale for principal performance evaluation as a collaborative, participative process; (b) to define the research-based, total systems approach to principal evaluation process; and (c) to provide a discourse pertaining to the application of microcomputers in education. A problem encountered in the search of literature is that a severe deficit exists in the available literature relating to the subject of this investigation. Research focusing on principal performance evaluation is scant, the subject of implementing professional
growth plans as a vehicle for performance improvement yields limited resources, and, practically no information exists concerning the use of microcomputer systems in administrative evaluation. Revealing a proliferation of studies in the area of teacher performance evaluation, the literature offers limited objective research focusing on the evaluation and improvement of principal performance (Duke & Stiggins, 1985; Ginsberg, 1989; Hallinger & Murphy, 1991; Manatt, 1988; Manatt, 1989; Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985).

**Performance Evaluation: A Collaborative, Participatory Approach**

This most critical section of the review of literature supports the appeal for an approach to principal performance supervision that requires increased communication with and support of the principal by central-level supervisors. Four areas are discussed in this section: (a) a review of the increased need for accountability and its impact on administrator evaluation, (b) consideration of the principal as lifelong learner, (c) the eminent role of the superintendent as collaborator and builder of trust, and (d) the often ignored need for communicating clearly defined expectations for principal performance.

**Increased Need for Accountability**

Public demands for improved student achievement highlight the need for increased accountability and the implications for instructional leadership, emphasizing the need for improved principal performance. An impressive number of credible researchers over the past two decades link positive student
outcomes to building administrator behaviors, agreeing that, as the instructional leader of the school, the principal makes a difference (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Barth, 1990; Behling & Champion, 1984; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Brookover, Brady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbacker, 1979; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Dwyer, 1986; Dzacky, 1988; Edmonds & Fredericksen, 1978; Hord, 1990; Keefe & Jenkins, 1984; Larsen, 1987; Lieberman & Miller, 1984; McCurdy, 1983; NAESP, 1986; Patterson, Purkey, & Parker, 1986; Persell, Cookson, & Lyons, 1982; Phi Delta Kappa, 1980; Robinson & Block, 1982; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Outson, 1979; Sarason, 1982; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Sweeney, 1982). The principal is recognized as the instructional leader of the school and an unprecedented need for improved performance evaluation linked to increased student achievement has been established.

The principal is charged with communicating vision to all people associated with the school (Duke, 1990). According to Deal and Peterson (1990), this is the person who shapes school culture by acting as:

- A **symbol** who affirms values through dress, routines, attention, and behavior;
- A **potter** who shapes and is shaped through the school's heroes, rituals, ceremonies, and symbols;
- A **poet** who uses language to reinforce values and sustain the school's best image of itself;
- An **actor** who improvises in daily school dramas; and
- A **healer** who oversees the transitions and changes in school life.
During a year-long field study of 12 successful principals, Dwyer (1986) established that the principal's behavior influences student outcomes by affecting the instructional organization and the social climate of the school. The study confirmed that successful principals: (a) act with purpose, (b) have a multi-faceted image of schools, (c) use routine behaviors to progress incrementally toward goals, (d) engage in similar kinds of behavior, and (e) vary routine behavior to suit their contexts and purposes.

The 1990 Rand Corporation report, which focused on at-risk students in urban high schools, supports the premise that the principal is the person accountable for innovations aimed at motivating disadvantaged youth to learn and develop into responsible citizens (Hill, Foster, & Gendler, 1990). The conclusion is drawn that strategies such as choice and site-based management (external conditions) will improve education for inner-city youth only when combined with the focus school approach (inner strategy) (pp. 75, 88). In this approach, change comes from a "cadre" of teachers and principal working together cooperatively at the school site.

These studies highlight the need to examine methods by which principal performance can be effectively evaluated, enhanced, and improved (Ginsberg, 1989). Three points upon which researchers appear to agree are: "(1) student achievement patterns can and must be improved; (2) the local school, under the brilliant leadership of the principal, is where necessary changes must be made; and (3) principals need a lot of help and support in order to pull it off" (Snyder & Giella, 1987, p. 38).
Principal as Lifelong Learner

Continual, personal growth of the participants in the workplace is the challenge of organizations today since enduring organizational change is achieved by "the release and full use of the individual's potential" (Bennis, 1989a, p. 187). Experts in the field of educational administration contend that considering the principal as lifelong learner is essential in order that restructuring efforts result in substantive and lasting change (Hallinger & Murphy, 1991; Hord, 1988; Olds, 1977; Rhodes, 1990a; Senge, 1990). The definition of lifelong learning, according to Senge (1990), is:

... not acquiring more information, but expanding the ability to produce the results we truly want in life. It is lifelong generative learning. ... People with a high level of personal mastery live in a continual learning mode. They never 'arrive.' ... personal mastery is not something you possess. It is a process. It is a lifelong discipline (p. 142).

Due to the visibility of the position itself, it makes sense that promoting continuous self-growth and professional improvement in principals is a meritorious district goal (Barth, 1990; Coursen & Thomas, 1989; Smith & Andrews, 1989). The building principal, who makes a variety of contacts on any given day, has a unique opportunity to teach by example (Hord, 1988). The principal is in a position to model behaviors which are observed and emulated by students, parents, and teachers "in a total school community of learners" (p. 8).

Authorities in both corporate and educational administration recognize the value of continual, adult learning as the integral component of progress.
The literature establishes that lasting, professional development depends on growth of both the individual and the organization. Professional attributes which enhance on-the-job performance can be developed compatibly with personal skills through the realization of self-actualization. Promoting personal growth and self-actualization of individuals in an organization is an objective which merits serious consideration in the goal setting stage of strategic planning (Bennis, 1989a; Deal, Dornbusch, & Crawford, 1977; Deming, 1986; Gardner, 1990; Glasser, 1990; Hord, 1990; Joyce & Showers, 1988; Maslow, 1968; Olds, 1977; Redfern, 1983; Rhodes, 1990a; Senge, 1990; Shroyer, 1990).

A reasonable first step, as the focus for reform strategies, is the targeting of the administrative culture. According to Hallinger & Murphy (1991), "When administrators have positive learning experiences, they are more likely to seek and support additional learning for their subordinates (other administrators, teachers, and support staff) and students" (p. 519). Moreover, addressing the professional development and personal growth of administrators in the system will effect improved relationships throughout the entire organization by a natural filtering down of positive communications and satisfactory working relationships.

Professional and personal growth conceptualized as an ongoing process, not as an end in itself, is paramount to effectively promoting the flow of innovations and transitional programs vital to restructuring in education (Joyce & Showers, 1988). The district, strategic plan should be continuous and developmental in nature; allowing for staff development organized in such a
manner as to allow flexibility to address changing needs of the organization as well as promoting personal self-actualization of individuals (Shroyer, 1990).

**Adversities of the Principalship**

Adversities inherent within the role of principal compound to create a potentially stressful position (Barth, 1990; Duke, 1988; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Manasse, 1983; Sweeney, 1985). Numerous factors exist that account for the increasing need for more and improved supervisory communications with principals. Components of the position which naturally lend themselves to the making of a stressful situation include: confusion in role expectations (Manasse, 1983); being caught in the middle "between teachers and external ideas and people" (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 144), or between central office expectations and teachers (Sweeney, 1985); dealing with the "changing nature of the principalship and the impediments to successful leadership" (McCurdy, 1983, p. 92); serving as a "scapegoat" when program goals are not accomplished (Dwyer, Barnett, & Lee, 1987); and working as an isolated administrator, sometimes attempting to solve seemingly unsolvable problems for diverse populations—students, parents, and staff (Barth, 1990; Duke, 1988).

The very nature of the principal's role and, quite often, the personality of the individual, are factors that create circumstances which threaten the success of principals (Duke, 1988). Ideally, a principal is employed because he or she is a creative, proactive, "take charge" type of person. This individual usually is one who wants to please, sets high personal expectations, and strives to achieve excellence. A natural consequence of these "type A" personality traits,
combined with fragmented role expectations (Smith & Andrews, 1989), is stress-related problems for the individual.

Another major problem for principals, according to Schmoker (1991), is that the duties of the position keep the individual bound to building management tasks, such as attending to "busses, buildings, and budgets" (p. 31). Minimal time is left to prioritize for instructional management, the principal often being overwhelmed by non-academic concerns. In the next decade, superintendents and school boards must necessarily free principals from some of the mundane management tasks so that time commitments can be prioritized to effectively address the role of instructional supervision (Hord, 1990).

The need for increased attention to the emotional well-being and self-growth of dynamic leaders was verified in a study by Duke (1988). Following the investigation of young principals who were considering quitting their positions, Duke surmised that the same qualities which helped principals become successful leaders could likewise undermine their effectiveness and cause them to be unsure of themselves and their positions. Moreover, success often brought increased demands along with guilt centered around not being able to meet the demands.

To a large degree, educators are isolated professionals (Lortie, 1975), a solitary condition which lends itself to the creation of problems in coping with on-the-job stress. Often lacking in a peer support group and distanced from positive reinforcement by superiors, principals are prone to strong feelings of isolation (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Studying the actions of five principals,
Dwyer, Lee, Rowan, and Bossert (1983) found a pervasive theme of feelings of isolation in the perspectives of the principals. Furthermore, the researchers noted that the subjects being studied perceived the interest and understanding of the interviewers as supportive and as indications that what they were doing was of importance.

A related factor which compounds stress, is the "loose coupling" of schools (Weick, 1976), a condition in which goals can be relatively unclear and changing. Although the condition of loose coupling served school administration well in the past, it is contradictory to the current drive for accountability, which has resulted in more stringent practices of supervision and evaluation. In a loosely coupled organization, some events and roles are interdependent and responsive, each also preserving its own identity and a certain degree of separateness. Simultaneously, schools are both tightly and loosely coupled (Sergiovanni, 1984). For instance, the roles of principal and superintendent can be regarded as being loosely coupled as each role depends on the other in some capacities but also has a unique degree of separateness. In supervising the work of principals, central office administrators maintain a balance of autonomy and control over principals, combining both tight and loose controls (Peterson, 1984). Lending a measure of stress to administration, the appropriate degree of connectedness, and/or lack of, is a difficult and important balance to maintain (Weick, 1982).

The common sense ramification of all of this is that the collaborative leadership of well adjusted individuals reduces fear and apprehension in an organization in such a way that people can learn and grow effectively. A
principle to consider during unsettling and stressful times of transition is that people do not learn or work well under conditions of fear or confusion which lead to undue distress (Barth, 1983; Glasser, 1990). Students, teachers, and administrators all benefit in "school conditions of low anxiety and high productivity" (Barth, p. 14) where channels of communication are straightforward and supportive.

**Superintendent as Collaborator and Builder of Trust**

Three essential components of implementing organizational change are trust, clarity, and participation (Bennis, 1989b, p. 30). "First, such people must gain our trust. Second, they must express their vision clearly so that we all not only understand but concur. Third, they must persuade us to participate."

Numerous researchers agree that in schools effective in improving student achievement, central level administrators build trust by stressing collaboration and collegiality, paired with schoolwide staff development efforts directly related to school goals (Barth, 1990; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Clickman & Calhoun, 1991; Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985; Pajak & Glickman, 1989; Vaughn, 1985). In order to effect lasting organizational change, the collaborative philosophy, in accord with Bennis' "trust, clarity, and participation," must be visibly promoted by members of the school board and central level administrators. The concept must be understood, internalized, and practiced by all members of the institution.
Envisioning a "major change in the ecology of professional life," Joyce and Showers (1983) describe a school environment in which collaboration is the norm, continuous training and study interwoven into the "fabric of the school" in such a way that individuals derive satisfaction from experiences in improvement and growth (p. 1). In order to promote such enduring innovations as site-based governance, teacher empowerment, and outcome-based instruction, teachers must recognize a sense of supportive, strong, and active leadership. Barth (1990), Schmoker (1991), and Deal and Peterson (1990) agree that the principal is the person who shapes the culture necessary to promote and sustain these innovations that are inherent within the change process. Nonetheless, the major impetus must come from the superintendent and central-level supervisors in the form of positive, personal, and supportive interpretation of district expectations (Hord, 1990; Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Pajak & Glickman, 1989).

The superintendent who takes an active role as the district's instructional leader increases the chances for students to succeed (Hord, 1990). Student outcomes are more likely to improve in schools where the superintendent is actively involved with principals in setting goals and promoting a positive school image, concludes Hord. Promoting team management with teachers as change agents, outcomes-focused superintendents are highly visible; active leaders in curriculum and instruction; and prioritize large amounts of time to be spent on the supervision, evaluation, and coaching of principals (Anderson, 1989; Hord, 1990; Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985).
Examining the characteristics and activities of effective California schools, Murphy, Hallinger, and Peterson (1985) found six noteworthy characteristics in common: (a) Evaluation procedures and criteria were clearly defined; (b) supervision and evaluation functions were used as means of linking school and district offices; (c) the supervision and evaluation process also served as a base for the development of other linkage functions, such as goal setting and curriculum alignment; (d) district management focused on such core activities as instruction and curriculum; (e) outcome controls focusing on student achievement was central to the principal evaluation process; and (f) the superintendents were actively involved in the supervision and evaluation process.

It has been concluded from studies examining the roles of leaders in the corporate sector that the activities of educational administrators do not differ from what leaders do in any organization (Bennis, 1989a; Snyder & Anderson, 1987). Effective leaders in the corporate sector set goals intent upon serving the customer (Peters & Waterman, 1982). From these studies it can be surmised that educators must understand that in the "business" of education, the customer is the student! Therefore, as instructional leaders, school administrators should engage in activities that will improve the organization's (or school's) ability to succeed in the business of educating children (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990).

The ultimate goal of the superintendent is for the organization and workers to become aligned in the common purpose of meeting student needs, contends Rhodes (1990a, 1990b, 1990c), interpreting the works of W. Edwards
Deming. Quality control as an organizational, decision-making process requires that: (a) everyone is responsible for the quality of student learning, (b) the superintendent fosters a common vision among all members of staff, and (c) everyone continually works together to identify and meet the needs of students. In the Deming model, the superintendent, operating with a high level of trust, assumes that each staff member is employed in education because he or she wants to make a difference in the lives of children. As collaborator and builder of trust, the goal of the superintendent is to accomplish the alignment of the system and the educators so that student needs are effectively met.

Contrary to assumptions drawn from effective schools research, Pajak & Glickman (1989) conclude that the role of the school principal as instructional leader is secondary to that of superintendents and central office supervisors. Studying school districts that demonstrated improvements in student achievement over three consecutive years, it was concluded that the primary figures are more apt to be central office supervisors, lead teachers, assistant principals for instruction, department-and grade-level heads, and teams of teachers. Reportedly, the superintendent and central office supervisors were the "key figures in stimulating and facilitating efforts to maintain and improve the quality of instruction" (p. 62). A previous study with similar conclusions was performed by Loucks-Horsley & Hergert (1985), who contend that superintendents, specialists at central office, teachers and supervisors all play important roles in conjunction with the principal in the facilitation of change.
Sensitive implementation of evaluation, with frequent communication, lends itself to positive professional relationships, thus enabling superintendents and principals to work together harmoniously in the future (Smith & Andrews, 1989; Weiss, 1988). The use of intensive coaching and support of principals by central-level supervisors is strongly advocated by Hallinger and Murphy (1991), who posit "that perhaps the most important influence on the behavior of school leaders are the attitudes and behaviors of other leaders--past and present--with whom they come into contact" (p. 520). Weiss found this approach to administrative evaluation improved communication by encouraging discussions of the perceived differences in performance, providing the superintendent with opportunities to clarify for principals expectations of what district office personnel consider to be critical components of principals' performance.

Moreover, principals express a desire for improved communications with superintendents and "closer working relationships to assist them in providing superior leadership" (McCurdy, 1983, p. 56). Asked through a survey by AASA, "What one thing could superintendents do to help principals perform more effectively?" elementary and secondary principals responded in agreement: "foster better communications between superintendents and principals" (p. 56). Responses also provided, though less emphatically, were: provide more support, give principals more authority, closer relationships with superintendents, and involvement of principals in district decision-making process.
Overlapping the obvious effects of positive communications among central office staff and principals, is the effect of the principal's emotional well-being on the performance of teachers and non-certified members of staff. A collaborative process of evaluation which is both speculative and considerate of personal growth needs can contribute significantly to positive communications throughout the staff of the entire organization (Castetter, 1971; DeRoche, 1987; Hallinger & Murphy, 1991; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Weiss, 1988). Since effectiveness of the instructional leader depends, to a large extent, on the quality of input and cooperation from members of staff, it makes sense to promote an attitude of well being and positive communications among all administrators in the district.

It is important that the visible behaviors of leaders be in alignment with values and beliefs of the organization. In the words of Senge (1990), "An organization's commitment to and capacity for learning can be no greater than that of its members." In order for the change process to realistically address student needs, administrators must communicate in such a way that everyone in the system understand the shared vision, speak a common language, and agree on a common model for instruction (Hord, 1990; Rhodes, 1990b).

Need for Clearly Defined Expectations

A recurring theme throughout the review of literature is the need to clearly delineate expectations and procedures of the evaluation process to principals. An integral facet of the evaluation cycle is providing principals with realistic and clear understandings of what is expected of them (Anderson,
1989; Duke & Stiggins, 1985; Manatt, 1988; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Valentine, 1987). This phase of the cycle has become increasingly important during the past decade due to the change in the principal's role from one of manager to that of instructional leader, creating confusion in role expectations (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

The planning necessary to prepare for change is the "heart" of effective evaluation (Bolton, 1980). During this phase, it is essential that the principal be provided with a clear interpretation of the specific evaluation criteria and procedures, delineating the balance between "performance and outcome measures" (Deal, Dornbusch, & Crawford, 1977). Research indicates, however, that school districts often fail to execute this crucial step (Anderson, 1989; Harrison & Peterson, 1988). In a study of Iowa school districts, Williams (1990) found that only 11 percent of responding districts had evaluation procedures which call for a pre-cycle evaluation conference.

Merely holding high expectations for principals as instructional leaders "is not sufficient" (Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. 41). A lack of clear definition of role in terms of observable behaviors and practices can lead to perplexity on the part of the principal, complicated by miscommunication with district office personnel (Anderson, 1989; Andrews & Soder, 1987; Cohen & Manasse, 1982; Duke & Stiggins, 1985; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Valentine, 1987; Williams, 1990). Promoting improvement of performance and professional growth, Harrison and Peterson (1988) advocate that supervisors provide frequent communication regarding performance, "whether it is satisfactory or
dissatisfactory," so that principals have "useful information about what they can correct, maintain, or improve" (p. 4).

Clarification of expectations, an active role in the shared vision, and frequent, two-way discourses concerning procedures and events all serve to assist principals in clearer interpretations of situations (Anderson, 1989). In order that an administrator be provided the greatest opportunity to be successful, Moss-Kanter (1983) asserts, "Tasks should be clearly defined; people should know exactly what they are being asked to do. And most important, lines of authority should be unambiguous" (p. 138).

The evaluator and evaluatee both benefit from an evaluation process which includes clear expectations, regularly scheduled sessions of participatory communication, and a high degree of appropriate, straightforward feedback (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Besides delineating role expectations, this type of communication serves to alleviate detrimental symptoms of stress and anxiety, fostering positive feelings in two ways: by providing a sense of control over the nature of results expected as well as increasing enthusiasm and motivation for improvement.

**Principal Performance Evaluation Process**

This section of the review of literature addresses the total systems approach to principal performance evaluation and supervision (Manatt, 1988). Inclusive in this section are: (a) a discussion of the total systems approach to principal performance evaluation; (b) a review of the research on testing for discriminating power of evaluation items; (c) a review of the components
involved in the writing of professional growth plans; and (d) a review of research pertaining to similarities of role and characteristics of principal which justify using the same evaluation instrument and process for all grade levels.

**Total Systems Approach**

In the study of principal performance evaluation, two prerequisite assumptions were made. First, that principal performance can be measured in terms of established competencies and behaviors; and second, principal performance can be improved through the evaluation and supervisory process. Designed to serve duality of purposes, the effective principal performance evaluation process can improve administrative morale and educational climate through improved communications, while complying to requisites of accountability for the local school district (Weiss, 1987).

Authorities agree that principal evaluation is most effective when based on the systems approach to organizational planning (Castetter, 1971; Knezevich, 1984; Manatt & Stow, 1982). The systems approach serves as a tool to assist in planning, in the achievement of outcomes, and as a means for resolving problems (Kaufman, 1988). According to Hoy & Miskel (1987), "a system is a set of interdependent elements forming an organized whole" (p. 16). The term, total systems approach, denotes viewing the school as a network of interrelated and interacting subsystems—rather than as isolated, separate units—each subsystem charged with accomplishing a part in the district mission (Castetter, 1971; Drake & Roe, 1980; Knezevich, 1984; Senge 1990). Senge refers to the systems approach to people and change as the "fifth
discovery," positing simply that, "Systems thinking is a discipline for seeing wholes" (p. 68).

Evaluation based upon the systems approach gives due consideration to the way in which the parts of the organization interact to facilitate achievement of the district's goals (Castetter, 1971). The research-based, total systems approach to administrative evaluation and supervision serves the school district in a number of capacities (Manatt & Stow, 1982). The primary and obvious reason for the process is accountability, in order to ensure that the curriculum and instruction at the building level is aligned with district mission and goals. The second, but not less important consideration is that of providing a means for performance improvement through a process using collaboratively written professional growth plans.

The effective evaluation system serves in these capacities:

- is an integral management tool
- emphasizes doing the right things
- assesses improvement needs
- can identify merit performances
- and has specific measures (Manatt, 1988, p. 8).

Generally, three major themes emerge as necessary for effective administrative appraisal: (a) setting criteria, (b) sampling performance, and (c) communicating expectations and results (Harrison & Peterson, 1988). Activities of the process can be separated into two categories, each one serving an important purpose and deserving to be performed in an organized fashion (Manatt, 1988; Millman, 1981; Rentsch, 1976; Valentine, 1987).
1. Formative evaluation serves as a means to assist administrators in improvement of performance. Communication is involved between the evaluator and evaluatee, focusing on improvement of the overall educational program. This activity is ongoing, descriptive, developmental, and non-judgmental.

2. Summative evaluation serves in the capacity of an end critique of the administrator's performance upon which promotion, retention, or incentive pay is based. It is an activity which is final, judgmental, and comparative.

The components of the evaluation system referred to in this study are outlined in the 16 step performance evaluation cycle (Figure 1) developed by the School Improvement Model at Iowa State University. The steps inclusive in the formative cycle are: (1) establishing the self-evaluation, (2) setting a benchmark of administrator performance, (3) critical self-evaluation, (4) goal setting conference, (5) pre-observation conference, (6) slice-of-time observation, (7) analysis of data/conference preparation, (8) feedback conference, (9) supervisory conference, (10) post-supervisory observation conference, and (11) add other data. The summative cycle comprises steps 12 through 16: (12) summative written report, (13) summative conference, (14) written agreement, (15) listing results, and (16) establishing new goals and planning (Manatt, 1988, pp. 18-21).

**Evaluation Items-Tests for Discriminating Power**

Increased accountability in the "delivery of educational services" will be successful only as schools use principal evaluation criteria which have been
Figure 1. Administrator Performance Evaluation Cycle (Manatt, 1988)
identified by effective schools research (Manatt & Stow, 1982). The review of literature revealed a number of principal performance evaluation models created for adoption by local school districts (Manatt, 1988; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Valentine, 1987). Because of variations in the needs and values of systems, an evaluation instrument must also be job specific to fit the individual situation. A single checklist cannot be devised for successful use in all situations. Therefore, it is necessary to develop lists of criteria based upon item discrimination power for adapting to reflect the uniqueness of the individual school unit (Look, 1983).

Discriminating between high and low performance of principals requires evaluators to have instruments available that contain lists of items which do in fact measure differences. In order to have discriminating power, the list of items used must have been verified to elicit similar responses from members of the group of evaluators, as well as showing maximum differences among the individual principals being rated. The literature revealed numerous lists of competencies, skills, and behaviors used to rate principal performance. However, few studies were found which established discriminating power of the items of criteria. For each of the research studies found to prove discriminating power (Larsen, 1987; Look and Manatt, 1983; Weiss, 1988), a brief description is provided.

Look (1983), in a doctoral study which provided the basis for numerous other research efforts, established a bank of principal performance evaluation items and verified validity and discriminating power. Three principal behaviors found to be significantly more appropriate in reaching the goal of
increased student achievement on standardized tests are: (a) takes a strong interest in teachers' professional development, (b) monitors the curriculum and identifies progress toward goals, and (c) promotes activities to solve instructional problems. Look identified discriminating items through a survey of 55 principals in eight school districts, applying the Menne and Tolsma methodology to establish discriminating power. Discriminating items verified in this study could be adopted for use by local districts.

In research of high import to this study, Larsen's findings (1987) support the precept that behaviors of the building principal do make a difference in student achievement. The doctoral study was found through ERIC and Dissertations Abstracts, International. Larsen found 10 principal leadership behaviors to differ significantly when comparing high-achieving schools (HAS) to low-achieving schools (LAS). Teachers from HAS rated their principals as demonstrating the following leadership behaviors significantly more often than did teachers in LAS: (a) ensures that school instructional goals are developed congruent with district policies; (b) ensures that instructional goals are clearly communicated to everyone; (c) communicates high expectations for student academic performance to staff; (d) participates in formal and/or informal discussions concerning instruction as it impacts student achievement; (e) ensures that systematic procedures for monitoring student progress are utilized by staff; (f) assists teachers in securing available resources for program implementation; (g) makes regular visits to the classrooms; (h) evaluates curricular progress; (i) observes innovative curricular programs; (j) establishes a safe/orderly school environment with a
clear discipline code. Initially, 29 behaviors were identified as important, ranked by a panel of nationally known experts in the field of educational administration. Larsen posited that principal involvement in instructional leadership focuses on 29 identified behaviors rated as "most important" by national experts, with special emphasis placed on the 10 specific behaviors found to occur at a significant rate in HAS.

An in-depth study of particular assistance in this investigation was found through ERIC and Dissertations Abstracts, International and sent for through Interlibrary Loans of the University library. Weiss (1988) developed a principal performance, assessment process, using a pilot study to establish the validity of a pool of 79 items. A pilot study was used, verifying the reliability and validity of the items. Three phases of the study were beneficial to this investigation. First, the list of behaviors were implemented in conjunction with other lists. Second, research of previous studies pertaining to similarities of the three levels of principalships provided a basis for the search of the same topic in this study. Finally, a summary of positive feedback from subjects in regard to the collaborative aspect of the evaluation process served to substantiate the present position as to the need for a collaborative approach to principal performance evaluation.

**Professional Growth Plan**

In the total-systems approach to evaluation, writing the professional growth plan is an integral, culminating phase of the process. This approach provides for the development of trust while placing emphasis on
improvement of performance (Rauhauser, 1983; Redfern, 1980; Weiss, 1988). The agreement is a written plan for improvement of performance, accomplished at the end of the cycle with implementation planned for the beginning of the next cycle. Effective evaluation systems not only measure competence, but also support the training of the individual to become more competent (Manatt, 1989). This written agreement is a plan for success!

The growth plan is collaboratively developed by the supervisor and the principal (Bolton, 1980; Stow, 1988). The plan is a strategy for improvement in which a goal is set and measurable behavioral objectives are selected. A guideline to follow in developing the plan, according to Stow (1988), is: (a) use needs determined from the criteria ratings as a base, (b) place emphasis on an individualized plan, and (c) be prepared to revise as needed.

The growth plan may be written with a principal demonstrates obvious need for improvement or with a principal who exhibits exemplary leadership behaviors and is interested in enhancement of performance (Valentine, 1987). In either case, the principal and supervisor review the criteria, determine the appropriate criterion to address, and establish the behavioral objective and activities to improve or enhance performance.

The plan has been called a Job Improvement Target by Redfern (1980), a Professional Improvement Commitment (PIC) by the School Improvement Model at Iowa State University (Stow, Manatt, Mitchell, and Hawana, 1985), a Professional Improvement Plan by the school site in this study (School District of St. Joseph, 1988); and a Growth Plan by Valentine (1987). No matter what label is used, the intent remains the same: individual improvement of
performance in a specific area. As delineated by Stow (1988), the essential elements of a PIC are:

1. goal (general intent);
2. objective (specific, measurable behavior);
3. set of procedures (plan-of-action) or a sequence of steps with a timeline which keeps the process moving ahead, and indicates a completion date;
4. progress check to indicate how it is going;
5. standard along with the evidence which indicates how it will be known if the PIC has been accomplished (p. 83).

Mueller (1987) developed a bank of model Professional Improvement Commitments (PICs) for use with secondary principals. Through quality testing and analysis an initial bank of 72 PICs was established. The model PICs are intended for use by supervisors of principals when performance improvement needs are identified. Recommendations from Mueller's study served as a suggestion to initiate this investigation.

Writers in both educational and corporate realms advocate the professional growth plan approach to performance improvement. Three essential components of implementing organizational change, in agreement with Bennis (1989b) and Deming (Rhodes, 1990) and inherent within this process, are: trust, clarity, and participation. Results of the written agreement are: (a) clearer understanding of expectations, (b) improved communications between the evaluator and evaluatee, and (c) feelings of a greater sense of importance in the evaluation process.
**Similarities and Differences of Principals' Roles/Characteristics**

A number of studies pertaining to roles and behaviors of principals support the practice of school districts' using the same performance evaluation instrument, exclusively, for principals at all grade levels (i.e., elementary, middle school, high school). Defining the role and responsibilities of building principals, specialists in the field of educational administration do not delineate among building levels.

Currently, practitioners and researchers agree that the primary responsibility of the principal is that of instructional leader (McCurdy, 1983; Smith & Andrews, 1989). The principal is recognized, without restriction, as the person responsible for collaboratively establishing a climate and culture within the building so that effective instruction and learning can take place (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Hord, 1988; Lieberman & Miller, 1984). From a review of studies of the principalship, Fullan & Stiegelbauer (1991) found that "the long-term institutional development of schools requires that principals help shape the instructional and work climate of the school as an organization" (p. 162). Interestingly enough, this definitional status does not carry a grade level assignment but is generalized across all grade levels, prekindergarten through 12th grade. As communicator, nurturer, promoter of change, and supporter of staff and students, the charge appears to be generally the same no matter which level the principal is assigned.

Research conducted comparing how principals at different grade levels perceive their roles indicates that, although populations served may vary, as well as programs and structures, perceptions of the principals as to roles and
administrative tasks do not differ significantly (Andrews & Hallett, 1983; McIntyre, 1974; Poppenhagen, Mingus, & Rogers, 1980; Stiegelbauer, Muscella, & Rutherford, 1986). "Principals in elementary, middle/junior high, and senior high schools do not hold different values about what is important in the principal's job, nor do they hold different views about how they should ideally spend their time" (Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. 22). Following are brief reviews of studies supporting the concept of similarities in perceptions of principals' roles and characteristics.

Principals and instructional supervisors were asked by McIntyre (1974) to rank over 30 competencies as they relate to the effective performance of their jobs. From the 10 highest ranking competencies for elementary and secondary principals, seven were the same, although in slightly different rank order.

Investigating principals' perceptions of roles and job specific tasks, Poppenhagen, Mingus, and Rogers (1980) found no significant difference among the three groups. Principals from different school levels perceived their administrative tasks, competence, and involvement in district-wide policy making, autonomy in decision-making, job satisfaction, and time spent to be similar. The research identified "dissimilarities, particularly among principals in suburban districts and between suburban and urban districts" (p. 80). Also, suburban principals perceived having more autonomy and greater influence in the planning process than did urban principals. Recommendations include that pre-service and in-service programs focus on "instructional leadership versus mediating roles for the principal" (p. 86).
Andrews and Hallett (1983) conducted a study utilizing a sample of 1,006 principals, the results of which indicated that principals at the different levels do not hold different values about what is important in the job. Likewise, their views were substantially alike as to how they should ideally spend their time. However, to a lesser extent, several other variables appeared to impact on differences (e.g., the type of school administered, size of school, size of district, type of district, and gender of the principal).

According to Stiegelbauer, Muscella, and Rutherford (1986), in schools successful in implementing change, the roles and actions of the principals, elementary and high school, were perceived more as similar than as dissimilar. Examining the change process in numerous schools across the country, they found that the principals were typically active and visible facilitators, developing plans of action, marshalling the resources, and soliciting staff support of the change effort. However, it was found that the size of the schools and the role of departmental heads at the high school level did effect the structure of the change facilitation teams and the process in general.

Pinckney (1982) reported findings that indicated teacher perceptions of the administrative functions performed by building administrators did not differ significantly between the elementary and secondary levels. Six administrative functions selected at a significant rate as typically performed by building administrators were: (a) human resource management, (b) instructional leadership, (c) student behavior, (d) school community relations, (e) pupil personnel, and (f) non-instructional.
Two other studies relate findings pertaining to how principals perceive levels of stress, use of time, and supervisory support. When asked through an AASA survey, what one thing superintendents could do to help principals improve performance, elementary and secondary principals' responses were in agreement, "foster better communications between superintendents and principals" (McCurdy, 1983, p. 56). In a study of 134 Mississippi principals, Pate (1988) found that, overall, there were no significant differences in perceived stress among the three groups.

Not all the research comparing perceptions of different levels of the principalships agree with the studies just described. Look (1982) concluded that elementary and secondary principals encounter different work situations and, therefore, should be evaluated using different performance evaluation instruments. Look listed these differences: secondary principals usually supervise larger schools, thus greater numbers of students and teachers, communicating with more parents, and managing a larger school plant; secondary has a more diversified curriculum, teachers having specific areas of expertise; secondary has more extracurricular activities; differing programs of discipline in elementary and secondary; and the secondary principal addresses more publics. In Look's review of literature, findings of three studies that pointed out differences in elementary and secondary principals' roles as instructional leaders are reviewed. Those were Firestone and Herriott (1982), McCleary (1979), and Howell (1981). A brief summary of each follows.

Differences in self-perceptions were reported by McCleary (1979), with supervision listed by elementary principals as their first responsibility in terms
of time allocated. Whereas, secondary principals perceived management as their first responsibility. Activities and student behavior, which ranked third and fourth on the secondary list did not appear on the elementary list. Howell (1981) found differences in the time allocated to various tasks by elementary and secondary principals. Firestone and Herriott (1982) reported results from a questionnaire completed by 27 elementary and 23 secondary schools in Pennsylvania. Findings were: some of the effective schools characteristics were significantly less prevalent at the secondary level than at the elementary level, there was significantly less agreement on instructional goals at the secondary level than at the elementary level, and teachers have a significantly greater influence over classroom management at the secondary level. Particularly meaningful differences were found in the influence over classroom management, indicating differences in instructional leadership.

Microcomputer Decision Assistance

The intent of this section of the literature review is to discuss the subject of current application of knowledge-based, expert systems in the field of education, especially as pertains to the use of microcomputers in educational administration. Three areas included in this section are: (a) knowledge systems technology as a tool for decision-making, (2) the application of technology in schools in America, and (3) overcoming impediments to the progress of computing in education.

The purpose of this investigation was to develop and test the feasibility of a microcomputer-based, decision assistance system for principal evaluation.
and supervision. Actually, the purpose was two-fold: to test the feasibility of modifying the CATE/S system that lends itself to the maximum employment of user-friendly software in the storage of evaluation data, and to provide a bank of professional growth plans to be generated by the software package for assistance in principal performance improvement.

The term, "knowledge system," will be used in the text to reference the type of software program implemented in this study. Knowledge system, as defined by Stevenson (1987) refers to a small-scale effort, usually containing 200 rules or less. The term, "expert system" is used in reference to large-scale systems (p. 41).

**Knowledge Systems Technology**

Expert and knowledge systems serve as a means to resolve complex problems, and therefore, it stands to reason that using such a system to assist in administrative performance evaluation, supervisors can streamline the process, saving valuable time of highly trained school personnel (Bank & Williams, 1987a; Richards, 1989). For practical educational purposes, the most effective structure by which to manipulate quantified data is an expert or knowledge system (Stevenson, 1987). According to Stevenson, knowledge systems technology used effectively by a school district can serve as an invaluable tool for resolving problems that require complex levels of human expertise. The increased capacity for compact storage of information allows for improved efficiency in the future of knowledge differentiation and delivery, both in administrative and instructional programs.
The decision support system (DSS) is a technological vehicle for integration of expert and knowledge systems into administrative decision-making (Bank & Williams, 1987a). Used by management in business to support strategic planning, the DSS is a system whereby a specific class of information is acquired and stored. According to Bank and Williams, the program is organized in such a way as to generate answers to unique questions, do trouble-shooting types of tasks, explore "what-if" types of questions, and can be implemented in educational administration as a vehicle to support and expedite the decision-making process.

Subsequent to the invention of microcomputers in the mid-1970's, hardware and software have changed at an astoundingly rapid rate (Frankel, 1987). For instance, in 1970 the only microcomputer which could be purchased was the Altair which was about the size of a large microwave oven, sold at $397, and boasted 256 bytes of memory (about enough memory capacity to save a paragraph of text). The availability of technology has advanced to the point that the consumer now has many affordable options — for example, a microcomputer including: a full typewriter-size keyboard; 512K of memory; a 32-bit processor with the capacity of addressing 2 million bytes of memory, should a person opt to use that much; a monochrome monitor of fine quality; superb monochrome and color graphics; and offering an operating system which just about anyone can learn to use in a matter of a few minutes or hours (p. 112).

In 1977 the first full-function microcomputers were made available—Radio Shack TRS-80, Apple II, and the Commodore Pet (Frankel, 1987).
However, there was little software industry at that time, thus, users of Pet, Apple, or "Trash" had to write the programs themselves. According to Frankel, at the time of his writing, the Montgomery County (Maryland) Public Schools were purchasing IBM PCs, each one equipped with 10- or 20-megabyte hard disks and two 360K floppy disks, 640K of memory (2500 times that of the original Altairs) and many optional components. In this case, the school system's researchers and writers implemented technology to take over tasks for which they previously relied on clerical workers and secretaries. Since clerical turn-around time is no longer a problem, a report that used to take at least three months to prepare is done in less than four weeks.

For over two decades school systems have commonly adopted software designed specifically for business rather than educational administration, primarily to facilitate transactional analysis and data processing (i.e., filing; budgeting; and tracking of information, forms, and deadlines (Fisher, Semrau, & Turban, 1990; Richards, 1989). Seemingly, slight effort has been expended to apply computerized quantitative analysis to the processes of evaluating alternatives, making decisions, or problem-solving, according to Richards. Accessing multiple sources (e.g., ERIC; Dissertations Abstracts, International; Educational Administration Abstracts) little evidence was found to indicate the practical application of knowledge systems in such administrative tasks as principal performance evaluation.

The Computer Assisted Teacher Evaluation/Supervision (CATE/S) is such a package (Manatt, Mitchell, Schlotfeldt, Hawana, & Stow, 1986). The CATE/S system has been used for some time by numerous school districts
across the United States in the evaluation and improvement of teacher performance. The software package was developed by the Iowa State University Research Foundation for administrators in order to speed up record keeping and to assist in the improvement of teacher performance. Designed in such a way that it can be customized to fit any school's needs, the program is a powerful tool used by supervisors of teachers in organizing evaluation data and suggesting improvement strategies for the performance of prekindergarten through 12th grade teachers. As stated earlier, the purpose of this research project involves the editing of a copy of the CATE/S software to accommodate the evaluation and improvement of principal performance.

A similar program, though less extensively developed than CATE/S, was found through the review of literature. A system which implements an organized data processing system designed to assist in the improvement of performance of school principals is the Performance Review, Analysis, and Improvement System for Educators (PRAISE). It is a formative evaluation instrument compiled by students of educational administration at Brock University at St. Catherine, Ontario (Knoop & Common, 1985).

Another program of interest is an "interactive" computer simulation developed along similar lines to CATE/S, though for a different purpose—that of providing simulations for principal training in the areas of problem-solving and strategic thinking. ITCOT ("In the Center of Things"), designed by a group of faculty members at Peabody College in Vanderbilt University in the mid-1980's is intended for use in graduate courses and staff development programs (Hallinger & McCary, 1991). The program allows leaders to have
spontaneous access to extensive information (e.g., school, staff, students, district) when confronted with problems of school improvement, so that the principals must determine the relevance of the information provided and how it bears on the problems encountered in order to complete the training simulation.

**Application of Expert Systems Technology in Schools**

The pace of rapid change in the information age pushed school administrators to attempt to respond quickly to the demand for computerization of the schools (Kimbrogh & Burkett, 1990; Piele, 1989). Educators are on the cutting edge of the information age, having been charged with the tasks of implementing technological advances and motivating people to accept change (Naisbitt, 1982). Among the many recommendations aimed at improving education in the United States, the use of technology is inclusive in each of the following three reports: *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative of Educational Reform* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983); *Transforming American Education: Reducing the Risk to the Nation* (National Task Force on Educational Technology, 1986); and *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education* (National Governor's Association, 1983).

Established in the fall of 1984 by Terrel H. Bell, then Secretary of Education, the National Task Force on Educational Technology was assigned the job of investigating the potential of integrating appropriate technology to improve instruction in our nation's schools (1986). A result was the report,
Transforming American Education. The Task Force became convinced that information technology "represents a powerful array of tools" which can be creatively implemented and integrated to help meet three fundamental goals: (a) improving the quality of learning, (b) increasing equity of opportunity, access and quality, and (c) ensuring greater cost effectiveness (p. 58).

Recommendations included in Transforming American Education and Time for Results are that research be conducted to improve traditional delivery methods, and to develop hardware and software as well as student work-stations. Addressing the area of supervision, Transforming American Education calls for developing systems in finance, planning, teacher education, curriculum development, and instructional effectiveness. Responding to the charge to implement technology in education, school administrators began to explore the various means by which technological advances could be applied to instruction and administration.

The use of microcomputers gradually caught on and is now accelerating at an increasing rate (King, 1987). Reported by the Office of Technology Assessment, 95 percent of American schools have one or more classroom computers and roughly 90 percent have VCRs, in addition to TV and electronic communications projects which are underway in nearly all of the states at this time (Perry, 1990). The implementation of microcomputer systems is becoming more commonplace in school districts across the nation and promises to continue to expand.

Social forces, as well as the availability of less expensive and more user-friendly software, have pressured schools to purchase and install new
technology. Schools have implemented microcomputers in order to maintain more efficient records and to lower costs (Bank & Williams, 1987b). One reason for the growth of microcomputer application in classrooms is the recreational attraction of the programs. According to King (1987), "Computing is an entertainment hassle" (p. 123). The word "hassle" denotes the frustrations and ambiguities which are inherent in establishing such an innovative process. Nevertheless, the entertainment value of the technology plays an important role as a motivator for the use of microcomputers (Perry, 1990).

Obstacles to Progress

Numerous obstacles impede the progress of establishing technological programs in education. Applying expert systems technology to administration and instruction is a complex, costly, and difficult to manage innovation (King, 1987); the development and establishing of new programs requiring extensive homework, planning, and evaluation. Nonetheless, as in other pioneering efforts, it is not surprising that the key impediment is that of motivating people to change. Initially, many teachers felt threatened by the new electronic teaching machine (Piele, 1989). Copeland and de la Cruz found that teachers gave reasons for failure as "a lack of comfort with technological tools and lack of administrative support . . ." (p. 41). Moreover, the same people who are conservative and fear change also fear the computer as an agent of change (Patton, 1987).
The limited impact of computers in quantitative analysis and the decision-making process is a multi-faceted dilemma. Reasons offered by Fisher, Semrau, and Turban (1990) for this condition are: the complex nature and constant change of the variables related to administrative decision-making; the nonquantifiable nature accompanying many of these variables; and the remnant fear that using these tools produces—"computerphobia." Of course, the obvious limitation impacting on the integration of technology in schools is addressing the human aspect of change (Idstein, 1987). Asking adults to change the way they think creates discomfort. Those who are already proficient in their own methods of management or instruction will not easily change their way of viewing the workplace. In addition, an obstacle impacting directly on the use of computers in education, is that some parents and educators alike unrealistically fear the dehumanization of the instructional process, the extreme view that automation and instruction add up to robot instructors in the schools.

Overcoming Obstacles

Managing the process of change is necessary in order that educators succeed in establishing effective, technological innovations in the schools (Levinson, 1991). Levinson posits that the completion of the transitional stage requires strategically planned staff development programs, tied to mission and strategic vision, in such a way as to integrate goals, technology, and human resources. Prerequisite to implementing training is that problems involved in technology be clearly defined, and, further, that principals and teachers be
involved in all aspects of the planning process (Caldwell, 1991; Levinson, 1991). Four conditions, proffered by King (1987), which must be met in the successful management of computing are:

1. Stability in the range of opportunities available to users;
2. Clearly articulated and agreed-on goals for application of the technology;
3. Readily available, comprehensible, and sensible guidance on how to manage under uncertainty;
4. General agreement on what is to be accomplished in relation to the basic mission of the organization (p. 130).

For those who fear using computers, there is a need for ongoing, intensive programs of training and in-service, linked to district goals. Thoughtfully planned programs of assistance are necessary for teachers and principals in order to move away from the use of computers primarily for drill and practice (Stevenson, 1987); and to apply both the substantive and the affective characteristics of computing to instructional programs (King, 1987). In order to ensure that staff development not be temporary, band-aid measures, careful planning of a continuous nature is necessary (Duttweiler, 1989).

An important strategy to consider in planning is that adults have opportunities to apply their expertise and experience by sharing with others (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Caldwell, 1986; Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). When studying the implementation of new applications of technology, Copeland and de la Cruz (1990) found that "colleague teams" who shared a history of working together were the most successful when planning together.
for the coming year as compared to those who had not worked together in the past (p. 41).

Idstein (1987) recommends four methods for instructing adult learners in computer applications: (a) applying learning theory with detailed task analysis; (b) patient, step by step instruction, in order to promote confidence and provide reassurance that this too can be assimilated; (c) for novice users, utilizing a slow, deliberate procedure of getting groups of people together; and (d) talking through a new application, followed by demonstrations, and finally, hands-on experience. According to Idstein, the concept of "learning by doing" is essential for everyone, because mastery of the techniques involved in using microcomputers successfully requires hands-on experience (p. 66).

Fewer barriers will exist for integrating computers into education as people realize that technology cannot dehumanize the instructional or the evaluation process. The classroom teacher will remain the center of focus for student learning, while the evaluation process will depend upon quality communication among supervisors and evaluatees. Aptly stated by Patton, "It is people who use information. Computers and organizations generate data, but it is people who use information. . . . The real challenge of our times is not in producing information or in sorting information but, rather, in getting people to transform information into knowledge" (p. 12). The position of the individual will become stronger as computers and telecommunications continue to drive change during the 1990's (Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990).
Summary

The review of literature began as a search for studies in two broad areas, principal performance evaluation and knowledge systems technology in education. Attention became focused on the recurring theme of the use of a collaborative and supportive approach to principal performance evaluation in schools effective in improving student achievement. A second area searched was progress of and obstacles to implementation of microcomputer technology in education.

Two occurrences cited in the literature as influencing principal performance evaluation were: the restructuring movement, which resulted in an urgent quest for improved principal performance evaluation; and the agreement among researchers that effective instruction is strongly related to building administrator behaviors. Authorities in the field of educational administration advise that planning for quality leadership in the 21st century necessitates a collaborative and supportive approach to principal performance evaluation with emphasis on professional growth of the individual.

Communicating vision, while developing and maintaining a climate for learning, is a shared challenge of superintendents and principals. A reasonable first step as the focus for change is to target the administrative culture, since enhanced communication among administrators improves relationships in the entire system. The outcomes-focused superintendent takes an active role in both instruction and evaluation, collaborating with principals in goal setting and monitoring activities; thus, effecting change and culture throughout the organization.
Implementing the research-based, total systems approach, wherein all facets of the school system are taken into consideration, principal evaluation will lasting improvement of performance. The written professional growth, an integral phase of the total systems approach to evaluation, is an efficient means of affecting change, whether addressing a principal who exhibits exemplary performance or one who demonstrates need for improvement.

A challenge for school administrators in the 1990's is the integration of computers into education in such a way that it will seem as common and everyday as the way in which we now use such standard items as books and calculators (King, 1987). When people realize that computers cannot dehumanize the instructional process, that the classroom teacher will remain the center of focus for student learning, fewer obstacles will remain for integrating computers into classrooms and administration. As technology becomes more powerful and global horizons widen, the individual will become more valuable. Likewise, organizational changes will become manifest and lasting as individuals change (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1990).

Table 1 is a synthesis of contemporary research pertaining to leadership, principal performance evaluation, and microcomputer assistance systems in education. The studies included in Table 1 are those which were found to be of particular benefit to this research endeavor.
Table 1. Research investigating leadership, principal performance evaluation, and microcomputer assistance systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennis, 1990a</td>
<td>Continued study of leadership; interviews of 28 leaders from all walks of life; emphasizes the leader as self-made adult learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, 1990</td>
<td>Treatise on transformational leadership; the leader as lifelong learner; that leadership can be learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasse, 1986</td>
<td>Review of literature pertaining to visionary leadership; discusses organizational, future, personal, and strategic components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senge, 1990</td>
<td>Book on building the learning organization through a systems approach of five disciplines with people continually expanding capacity for creativity; the fifth discipline—systems thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Piele, (Eds.), 1989</td>
<td>Synthesis of research, a handbook of practical information (15 chapters by different authors) based on: the person, the skills, and the structure; excellent on hiring, induction, and minorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder &amp; Anderson, 1987</td>
<td>Review of books pertaining to leadership in the corporate sector; Concludes - no difference in roles of schools and corporations in supporting creative workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Performance Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsberg, 1990</td>
<td>Review of literature pertaining to principal performance evaluation; suggested future research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persell, Cookson, &amp; Lyon, 1982</td>
<td>Review of 75-plus research studies, reported recurrent behaviors which appear to be associated with strong principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, 1990</td>
<td>Dissertation - principal evaluation practices in Iowa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superintendent as Collaborator and Builder of Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hord, 1990</td>
<td>Review of literature on instructional leadership of superintendents; concluded that the superintendent who takes an active role as instructional leader in the district increases the chance for students to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCurdy, 1983</td>
<td>Review of practices and responsibilities of principals role; Includes results of a survey of principals regarding evaluation and role of superintendent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, Hallinger, &amp; Peterson, 1985</td>
<td>Found high degree of superintendent involvement in supervision and evaluation process when examining practices in effective school districts in California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajak &amp; Glickman, 1989</td>
<td>Concluded that superintendent and central office supervisors are key figures to instructional improvement rather than the principal; surmised that improvement is brought about by organizational or infrastructure provided by superintendents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes, 1990a, 1990b, 1990c</td>
<td>Discussed Deming's theory of organizational quality control as applicable to the superintendency and restructuring of schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Role of the Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamburg &amp; Andrews, 1990</td>
<td>Found that principals in high achieving schools act demonstrably different than principals in low achieving schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behling &amp; Champion, 1984</td>
<td>A synthesis of research regarding the role of the school principal as instructional leader; includes a self-assessment instrument and a 77-item annotated bibliography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barth, 1990</td>
<td>Book on school improvement focusing on collegiality, interactions both within and outside, adult learners, and the school as &quot;a community of learners.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen &amp; Manasse, 1982</td>
<td>Summary of research findings pertaining to effectiveness of principals' behaviors in areas of knowledge and skills, goal-setting activities, and management behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal &amp; Peterson, 1990</td>
<td>Identified strategies, suggestions, and ideas to assist principals in &quot;shaping&quot; school culture; review of 25 books and articles on leadership—educational &amp; corporate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke, 1988</td>
<td>Studied principals quitting positions; surmised that same qualities that help principals become successful leaders can cause them to become unsure and stressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwyer, 1983</td>
<td>Established list of principals' instructional management behaviors, interviewed five principals; found feelings of isolation in common among principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwyer (Ed.), 1986</td>
<td>Special issue of Peabody Journal of Education, 63(1); 11 papers confirming significant relationships between principals' behaviors and student outcomes; material drawn from a series of case studies of school principals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwyer, Lee, Rowan, &amp; Bossert, 1983</td>
<td>Studied actions of five principals; found pervasive themes of feelings of isolation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullan &amp; Stiegelbauer, 1991</td>
<td>Synthesis of literature, complete, on changing leadership role of principalship; discussed role confusion and necessity for strong staff development programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Foster, &amp; Gendler, 1990</td>
<td>Rand report; compared urban high schools--comprehensive, magnet, and Catholic--and identified school effectiveness features; made recommendations for making these features available to urban public school students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbrough &amp; Burkett, 1990</td>
<td>Textbook emphasizing technical knowledge and leadership in the principalship; includes chapter entitled &quot;Computers as Aids to Principals.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Delta Kappa, 1980</td>
<td>Study of eight successful urban elementary schools; found the behavior of the building principal to be a key factor in increased student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson &amp; Block, 1982</td>
<td>Summary of 22 studies concerning the principal and student achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergiovanni, 1987</td>
<td>Textbook emphasizing transformational leadership in the principalship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney, 1982</td>
<td>Synthesis of eight studies pertaining to leadership behaviors associated with effective schools; concluded principals make a difference to student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discriminating Power of Principal Performance Evaluation Items**

| Ferrare, 1990 | Dissertation - identified list of behaviors for use as student rating of principals. |
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larsen, 1987</td>
<td>Dissertation - identified 29 behaviors, ten of which differed significantly more often in High Achieving Schools (HAS) than in low achieving schools (LAS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look &amp; Manatt, 1983</td>
<td>Established validity and discriminating power of bank of 50 items; three were judged as more appropriate in reaching the goal of increased student achievement on standardized tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine, 1987</td>
<td>Established list of 25 behaviors for &quot;outcome-based&quot; principal evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss, 1988</td>
<td>Dissertation - developed a principal evaluation process; found the collaborative approach to evaluation improved communications between principal and supervisor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarities in Roles/Characteristics of Different Levels of Principals

| Andrews & Hallett, 1983   | Found that principals at different levels do not hold different values about what is important in the job or how they should spend their time. |
| McCurdy, 1983            | Found that responses were in agreement when asked, "What one thing could superintendents do to help principals perform more effectively?" |
| McIntyre, 1974           | Found out of thirty competencies related to the effective performance of their jobs, the ten highest ranked were the same, although in slightly different rank order. |
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pate, 1988</td>
<td>Dissertation - found no significant differences in perceived stress between the three levels of principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinckney, 1982</td>
<td>Found teachers perceptions of percentage of time a principal should spend performing each of six functions were the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppenhagen et al., 1980</td>
<td>Found no significant differences in perception of roles and job specific tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiegelbauer, Muscilla, &amp; Rutherford, 1986</td>
<td>Found roles and actions of different levels of principals to be more similar than dissimilar in schools successful in implementing change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differences in Roles/Characteristics of Different Level Principals**

| Firestone & Herriott, 1982     | Found significant differences in features characterizing instructional goals, agreement on instructional goals, and influence over classroom management. |
| Howell, 1981                  | Reported differences in time allocated to various tasks.                                                                               |
| Look, 1983                    | Listed differences in characteristics of elementary and secondary principals.                                                            |
| McCleary, 1979                | Reported elementary principals perceived major responsibility to be supervision while secondary perceived major responsibility to be management. |

**Syntheses of Literature - Microcomputer Assistance Systems**

| Bank & Williams (Eds.), 1987   | Compilation of 21 current, research-based articles relating to knowledge systems as utilized in instruction and administration. |
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>FINDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copeland &amp; de la Cruz, 1990</td>
<td>Reports the results of a series of studies questioning the patterns of adoption of technological innovations and leadership roles; presents five assertions in regard to staff development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards, 1989</td>
<td>&quot;How to&quot; textbook focusing on microcomputers in educational strategic planning; used case studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III. METHODS

The purpose of this investigation was to develop and test the feasibility of a microcomputer knowledge system to assist in principal performance evaluation and improvement of performance. The study was based on the modification of the CATE/S software package from a decision support system for teacher evaluation to one which will serve as a tool in making decisions regarding principal performance evaluation and supervision. The rationale for the study was the need for a collaborative, participatory approach to the improvement of principal performance. The research design, procedures used, and the analysis of data are discussed in this chapter.

Research Design

This investigation was descriptive and developmental in nature. Statistics were relied on to reach the major conclusion regarding the feasibility of the study. The statistical procedure was the computing of central tendencies of the total sample on each item in the questionnaire. However, experience and inductive reasoning were relied upon to develop the professional growth plans, complete the survey, and draw conclusions. Also, to some degree, the data gathered were studied inductively, relying on experience to reach an opinion regarding the practical feasibility of the proposed system (Borg & Gall, 1989).
Procedures

The investigation focused on three main activities: a comprehensive review of the literature; the development of a bank of professional growth plans; and a test of feasibility, checking the microcomputer system's practical capability to assist in the evaluation and supervision of principal performance.

Selection of Cooperating School Site

The school site, St. Joseph, Missouri School District, was selected because: (a) interest in the proposed microcomputer evaluation system was expressed by central-level administrators, (b) of the necessity that the number of principals employed in the district indicate a span of control justified a large degree of central supervision, and (c) the district is representative of many school districts across the nation (e.g., population, socio-economics, ethnicity).

Expert Jury Participants

The expert jury was comprised of 15 administrators, 10 central-level administrators and five principals (Appendix B). Volunteer participants in the jury were: (a) five central-office administrators at St. Joseph, Missouri, (b) one superintendent of schools in Illinois, (c) three central-office administrators in Independence, Kansas, (d) five practicing principals from the states of Iowa and Kansas, and (e) one professor with recent past tenure as superintendent of schools in two western states. It was assumed that the combined expertise of these administrators would be sufficient in judging the practical feasibility of the proposed system, and, further, that they were representative of administrators in public schools.
Instrumentation

The Expert Jury Survey was constructed using a five-point Likert type scale (Appendix C) (Borg & Gall, 1989). Eleven questionnaire items were developed, focusing on the various capabilities of the proposed system. The questions were constructed, addressing the stated purposes of the research, with the assistance of Dr. Anton Netusil of Iowa State University.

Eight of the items used the numerical five-point scale, with strong agree/disagree format. The last three items required different types of responses. One item asked the respondent to differentiate between the size(s) school district(s) for which the system is suitable, requiring the subject to circle one or more of three answers; another required a "yes" or "no" response to the question, asking the subject if he or she would recommend that a school district purchase the package; the last item solicited an optional essay response, requesting suggestions for improvements to the proposed system.

Steps in Procedure

The investigation was performed in three phases. During the first phase a comprehensive survey of the literature was performed, searching for lists of principal behaviors which were previously identified as making a difference as a building level administrator, and established as having validity and discriminating power. The second phase focused on the development of a bank of behaviorally specific professional growth plans or strategies. In the third phase, a survey was administered to determine the practical feasibility of the system.
A condition which merits explanation is that the CATE/S software, and thus, the print-outs (Appendix G), continue to carry headings and titles that include the word "teacher," although the software is used in this study to depict principal evaluation. The copyright for the software is owned by the Iowa State University Foundation. For purposes of this study, it was not deemed necessary to seek permission from ISURF for modification of the software program. Principal evaluation criteria, PIC objectives, and scenarios were simply edited into software and the program left as is.

A discrepancy occurred between the planned procedure and the procedure actually used; that condition also merits explanation. It was assumed, as written in Chapter I, that hypothetical principal evaluations could be constructed from the field site school district criteria. However, upon receipt and examination of the school site's completed, summative, evaluation forms, it was found that practically no variance or discrimination existed in the summative evaluation ratings. Further, the only completed forms that were available were those of elementary principals--no high school or middle school. This investigation was undertaken assuming that prekindergarten through 12 principals can be evaluated using the same criteria. Further, in order to build hypothetical scenarios, data with a certain degree of variability was required. Thus, the evaluations available did not seem applicable in the study. As the project progressed, it appeared that, although the actual data would have served as further substantiation in the feasibility testing, the other proposed activities would suffice.
Following are detailed descriptions of the three phases of activities which comprised this investigation:

**Phase 1: Evaluation items-checking for discriminating power**

Nineteen criteria for principal performance evaluation were addressed in the study. The criteria were derived from the St. Joseph, Missouri procedural guide for principal evaluation, *Guidelines for Performance-Based Administrators Evaluation* (Appendix D) (School District of St. Joseph, 1988). The field site criteria were validated through a matrix analysis (Appendix E), matching the broad criteria to lists of principal behaviors which had previously been found to possess discriminating power. Utilized for this purpose were items from Look's study (1982) in which items discriminating at the .05 level of significance were identified; and from follow-up studies of Noriega (1985), Mueller (1987), Willis (1989), and Ferrare (1990). Criteria from studies of other university students, Larsen (1987) and Weiss (1989), were included on the matrix, as were those of Smith and Andrews (1989). It was established through the matrix analysis that each of the 19 items of field site criteria matched at least two items on previously validated lists. Therefore, it was verified that the field site items were valid and appropriate for use in this investigation.

**Phase 2: Development of a bank of Professional Improvement Commitments (PICs)**

The PICs (Appendix I) were developed through a multi-faceted plan, utilizing the input of a number of knowledgeable individuals and involving numerous re-write sessions. The behaviorally specific objectives were drawn from the field site descriptors and from the
researched lists of principal behaviors. Instrumental in the development of the objectives and procedures for accomplishing the objectives was a judgement panel of doctoral students–practicing administrators from school districts in various regions of the world (Appendix B). The volunteer panel took part in two work sessions, totaling eight hours. Initially, the panel received training in the writing of professional growth plans from Dr. Shirley B. Stow. Dr. Stow used training materials which she previously developed. Applying the Cooperative Processing decision-making model (Norman Public Schools, 1989) the panel brainstormed each of the objectives, offering suggestions for the refinement of the objective statement and for constructing the procedural activities. The materials taught at the workshop along with letters to the doctoral students and workshop agenda may be seen in Appendix F. The procedural activities which complete each plan (Appendix I) were edited and rewritten, then reviewed and critiqued by two Iowa State University, education administration professors who are experts in the writing of professional growth plans, Dr. Shirley B. Stow and Dr. Jacqueline Mitchell. Dr Stow took an active role in the final writing of the plans.

**Phase 3: Administering the survey** In order to test the feasibility of the proposed system to serve as a decision support tool, a copy of the CATE/S software was modified to accommodate the school site's evaluation plan. Principal evaluation components were edited into the software package for demonstration purposes (i.e., four evaluation performance areas, 19 school site criteria, 60 PIC strategies or objectives, and a sampling of data) (Appendix H).
As a precautionary, pilot step, the components of the system were reviewed and the Expert Jury Survey administered to a judgement panel of eight Iowa State University doctoral students (Appendix B). Members of the panel were asked to complete the questionnaire and then provide verbal feedback, answering the question, "Is the survey appropriate to assist in deciding the feasibility of the proposed principal evaluation and supervision system?" Feedback from members of the judgement panel was positive; thus, the instrument appeared to be clear in meaning and to test what it purported to test. As a result, the questionnaire was deemed to be an appropriate instrument for administering to members of the expert jury.

Depending on the individual subjects' previous experience with the CATE/S system, the software package was presented and/or demonstrated to members of the expert jury by three different methods at differing locations and dates:

1. The components of the system were demonstrated at the St. Joseph School District's media center to field-site, expert jury members, five central-level administrators (Appendix B). The demonstration included a presentation of the microcomputer system and an explanation of the compendium of PICs. The technology of a microcomputer, in conjunction with an LCD (liquid crystal display) projector and copies of sample screens and PICs (Appendices H & I), was utilized to demonstrate the capabilities of the CATE/S software. Hypothetical scenarios depicting three evaluators and 15 principals were presented. Print-outs generated by the software, showing the output of quantifiable results--means and standard deviations--were reviewed.
Also demonstrated was the capability of the system to generate the PICs. A question and answer session was held. The Expert Jury Survey was then administered to the jury members. A similar procedure was followed with the professor who, like the field site participants, had no previous experience with the CATE/S model.

2. The presentation of the system and a review of the PICs was made to members of an education administration class of doctoral students, followed by administering the survey instrument. In that case, the microcomputer demonstration was deemed unnecessary because all the students had been taught the CATE/S system in an earlier Supervision of Instruction class.

3. Each subject in the Independence, Kansas group received a packet comprised of a letter of request for participation, an explanation of procedures, sample computer screens, a copy of the Compendium of PICs, and a copy of the Survey (Appendices G, H, & I). It was deemed unnecessary to demonstrate the software as the administrators were previously trained and adept in the use of the CATE/S system since the system had been used in the district during the past four years as a teacher evaluation decision-support system. The same type of packet was mailed to the Illinois superintendent who had experience with CATE/S in the Supervision of Instruction class at Iowa State University.

Analysis of Data

An item analysis was performed as well as an analysis of the total responses. The mean score and percentages of responses of the entire sample on each item was determined, and on the total responses of the entire survey.
The resulting marginal tabulations provided a description of how the total sample distributed itself on the response alternatives for each single item. Moreover, a picture of how the respondents viewed the feasibility of the system as a whole was determined.

The Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed this project and concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected, that risks were outweighed by the potential benefits and expected value of the knowledge sought, that confidentiality of data was assured, and that informed consent was obtained by appropriate procedures (Appendix A).
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

The major problem of this investigation was the development and feasibility testing of a microcomputer-based, decision support system for use by school districts aspiring to develop innovative systems for the evaluation and improvement of principal performance. This chapter reports the results of both the statistical and inductive analyses which were conducted to determine the feasibility of the proposed system.

Analysis of Results

The investigation encompassed three distinct phases: (a) a comprehensive review of the literature, searching for lists of principal performance criteria with previously established discriminating power; (b) the development of a bank of behaviorally specific professional growth plans; and (c) a test of feasibility, checking the microcomputer system's capability of assisting in the evaluation and supervision of principal performance. Following is a description of the results of each of the three phases of the investigation.

Phase 1: Evaluation items—Checking for Discriminating Power

Nineteen criteria for principal performance evaluation, adopted from the St. Joseph, Missouri School District's evaluation guidelines (Appendix D), were instrumental in this investigation. The criteria were validated through the use of a matrix analysis (Appendix E), matching the broad criteria to lists of
specific principal behaviors previously established to have validity and discriminating power. Utilized for the purpose were items from Look's (1982) and follow-up studies; from studies of other university students--Larsen (1987) and Weiss (1989); and from Smith and Andrews (1989). It was verified through the matrix analysis that each of the 19 items of field site criteria matched items in at least two of the previously validated studies. Thus, it was demonstrated that the field site criteria were valid and appropriate for use in this investigation.

Phase 2: Development of Professional Improvement Commitments

The Compendium of PICs (Appendix I) was developed, using the St. Joseph School District criteria descriptors in conjunction with the researched lists of principal behaviors. The collaborative process involved a volunteer judgement panel of educational administration students (Appendix B) and the assistance of two professors with expertise in the area of writing professional growth plans. The result of the activity was the Compendium of PICs, a bank of 60 behaviorally specific objectives with matching procedures. The PICs are intended as suggestions for use by principals and their supervisors to assist in the improvement of principal performance.

Phase 3: Administering the survey

A copy of the CATE/S software was modified to contain the components of evaluation and supervision necessary in order to demonstrate the proposed system. Data were collected using the Expert Jury Survey (Appendix C), which
addressed the various capabilities of the proposed system, as well as the system as a whole.

As a pilot step, the components of the system were presented and the Expert Jury Survey administered to a judgement panel of Iowa State doctoral students (Appendix B). Members of the panel were asked to complete the questionnaire and provide feedback, answering the question, "Is the survey appropriate to assist in deciding the feasibility of the proposed principal evaluation and supervision system?" As a result of positive feedback from the judgement panel, the questionnaire was deemed to be an appropriate instrument to administer to members of the expert jury.

During March of 1991, the proposed system was demonstrated and/or presented to members of the expert jury. Each of the jurors examined the artifacts of the system, reviewed its capabilities, completing and returning the questionnaire as requested. A summary of the expert jury ratings may be seen in Table 2. Following is a description of the results of the Expert Jury Survey.

**Comparative Analysis of Survey Results**

In the data analysis, measures of central tendency were conducted to determine the level of agreement and/or disagreement that the system is feasible as a decision assistance tool. The mean score and standard deviation for each item was determined. The resulting marginal tabulations provided a description of how the total sample distributed itself on the response alternatives for each single item as well as a picture of how the respondents viewed the feasibility of the system as a whole. Results of the analysis of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The bank of Professional Improvement Plans (PIPs) has the capacity to be used cooperatively by a principal and evaluator in building a growth plan.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The software package has the capacity to assist in the growth of a high performing principal, as rated by his/her evaluator.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The software package has the capacity to assist in the growth of a low performing principal, as rated by his/her evaluator.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) match the specific criteria for improvement of performance.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The reports generated have the capacity to serve as support tools in determining pay-for-performance for principals.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item number</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. What size school district(s) will the software package be suitable for, considering the number of principals employed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of responses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7                          Small district 1-10:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11                         Medium district 10-30:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10                         Large district 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Would you recommend that a school district purchase the software package?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of responses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12                         yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0                          no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2                          &quot;not sure&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1                          no response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Do you have suggestions as to improvements which can be made to the software program and/or the PIPs?

Responses:

How often is this done? Yearly? There is a lot of documentation involved — this could be a negative. Fonts and display could be made more attractive. Inter-rater reliability is needed if reports generated are to be used in determining pay-for-performance. Outcome validation on PIPs with faculty External review — to validate sub-tasks/responsibility Software should include good documentation Cost should be affordable
central tendency calculations, and percentages of responses, are displayed in Table 3.

Responses on the Expert Jury Survey indicated that members of the jury were in agreement that the system is a feasible for use as a decision support tool in the evaluation and improvement of principal performance. The overall mean of the ratings on the survey was 4.2 with a standard deviation of .71. Of the total responses, 86.4 percent indicated "agree or strongly agree." Total agreement, with 100 percent of ratings falling in the categories of agree or strongly agree, was expressed on three items: "The bank of Professional Improvement Commitments (PICs) has the capacity to be used cooperatively by a principal and evaluator in building a growth plan;" "The software package has the capacity to assist in the growth of a low performing principal, as rated by his/her evaluator;" and, "The reports generated have the capacity to serve as a support tool for superintendents in the supervision of evaluators." The item eliciting the least agreement, with a mean of 3.7 and standard deviation of .60, was, "The software package has the capacity to assist in the growth of a high performing principal, as rated by his/her evaluator."

The last three items on the survey (nine through 11) were stated in such a way as to require various types of descriptive answers. Those responses may also be seen in Table 2. Following is an explanation of the responses on each of the three items.

Item nine asked the subject to differentiate the size school district for which the system is most suited. All 15 jurors responded to the item which required circling one or more of three answers. Nearly equal preferences were
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent agree</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The bank of Professional Improvement Plans (PIPs) has the capacity to be used cooperatively by a principal and evaluator in building a growth plan.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The software package has the capacity to assist in the growth of a high performing principal, as rated by his/her evaluator.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The software package has the capacity to assist in the growth of a low performing principal, as rated by his/her evaluator.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) match the specific criteria for improvement of performance.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The reports generated have the capacity to serve as support tools in determining pay-for-performance for principals.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent agree or strongly agree</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The reports generated have the capacity to serve as a support tool in determining staff development needs.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The reports generated have the capacity to serve as a support tool for superintendents in the supervision of evaluators.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The reports generated have the capacity to serve as a support tool in the dismissal of a principal who, following a program of intensive assistance, continues to receive substandard performance ratings.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicated for a medium or large size district. Ten subjects indicated the system's suitability for a large district, 11 a medium district, and seven a small district.

Item 10 required a yes or no response, querying of the subject if he or she would recommend that a school district purchase the package. All responses to the item were positive with the exception of three, two of which indicated "not sure" and one was left unanswered.

Involving an optional essay response, the last item (11) requested suggestions for improvements to the software program. Most of the subjects did not respond to the item. Responses were received from five subjects; these may also be seen in Table 2. In all probability, two of those responses would not have been proffered had more information been provided at the time. (For instance, the comment "cost should be affordable" probably would not have been written had the low cost of the system been fully explained in the presentation.) Serious consideration was given to the responses when writing the Recommendations section in Chapter V.

An additional analysis of the data was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference when comparing responses of central-level administrators to those of principals. The results of this brief, ancillary study are shown in Table 4. A comparison of means, the t-test, was conducted. At the .05 level of significance, no difference could be shown between the means of the two groups. Overall, the analysis revealed strong agreement by the superintendents and principals that the system is a feasible tool for evaluation and improvement of principal performance.
Table 4. Comparison of central office administrator/principal responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Jury Survey Items</th>
<th>Central Office Administrators N=10</th>
<th>Principals N=5</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>p Value^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #1</td>
<td>10 4.8 0.42</td>
<td>5 4.6 0.55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #2</td>
<td>10 3.6 0.69</td>
<td>5 3.8 0.45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #3</td>
<td>10 4.4 0.52</td>
<td>5 4.6 0.59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #4</td>
<td>10 4.3 0.82</td>
<td>4 4.0 0.82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #5</td>
<td>10 3.7 0.95</td>
<td>4 4.3 0.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #6</td>
<td>10 4.6 0.52</td>
<td>5 4.0 1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #7</td>
<td>10 4.3 0.48</td>
<td>5 4.0 0.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #8</td>
<td>10 4.2 0.79</td>
<td>5 4.0 1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Two-tailed probabilities are reported.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter focuses on summary statements that review the steps in the research, conclusions drawn from the results of the research, limitations in research design, a discussion of the implications of the study, and recommendations related to practice and future research efforts.

Summary

This study was conducted to develop and test the feasibility of modifying the CATE/S microcomputer system from a teacher evaluation tool to one that will assist in the evaluation and improvement of principal performance. The development of an initial item bank of professional growth plans which can be generated from the modified software package was a second, though no less important intent of the investigation.

A matrix analysis activity (Appendix E) verified the discriminating power of the 19 items of field site criteria, thus, establishing the criteria as appropriate for use in testing the feasibility of the proposed system. The collaboratively developed Professional Improvement Commitments (PICs) (Appendix I) aligned with the valid, field site criteria and were linked to procedural activities for assistance in the improvement of principal performance. For demonstration purposes, a copy of the CATE/S software was modified to contain the components of principal evaluation (i.e., four performance evaluation areas, nineteen school site criteria, 60 suggested PIC strategies or objectives, and a sampling of data) (Appendices G & H). Feasibility of the
system was tested through an expert jury comprised of fifteen administrators from four states (Appendix B).

The Expert Jury Survey (Appendix C) served to establish the feasibility of modifying the CATE/S system from one for use in teacher evaluation to a decision support system to assist in the evaluation and improvement of principal performance. It was shown that the CATE/S system is capable of improving the speed and efficiency of the evaluation process. Demonstration of the software package (Appendix H) successfully modeled the system's capability of assisting in these areas: (1) stores principal performance profiles individually, (2) generates PICs for each area of substandard performance designed to assist in principal performance improvement, (3) produces reports that allow for monitoring of evaluator discrimination, (4) produces reports that compare principals in a district, and (5) creates a report to assist in the planning of group and individual staff development for use in a district's strategic planning process.

Conclusions

Structured as a feasibility study, the research focused on finding answers to the questions proposed in Chapter 1. Considering the limitations of the study, the following conclusions appear warranted:

Can the existing CATE/S program be modified for use as a decision support tool in the evaluation and improvement of performance of principals?
The existing CATE/S program can be modified for use as a decision assistance support tool in the evaluation and improvement of principal performance. The evaluation components and items of criteria used by the local school district can be entered into the software and levels of criteria established. A summary of responses on the Expert Jury Survey (Table 3) indicated agreement that the reports generated could be of assistance to supervisors in the evaluation and supervision process. In fact, agreement of the total sample was 86.4 percent which exceeded the anticipated 80 percent.

How can lists of principal tasks and behaviors from the available literature be categorized to align with test site performance criteria, in order to coordinate a bank of professional growth plans?

The search of the literature revealed lists of principal validated behaviors which had been previously established to have validity and discriminating power. These behaviorally specific objectives were matched to the 19 criteria of the field site school district through a matrix analysis (Appendix E). A panel of volunteer, practicing, educational administrators, currently enrolled in doctoral courses (Appendix B), and two professors from the same department, then assisted in refining the objectives and procedures.

What group can be used as expert jury to respond to a survey intended to test the feasibility of the system?

The expert jury was comprised of 15 administrators, 10 central level administrators and five principals (Appendix B) from four states. It was assumed that the selected expert jury was capable of making honest and knowledgeable assessments regarding the feasibility of the system, and that
there would be at least 80 percent agreement among jurors that the proposed evaluation system was feasible.

What questions will be asked of the expert jury?

The Expert Jury Survey (Appendix C) was comprised of 11 questions that focused on the capabilities of the system to serve as a decision assistance tool in the evaluation and improvement of principal performance.

What will be the cost of installing the system in a school district, including: (1) personnel hours to edit the software and enter data, and (2) initial cost of the software package?

The proposed system can be installed in a school district with minimal expenditure of human and fiscal resources. In a district employing 15-20 principals, approximately 16 hours of personnel time will be required annually. A central office staff member proficient in microcomputer keyboarding can initially enter the district's principal evaluation criteria and the individual demographic data in a period of approximately four hours. Probably two hours per month of personnel time, October through March, will be required to update summative and formative evaluation data, and to print out reports for administrative use. At the beginning of each year, a two hour input session will be required to make changes, updating the demographic files of the software. The cost of the software package is a minimal, one time expense, amounting to approximately $100.
Limitations

Generalizing from the results of the study could be problematic since the study was a snapshot, reflecting one period in time. On account of the time limit, no attempt was made to conduct a field study or an experimental analysis of long term effects of the system on field site principal performance. The major conclusion concerning the feasibility of the system was drawn based on responses from the expert jury who observed the microcomputer simulation.

The following statements further delineate limitations which could serve to restrict the extent of generalization from the findings. The study was limited to the evaluation system of one mid-western school district; generalizing to other schools with differing populations could be questionable. Members of the expert jury were not selected randomly; each having affiliation in some manner to Iowa State University and/or the School Improvement Model. Bias could be present in the Professional Improvement Commitments as those were primarily developed by the researcher with the assistance of a team of doctoral students and the support and assistance of two professors, all from Iowa State University.

Discussion

The practical implication of this study is that the CATE/S system offers a unique opportunity for superintendents intent upon improvement of principal performance evaluation and supervision in their districts. The synthesis of studies provided in Table 1 is evidence that the principal
evaluation process is a valuable central-level administrative endeavor and can be improved. Studies by Williams (1990) and Peters and Bagenstos (1988) verify an increased need for improved principal performance evaluation and supervision. According to the responses on the Expert Jury Survey, members of the expert jury were in agreement that the CATE/S model has the capacity to provide assistance in fulfilling that need.

Positive responses on the Expert Jury Survey indicated that the system will serve in the capacity of intensive administrative assistance, which is advocated by Dwyer, Lee, Rowan, and Bossert (1986); Duke (1988); Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991); Hord (1990); and Manatt (1988) for the superintendent intent on change, focusing on professional growth of individual principals. Results of the Survey indicated that the Compendium of PICs has the potential to be used cooperatively by the supervisor and principal in building the individual growth plan, a process endorsed by Barth (1990) and Bennis (1989a) as a viable vehicle for effecting change. The importance of the cooperatively written growth plan was previously established by Redfern (1980) and Stow (1988), who advocate the growth plan as an integral culminating activity in the total-systems approach to evaluation.

Integration of ongoing staff development as an important part of a district's strategic plan is advised by Pajak and Glickman (1989) and Duttweiler (1989). Results of the Survey verified that the CATE/S system, which generates staff development reports, is capable of serving as a decision, support tool to assist in the strategic-planning, needs-assessment activity to determine staff development needs.
A result of the Survey was the recommendation that a district purchase the system. In accord with Stevenson's study (1987), it was determined that the cost of the system is negligible, estimates predicated on the assumption that an efficient evaluation program will already be in place. Speculating on the basis of time spent modifying the software package for demonstration purposes in this study, it is estimated that a district employing 15-20 principals will annually expend approximately 16 hours personnel time in editing and entering data. Software costs involve a one-time expense of $100. Training expenditure can be minimal, in that one member of staff can learn to operate the system, who, in turn, can share that expertise with others. No expense is anticipated for hardware as the system can be installed on most brands of microcomputers in place in school districts today (i.e., IBM XT/AT, IBM PS2, Macintosh, Apple IIGS, Apple IIe). Furthermore, the system has the capacity to generate individual and composite reports (Appendix H) that serve to maximize efficiency in the evaluation process, thus amounting to fiscal savings in the long run.

The expert jury verified that putting the software package in place as a decision assistance, support tool, a superintendent and school board can improve the process of evaluation and improvement of principal performance. The package has the capacity to assist in improvement of principal performance by making the record-keeping process more efficient, generating suggested growth plans for both high and low performing principals, and assisting in the supervision of evaluators. Further, it was concluded that reports generated by the system can affect decisions regarding
staff development planning, termination of employment, and pay-for-performance.

Contributions made by this research to the field of education fall into three categories. First, the investigation established the feasibility of implementing the CATE/S microcomputer system as a viable decision support tool to assist in the evaluation and improvement of principal performance. Second, an initial, item bank of Professional Improvement Commitments, which can be generated by the software, was developed to serve as a basis for planning in the professional growth of individual principals. Finally, the review of literature is a substantive contribution, since limited research syntheses are available on the subject of principal performance evaluation. The time and effort expended in this research effort were worthwhile because, according to Barth (1990) and Bennis (1989a), in order for student achievement to improve, schools have a great need for enthusiastic leadership from principals who are visionary, optimistic, confident, and engaged in personal and professional growth.

Recommendations for Practice

1. A school district implementing CATE/S as a decision support tool to assist in the evaluation and supervision of principal performance can enter local school district evaluation components into the software and establish levels of criteria. Data pertaining to individual principal performance is then entered, enabling the system to generate reports, linking PICs to items which show a low rating. The reports and the PICs are displayed on the screen and
converted to hard copy (Appendix H). The Compendium of PICs (Appendix I), which provides suggested activities hooked to the PICs, can then be referenced by the supervisor when preparing for the summative conference and the collaborative writing of the growth plan with the principal.

2. The matrix-analysis outline (Appendix E), constructed for this investigation, can be implemented by a district in checking local criteria for validity and discriminating power. A district's lists of criteria may be checked by copying the outline, adding a column to the right side, and then matching the local items to ones verified in this and previous studies.

3. It is recommended that superintendents intent upon improving student outcomes take an active role in the instructional process and in a collaborative process of evaluation and supervision of principals. There is strong agreement in the literature that, in effective schools, central-level administrators are visible as instructional leaders, prioritizing time to evaluate, coach, and support principals.

4. The collaborative approach to used in principal evaluation and supervision will serve to alleviate adversities of the principalship. Increased communication, ongoing monitoring of performance, and straightforward, honest feedback are means by which superintendents can effect the improvement of principal performance.

5. During the early phase of the evaluation process, it is recommended that superintendents and school boards provide principals with clear delineations of expectations and procedures involved in the evaluation process. Experts in the field of administrative evaluation agree that lack of
clearly communicated expectations leads to perplexity and confusion on the part of principals.

6. A school district can use the same evaluation instrument and process for all grade levels of principals. The review of research pertaining to similarities of roles and characteristics of principal behaviors indicates that it is practical for the criteria for rating performances to be the same, since the focus for principal performance at all levels has become that of instructional leader.

7. It is recommended that principal evaluation be based on the total systems approach to organizational planning, viewing the evaluation process as a part of the network of interrelated subsystems in the total organization. The manner in which evaluation interacts and the degree of connectedness with the other parts of the organization deserves due consideration in the strategic planning process.

8. The writing of a professional growth plan is recommended as a necessary step to be implemented at the conclusion of the evaluation cycle, in order to ensure improvement of performance. Training by a professional knowledgeable and experienced in the area of professional growth plans is a necessary element of staff development for a district intent upon improvement of performance. The growth plan, or PIC in this study, is a written agreement, collaboratively developed by the supervisor and the principal. The plan may be written with a principal who has a need to address an obvious area of deficiency or with a principal who exhibits exemplary behaviors and is interested in enhancement of performance.
9. The local school board is advised to include goals in the district's strategic plan to incorporate computers and technology into instructional and administrative programs. In order to keep a district on the "cutting edge" of innovation and change, it is important to perform an annual review of programs in use in the district, comparing research findings with current use of technology in the school system.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. The results of this study need further verification. A field test, using the proposed system with actual principal performance evaluation data, could serve that purpose. The field test should encompass a span of two to three years, involving data from a school district that employs at least 20 principals who demonstrate a marked degree of variability in performance ratings. Hypotheses could be constructed explaining that: (a) the system is of assistance in the improvement of principal performance, (b) the system is advantageous for use in assisting in the improvement of performance on an individual basis of both high and low performing principals, and (c) CATE/S is suitable as a decision support instrument in deciding such issues as tenure, termination, and pay-for-performance.

   The first step will be to establish a data base. A pretest and posttest instrument could be used to check the perceptions of individuals (i.e., supervisors, principals, teachers, students), performance improvement of the principals involved, and student outcomes. A t-test could then be performed, comparing the means of the scores for significant differences.
Another consideration, applicable in a large district (more than 30 principals), is a field study, implementing the proposed system as an alternative form of principal performance evaluation (or a pilot project) with a limited number of principals. Improvement shown by principals in the alternative system could be compared to that of principals (control group) evaluated by the original process.

2. It is necessary to expand the Compendium of PICs. This can be done by surveying supervisors of principals for lists of performance objectives perceived as necessary in principal performance improvement. The objectives can then be compiled and matched to procedures. The Compendium can be checked for validity by again surveying supervisors using a questionnaire attached to each PIC, asking such questions as: "Would this PIC be of assistance: (a) in improvement of performance of principals in your district? (b) in improvement of performance of a low performing principal? (c) in improvement of performance of a high performing principal? (d) in determining pay-for-performance? and (e) do the procedures realistically address the PIC objective?"

3. Reports generated by the software could be verified for inter-relater reliability in order to ensure the credibility of using the reports to assist in the determination of such conditions as tenure, termination, and pay-for-performance. This could be done through the use of scenarios, actual principal performance data from a school site, and an established pay-for-performance school district policy. Videotaped simulations could be used with the scenarios. A survey could then be administered to a representative
expert jury, asking the subjects to establish a pay-for-performance ranking for each principal in the scenario. The responses could be compared to determine whether or not several raters can use the system with a high degree of reliability.

4. The results of performing a national survey of various principal performance systems in use today would be of assistance in planning innovative programs of evaluation and improvement of performance. A survey could include feedback concerning objective outcomes of systems and the perceptions of the individuals involved. Inclusive in the study could be a survey of the various procedures used to evaluate different levels of principals. Ancillary analysis could include other demographic data (e.g., age, gender, tenure, size of district).

5. A need for a synthesis of current research pertaining to principal performance evaluation is obvious. This could be done through the alternative thesis style, with publication as the major intent.

6. The results of performing a national survey of the application of technology in schools would be of use to educators in strategic planning. The survey could address both administrative and instructional applications, querying as to varying uses of technology (e.g., data processing, decision-making, teaching drillwork or higher level cognitive skills) as well as outcomes of programs.
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APPENDIX A.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY HUMAN SUBJECTS RELEASE FORM
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. [☐] Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #s), how they will be used, and when they will be
      removed (see Item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. [☐] Consent form (if applicable)

14. [☐] Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

15. [☐] Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

   First Contact
   
   Last Contact
   
   March, 1991
   
   Same
   
   Month / Day / Year
   
   Month / Day / Year

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual
    tapes will be erased:

   Month / Day / Year

18. [Signature] Departmental Executive Officer Date Department or Administrative Unit
    
19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:

   X Project Approved  ___ Project Not Approved  ___ No Action Required

   Patricia M. Keith Name of Committee Chairperson Date Signature of Committee Chairperson
APPENDIX B.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF EXPERT JURY

LIST OF MEMBERS OF SURVEY JUDGEMENT PANEL

LIST OF MEMBERS OF PIC JUDGEMENT PANEL
Table B.1. Members of expert jury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Braden</td>
<td>Boone, Iowa</td>
<td>Elementary Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Brookshier</td>
<td>Independence, Kansas</td>
<td>High School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Coffey</td>
<td>Independence, Kansas</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy DeWar</td>
<td>St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Grove</td>
<td>Webster City, Iowa</td>
<td>Middle School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Harland</td>
<td>St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
<td>Director of Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Harmsen</td>
<td>St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Lucas</td>
<td>St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mock</td>
<td>Independence, Kansas</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Owens</td>
<td>Mazon, Illinois</td>
<td>Superintendent, K-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Paolillo</td>
<td>St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
<td>Director of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Poston</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ames, Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Pottratz</td>
<td>Mason City, Iowa</td>
<td>Middle School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Robinson</td>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa State Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Taylor</td>
<td>Independence, Kansas</td>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B. 2. Members of survey judgement panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Frerking</td>
<td>Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, Missouri</td>
<td>Director, University Laboratory School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Omotani</td>
<td>Medicine Hat, Alberta, Canada</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Price</td>
<td>Osterholtz, Germany</td>
<td>High School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Sessions</td>
<td>Nuernberg, Germany</td>
<td>Teacher, DODDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Sessions</td>
<td>Nuernberg, Germany</td>
<td>Elementary Principal, DODDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaVerne Suggs</td>
<td>Greensboro, South Carolina</td>
<td>Assistant Elementary Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Weber</td>
<td>Tucson, Arizona</td>
<td>Programming Arizona Teacher Residency Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B. 3. Members of PIC judgement panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Black</td>
<td>Seargent Bluff, Iowa</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Alice Christensen</td>
<td>University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming</td>
<td>Professor, Counselor Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby Costner</td>
<td>Urbandale, Iowa</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Frerking</td>
<td>Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, Missouri</td>
<td>Director, University Laboratory School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Guillory</td>
<td>St. Charles Parish, Louisiana</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Holtzman</td>
<td>Missoula, Montana</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Niska</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission, Kansas</td>
<td>Middle School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Omatani</td>
<td>Medicine Hat, Alberta, Canada</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Price</td>
<td>Osterholz, Germany</td>
<td>High School Principal, DODDS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Scott</td>
<td>Heidelberg, Germany</td>
<td>U.S. Army (Europe) Chief of Enlisted Personnel, Medical Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Sessions</td>
<td>Nuernberg, Germany</td>
<td>Teacher, DODDS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Sessions</td>
<td>Nuernberg, Germany</td>
<td>Elementary Principal, DODDS*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DODDS is an acronym for Department of Defense Dependents' Schools.
APPENDIX C.
EXPERT JURY SURVEY
EXPERT JURY SURVEY
COMPUTER ASSISTED PRINCIPAL EVALUATION/SUPERVISION

My position is: CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR ______
PRINCIPAL ______

Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate your perception of the software package by circling a number on the scale opposite each of the following statements:

1. The bank of Professional Improvement Plans (PIPs) has the capacity to be used cooperatively by a principal and evaluator in building a growth plan.

2. The software package has the capacity to assist in the growth of a high performing principal, as rated by his/her evaluator.

3. The software package has the capacity to assist in the growth of a low performing principal, as rated by his/her evaluator.

4. The Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) match the specific criteria for improvement of performance.
5. The reports generated have the capacity to serve as support tools in determining pay-for-performance for principals.

6. The reports generated have the capacity to serve as a support tool in determining staff development needs.

7. The reports generated have the capacity to serve as a support tool for superintendents in the supervision of evaluators.

8. The reports generated have the capacity to serve as a support tool in the dismissal of a principal who, following a program of intensive assistance, continues to receive substandard performance ratings.

9. What size school district(s) will the software package be suitable for, considering number of principals employed?

   Circle one or more — based on number of principals:

   small district 1-10
   medium district 10-30
   large district 30 plus

10. Would you recommend that a school district purchase the software package?  

    Circle one:  

    yes  
    no

11. Do you have suggestions as to improvements which can be made to the software program and/or the PIPs?
APPENDIX D.
SCHOOL DISTRICT OF ST. JOSEPH PRINCIPAL EVALUATION
ITEMS OF CRITERIA AND DESCRIPTORS
# SUMMATIVE EVALUATION FORM

**Performance Area I: THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Performance Expectation</th>
<th>In Addition To Performance Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provides direction for the school</td>
<td>Not Observed A</td>
<td>Does not provide direction for the school</td>
<td>Sometimes provides directions for the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provides for instructional management</td>
<td>Not observed A</td>
<td>Provides little or no instructional management</td>
<td>Inconsistently provides for instructional management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provides for appropriate curricular development</td>
<td>Not observed A</td>
<td>Does not provide for appropriate curricular development</td>
<td>Intermittently provides for appropriate curricular development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of Performance-based evaluation strategies</td>
<td>Not observed A</td>
<td>Displays little or no skill in use of Performance-based evaluation strategies</td>
<td>Intermittently uses Performance-based evaluation strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provides leadership for positive educational changes</td>
<td>Not observed A</td>
<td>Does not provide leadership for positive educational changes</td>
<td>Inconsistently provides leadership for positive educational changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provides for staff development</td>
<td>Not observed A</td>
<td>Does not provide for staff development</td>
<td>Inconsistently provides for staff development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Area II: ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Performance Expectation</th>
<th>In Addition To Performance Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school</td>
<td>Not observed A</td>
<td>Shows no evidence of effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school</td>
<td>Intermittently provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CRITERIA* Administrator...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Area</th>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Performance Expectation</th>
<th>In Addition To Performance Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Insures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment</td>
<td>Not observed A I</td>
<td>Does not provide for a positive learning environment</td>
<td>Occasionally provides for a positive learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Manages fiscal resources</td>
<td>Not observed A I</td>
<td>Does not manage fiscal resources</td>
<td>Inconsistently manages fiscal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Promotes a positive school climate</td>
<td>Not observed A I</td>
<td>Does not promote a positive school climate</td>
<td>Sometimes promotes a positive school climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Area III: INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA* Administrator...</th>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Performance Expectation</th>
<th>In Addition To Performance Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students</td>
<td>Not observed A I</td>
<td>Is unresponsive to the needs of students</td>
<td>Intermittently shows sensitivity to the needs of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff</td>
<td>Not observed A I</td>
<td>Shows little or no cooperation with staff</td>
<td>Intermittently cooperates with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with District Administration and Board of Education</td>
<td>Not observed A I</td>
<td>Shows little or no cooperation with the District Administration and Board of Education</td>
<td>Intermittently demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with District Administration and Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with the parents/community</td>
<td>Not observed A I</td>
<td>Shows little or no interaction with parents/community</td>
<td>Intermittently interacts with parents/community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Performance Area IV: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA* Administrator...</th>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Performance Expectation</th>
<th>In Addition To Performance Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Demonstrates professional responsibility</td>
<td>Not observed</td>
<td>Does not fulfill directed school responsibilities</td>
<td>Needs to be reminded to meet directed school responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Assumes responsibilities outside of the building as they relate to the school</td>
<td>Not observed</td>
<td>Does not assume responsibilities outside of the building</td>
<td>Intermittently assumes responsibilities outside of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supports District and building-level regulations and policies</td>
<td>Not observed</td>
<td>Does not comply with building-level and District regulations and policies</td>
<td>Intermittently complies with building-level and District regulations and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Participates in professional growth activities</td>
<td>Not observed</td>
<td>Shows no interest in professional growth activities</td>
<td>Participates in professional growth activities only when required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tolerates stress effectively</td>
<td>Not observed</td>
<td>Does not effectively tolerate stress</td>
<td>Inconsistently tolerates stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Circle the appropriate performance level
**Circle "A" if it was appropriate that criterion was not observed;
Circle "I" if it was inappropriate that criterion was not observed

NOTE: Areas rated below performance expectations must have job targets in effect.

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS:

Administrator's Signature/Date

Evaluator's Signature/Date

(Signatures indicate that information has been read and discussed.)
Administrator Performance:  
Performance Areas, Criteria, and Descriptors

I. Instructional Leader

THE ADMINISTRATOR:

1. Provides direction for the school
   a. Identifies present and future school goals.
   b. Involves faculty and community in goal development.
   c. Uses needs assessment data for goal directions.
   d. Establishes priorities.

2. Provides for instructional management.
   a. Demonstrates knowledge of and promotes curricular goals and objectives.
   b. Monitors faculty application of curricular goals and objectives.
   c. Monitors student progress toward achievement of goals and objectives.
   d. Monitors curriculum based upon student needs and achievement data.

3. Provides for appropriate curricular development.
   a. Analyzes present curricular offerings.
   b. Updates curricular offerings based upon student needs.
   c. Utilizes faculty based upon student need and personnel skills.
   d. Seeks faculty input in curricular assignments.
   e. Monitors student achievement.

4. Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies.
   a. Demonstrates knowledge of varied teaching strategies.
   b. Understands the learning process.
   c. Demonstrates effective observational skills.
   d. Observes classroom instruction on a planned basis.
   e. Demonstrates effective notetaking skills.
   f. Demonstrates effective conferencing skills.
   g. Provides suggestions for improvement through professional improvement plans when identifying areas of concern.

5. Provides leadership for positive educational changes.
   a. Encourages change which leads to a better school environment.
   b. Establishes a systematic process for change that is known and understood by the faculty.
   c. Participates in curricular meetings of grade levels or departments.
   d. Maintains a school-wide process of program review and revision.
   e. Communicates curricular changes to students, staff and community.

6. Provides for staff development.
   a. Assesses faculty staff development needs.
   b. Provides appropriate staff development activities and resources.
   c. Utilizes faculty in staff development activities.
   d. Evaluates the staff development program.
   e. Informs faculty of new developments and trends in education.
II. Organizational Management

THE ADMINISTRATOR:

7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.
   a. Prepares and executes short and long range plans that support the educational goals of the school.
   b. Develops objectives that are easily understood.
   c. Organizes staff for maximum efficiency and effectiveness.
   d. Demonstrates ability to deal with a volume of paperwork.
   e. Uses time efficiently to perform job responsibilities.
   f. Involves staff in the development and review of operational procedures.
   g. Performs routine functions efficiently.
   h. Delegates appropriate responsibilities and tasks to staff.

8. Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment.
   a. Supervises custodial operations in maintaining a clean school.
   b. Assesses needs for building repairs and improvements.
   c. Implements programs to promote student pride.
   d. Promotes cooperative effort among the entire staff.

9. Manages fiscal resources carefully and consistently.
   a. Prepares and administers school budget effectively.
   b. Ensures accuracy and punctuality of financial reports.
   c. Monitors budget expenditures.

10. Promotes a positive school climate.
    a. Shows enthusiasm for the job.
    b. Exhibits a positive attitude toward staff and students.
    c. Supports those responsible to him/her.
    d. Promotes an atmosphere of cooperation, mutual trust and positive staff morale.
    e. Recognizes students and staff members whose performances have been outstanding.

III. Interpersonal Relations

THE ADMINISTRATOR:

11. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.
    a. Uses discretion in dealing with students' needs.
    b. Demonstrates a respect, understanding, and acceptance of students' needs and concerns.
    c. Interacts frequently with students.
    d. Reinforces positive student efforts.
    e. Maintains high visibility to the student body.
    f. Promotes positive student attitudes by providing clearly written expectations for students.
    g. Exhibits a sincere concern for the feelings of the students.
    h. Provides appropriate feedback to students who have concerns, questions or problems.

12. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.
    a. Evaluates in a positive, systematic and cooperative manner.
    b. Communicates effectively job expectations to staff.
    c. Encourages staff input.
    d. Demonstrates sensitivity to staff problems.
    e. Recognizes accomplishments and strengths of all personnel.
13. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with Board of Education, District and Building Administration.
   a. Supports Board policies and District regulations.
   b. Uses appropriate channels for resolving concerns/problems.
   c. Supports and participates in board and District projects.
   d. Encourages Board and District visitation and involvement.

14. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with parents and community.
   a. Encourages parental and community participation in school activities.
   b. Participates in parent and community projects.
   c. Informs parents and community regarding school related activities.
   d. Works with parents in resolving problems relating to student achievement, behavior and attendance.
   e. Demonstrates a respect, understanding and acceptance of community attitudes and needs.

IV. Professional Responsibilities

THE ADMINISTRATOR:

15. Demonstrates professional responsibility.
   a. Completes duties in accordance with the established job description.
   b. Uses appropriate channels for communication, decision-making and resolving concerns.
   c. Provides accurate data and reports.
   d. Separates personal problems from professional responsibilities and duties.
   e. Shows discretion in the use of professional information.

16. Assumes responsibilities outside the building as they relate to school matters.
   a. Serves effectively as a school representative.
   b. Projects a positive image.
   c. Assumes responsibility for student management.

17. Supports District and building level regulations and policies.
   a. Stays informed and effectively implements board policies and District/building regulations.
   b. Evaluates administrative effectiveness through self-imposed and District-developed evaluation.
   c. Demonstrates punctuality.

18. Participates in professional growth activities.
   a. Maintains current knowledge in the fields of administration, effective teaching and effective schooling.
   b. Participates in professional organizations, conferences and workshops.
   c. Takes advantage of opportunities to learn.
   d. Shares knowledge with colleagues, staff, students, parents, and communities.

   a. Makes an effort to maintain good physical condition.
   b. Performs effectively under pressure and adversity.
   c. Invests time in activities which permit mental and physical relaxation.
   d. Manages time effectively.
APPENDIX E.

MATRIX ANALYSIS PERFORMED TO CHECK SCHOOL SITE CRITERIA ITEMS FOR VALIDITY AND DISCRIMINATING POWER, MATCHING ST. JOSEPH SCHOOL DISTRICT CRITERIA TO LISTS OF CRITERIA ITEMS FROM PREVIOUSLY VALIDATED STUDIES
Table E.1. Matrix analysis performed to check school site criteria items for validity and discriminating power, matching St. Joseph School District criteria to lists of criteria items from previously validated studies

|-----------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|

I. Instructional Leader

1. Provides direction for the school  
   - X

2. Provides for instructional management  
   - X

3. Provides for appropriate curricular development  
   - X

4. Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies  
   - X

5. Provides leadership for positive educational change  
   - X

6. Provides for staff development  
   - X

\(^aX\) indicates a match between a particular item in St. Joseph criteria and item(s) in the other study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Organizational Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provides for effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Manages fiscal resources carefully and consistently</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Promotes a positive school climate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with Board of Education, District and Building Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E. 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV Professional Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with parents and community.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Assumes responsibility outside the building as they relate to school</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supports District and building level regulations and policies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Participates in professional growth activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tolerates stress effectively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F.

PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITMENTS WORKSHOP ITEMS

MEMO TO DOCTORAL STUDENTS, DECEMBER 17, 1990
MEMO TO DOCTORAL STUDENTS, JANUARY 17, 1990
MEMO TO DOCTORAL STUDENTS, FEBRUARY 2, 1990

WORKSHOP AGENDA: WRITING PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITMENTS

PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITMENTS (A GUIDE)

BY DR. SHIRLEY B. STOW

COOPERATIVE PROCESSING MATERIALS
MEMO

TO: Ed Administration Doctoral Students

FROM: Rosemary D. Noel, 294-3508
December 17, 1990

RE: WORKSHOP: "Writing Professional Improvement Commitments: A Skill That Can Be Taught" - Dr. Shirley B. Stow

DATE: January 25
TIME: 3:00 - 7:00 P.M.
WHERE: To be announced later

Dr. Stow and I are planning a short workshop: "Writing Professional Improvement Commitments: A Skill That Can Be Taught." The purpose of this activity is to further my dissertational project and the ISU Research Foundation computerized program for assisting in the evaluation of principals.

The dissertation is entitled Developing and Testing the Feasibility of a Microcomputer-based System for Principal Performance Evaluation and Supervision. The growth plans, which address nineteen pre-set areas of criteria, will be imbedded into a computer program to be used by principals and their evaluators. At this point, I need assistance in re-writing and refining objectives and activities for improvement of individual principals.

Dr. Stow has offered to share her expertise with us. I believe that we can all benefit from her knowledge and experience in the area of writing professional improvement commitments.

Soup and salad will be provided.
MEMO

TO:  Ed Administration Doctoral Students

FROM:  
Rosemary D. Noel, 294-3508  
January 17, 1990

RE:  
WORKSHOP:  "Writing Professional Improvement Commitments:  
A Skill That Can Be Taught" - Dr. Shirley B. Stow

DATE:  
January 25

TIME:  
3:00 - 7:00 P.M.

WHERE:  
Buchanan Hall  
Benson Lounge (in the basement)  
Park on street or in visitor parking

As you were informed in previous memo, Dr. Stow and I are planning a short workshop, the purpose of which is to further my dissertational project. I need assistance in writing objectives and activities for improvement of performance of principals.

A light supper is planned.

Please return the attached sheet if you plan to attend.
MEMO

TO: Ed Administration Doctoral Students

FROM: Rosemary D. Noel, 294-3508
February 2, 1990

RE: "Writing Professional Improvement Commitments:

DATE: Friday, February 8, 1991

TIME: 5:00-8:00 P.M.

WHERE: Buchanan Hall (across the street, southwest of Memorial Union)
Benson Lounge (in the basement)

The purpose of this note is to request assistance from fellow graduate students one more time.

A great big thanks to the folks who set aside time to make last week's workshop a whopping success. We learned a lot about writing growth plans with Dr. Stow; had practice in cooperative group processing; and made a really big dent in my dissertational project. I have entered that work into the computer, proofed, and refined the writing. Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Stow have each offered to lend their expertise for further review and validation of our work.

Please plan to join me at the above noted place to complete the project. Supper will be brought in.

R.S.V.P.
3:00  Introductory comments  Stow

Essential components of PICs (PIPs)  Stow

Guided practice  Stow

Components of Cooperative Group Processing  Noel

Production of PIPs  Group members

Critique of PIPs  Group members

5:30 - 6:00  Lunch  Sukothai

8:00  Dismissal
PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITMENTS

SHIRLEY B. STOW
CO-DIRECTOR
Writing a PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITMENT

1. Summative Evaluation

2. Building a Conducive Climate

3. Beliefs

4. Guidelines for Development

5. Characteristics

6. Components
ADMINISTRATOR PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Merry Administrator

DATE

Simsville

SCHOOL

I. PERFORMANCE AREA: Organizational Management

II. CRITERION: Provides for the effective and efficient day-to-day operation of the school.

III. OBJECTIVE(S): (i.e., applicable descriptors/definable deficiencies)

During the next six months I will increase the amount of time which is spent supporting the educational goals of the school by 20 percent as evidenced by a time log and artifacts of the process.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR ACHIEVING OBJECTIVE(S): (i.e., explanation of administrator and evaluator responsibilities)

A. Review time log of previous six months.
B. Review educational goals.
C. Identify deficiencies.
D. Prioritize activities.
E. Record time.
F. File artifacts.
G. Submit time log and artifacts.

V. APPRAISAL METHOD AND TARGET DATES:

The evaluator will compare the time log and artifacts with standard (show an increase of time spent on supporting goals by 20 percent) by 11/10/9.

VI. ADMINISTRATOR'S COMMENTS:

Administrator's Signature

VI. EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS:

Evaluator's Signature

DATE OBJECTIVE ACHIEVED: _______________

FOLLOW-UP COMMENTS:

Administrator's Signature

Evaluator's Signature

*Signatures indicate that information has been read and discussed.

*Only one criterion should be identified on each professional improvement plan sheet.
(Administrator Evaluation)

PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE AREA: (check one)</th>
<th>Criterion on which the PIC is based:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ Instructional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Management Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. GOAL (general intent)

II. SPECIFIC MEASURABLE BEHAVIOR (What will be done?)

III. PROCEDURES: (How will it be done?)

Steps:

Timeline
IV. DOCUMENTATION/APPRaisal METHOD FOR FINAL ACCOMPLISHMENT OF TARGET:
(How will you know it was done?)

Evidence

Standard

Appraisal method

EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS:
This PIC was:

_____ Not Accomplished

_____ Partially Accomplished

_____ Fully Accomplished

EVALUATEE'S COMMENTS:

Signature   Date

Signature   Date
A GLOSSARY OF BEHAVIORS
(Professional Improvement Commitments)

This list of behaviors is "illustrative" and will help establish a more precise interpretation.

1. ARRANGE—to prepare for subsequent action
2. CATEGORIZE—to separate into sections
3. CHART—to exhibit as a graph, outline, diagram, or drawing
4. CLASSIFY—to arrange, tabulate, catalogue, or list
5. COMBINE—to connect, link, or join
6. COMPARE—to notice similarities or distinguish between
7. COMPILATE—to collect, arrange, or assemble
8. CONSTRUCT—to create or cause to exist
9. DEFINE—to set limits, describe, or explain
10. DESCRIBE—to make clear or apparent, give the details of
11. DIAGRAM—to sketch, draft, or draw
12. DISCUSS—to confer, talk over, or consider
13. EXAMINE—to inspect with care, analyze, or investigate
14. EXPLAIN—to account for or make clear for others
15. FOLLOW—to comply or adhere to
16. IDENTIFY—to characterize, specify, or point out
17. ILLUSTRATE—to represent or portray
18. ITEMIZE—to enumerate or enter in a list
19. LABEL—to specify or mark
20. LIST—to post or tabulate
21. LOCATE—to discover or search out
22. MODIFY—to change, alter, or vary
23. OPERATE—to administer or-conduct
24. ORGANIZE—to systematize or put in order
25. OUTLINE—to rough out or arrange in a preliminary way
26. PLAN—to think through a set of procedures and outcomes
27. PREPARE—to make ready or collect information
28. PRODUCE—to bring forth, design, or turn out
29. RECORD—to register, tabulate, or keep an account of
30. REPRODUCE—to duplicate, repeat, or remake
31. SELECT—to decide or choose
32. SHOW—to demonstrate or display
33. STATE—to declare, report, or affirm
34. SUMMARIZE—to review or compile
35. USE—to apply, utilize, or put into practice
36. WRITE—to compose in words or comment upon
David Thompson has been a principal in Simsville for seven years. He provides an excellent staff development program in his building. He asked the teachers to provide input. This was accomplished by having each department prioritize a list of possible topics. Then the department chairpersons met with David and discussed the highest rated topics. Consensus was reached; two of the topics became the focus of this year's program. David contacted resource persons to teach the sessions.

He is responsible for the organization of student body activities. He worked on this task with one of his assistants. After procedures were written, they were discussed with a representation of the student body.

David exceeds the district's expectations in planning the master schedule and teacher assignments. His plan is developed, discussed with the administrative team at the building, and shared with his supervisor several weeks ahead of the due date. The plan is very accurate and easy to implement.

Your concerns about David's performance have been in the areas of school-community relations and instructional leadership. He does not return calls to parents as promptly as he should nor does he become involved in the school-community efforts, i.e., fund-raising activities of parent groups; book exchange programs. His instructional leadership skills, an area which has a high priority in the school, causes some concern because he does not assist with instructional strategies which emphasize student achievement. His involvement with coordinating the instructional program leaves much to be desired.

How would you work with David when it is time to write a professional improvement plan?
I. BRAINSTORMING -- In-Turn Response Method

1. Person seated to right of leader speaks first.
2. Only one person may speak at a time.
3. Each group member either speaks or passes.
4. Number each response.
5. No discussion, debate, or clarification is permitted at this step.
6. Continue the in-turn response until all members have passed.

II. CLARIFICATION

1. Each person, in turn, may ask a question of another person concerning the item which the other person contributed.
2. A brief explanation is given by the other person.
3. Clarify only! There is no discussion at this point.
4. Use the In-Turn Response and pass rule.

III. DISCUSSION -- Pro/Con Statements

A. PRO STATEMENTS:
1. Speak in behalf of keeping any item -- clearly and concisely.
2. Do not repeat opinions already stated by someone else.
3. Something new may be contributed at this point.
4. Use the In-Turn Response and pass rule.

B. CON STATEMENTS:
   Use the same procedure as in A with the exception of speaking in behalf of eliminating an item from the list.
IV. DECISION/VOTING COMPONENT -- CLEAR-OUT VOTING

1. The leader goes through the list item by item.
2. Group members vote by casting their vote using the open hand for 'yes' and the closed hand for 'no'. Record the number of votes.
3. Everyone votes on each item. A member can not pass.
4. The recorder counts the number of yes votes. A simple majority vote or a tie vote means that an item remains on the list.
5. Mark through item if it does not receive a majority or a tie vote.
APPENDIX G.

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

EXPLANATION OF METHODS AND PROCEDURES
Dear Participant:
Thank you for agreeing to assist in completing this doctoral study. The title of the dissertation is Developing and Testing the Feasibility of a Microcomputer-Based System for Principal Performance Evaluation and Supervision. The investigation is descriptive and developmental in nature, with an extensive review of literature on current research in the area of evaluation and improvement of performance of principals.

The purpose of this study is two-fold. The first is to explore the feasibility of modifying the CATE/S program for assisting in teacher evaluation to a program of decision assistance in the evaluation of principals. The second theme of the study is to promote professional growth in principals through a process of intensive assistance -- collaborative growth planning.

In the wake of movements in excellence, reform, and now, restructuring, the leadership role of the principal has emerged as a subject of concern. The individual in the position to exert optimal influence on students, teachers, programs, and thus, instructional outcomes, is the building principal. Improved techniques of evaluation support and encourage the emotional well-being of dynamic leaders while emphasizing improvement of performance.

After perusing the enclosed materials and completing the questionnaire, please return the questionnaire to Jay Coffey, who, in turn, will compile and return them. Your responses on the survey will be kept in complete confidence. Please note that identifier codes or numbers are not used.

Feel free to contact me if you have questions to be answered. Again, thank you for agreeing to take time from a busy schedule to further this investigation.

Sincerely yours,

Rosemary D. Noel
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

1. Nineteen items of criteria for principal evaluation and improvement of performance were addressed. The criteria were derived from Guidelines for Performance-Based Administrators Evaluation Principal Evaluation, the St. Joseph, Missouri procedural guide for principal evaluation.

2. The criteria were verified and checked for discriminating power by a matrix analysis, matching the St. Joseph criteria with previously validated lists -- Look (1982), as well as Noriega (1985), Mueller (1987), and Willis (1989) of Iowa State University. Criteria from two research studies of other universities--Larsen (1987) and Weiss (1989)—were included in the matrix, as was Smith & Andrews (1989). All of these have previously established discriminating power.

3. Lists of principal behaviors from effective studies, in conjunction with the St. Joseph descriptors, were used to compile the sixty growth plans or Professional Improvement Commitments.

4. The suggested procedures for carrying out the growth plans were constructed with the assistance of a team of educational administration doctoral students at Iowa State University. The team was trained in the writing of Professional Improvement Commitments by Dr. Shirley B. Stow. The Cooperative Processing decision-making process (Norman Public Schools, 1989) was used to brainstorm the objectives and procedures.

5. The procedures and activities were then reviewed and rewritten with with the assistance of two Iowa State University educational administration professors who are experts in the writing of professional growth plans--Dr. Shirley B. Stow and Dr. Jacqueline Mitchell.

6. The CATE/S software package was edited to contain the components of principal evaluation in place of teacher evaluation. The software was then demonstrated to St. Joseph central administration personnel as a system which has the capability of generating strategies for assisting in the improvement of performance of principals.
APPENDIX H.

CATE/S DEMONSTRATION DATA
Evaluator Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J. C. Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>J. D. Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>J. M. Mundy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mike Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>June Morehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Michael Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Debra Gorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Beth Fleharty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Margaret Atwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Phillip Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Anne Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Stu Howell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ada McIntyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Paul Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>June Carnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Zach Fitzpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Mary Anne Weigel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Howard Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pete Wilkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Gene Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>John Thompson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff with Particular Ratings in a Criterion

Criterion # 1: Provides direction for the school.

The following staff were rated from 1 to 2 on this criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ada McIntyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Gene Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Phillip Dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status Report — Evaluations Completed (Current Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE(S) OF OBSERVATION</th>
<th>DATE OF SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mike Smith</td>
<td>1-2-91</td>
<td>3-1-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Margaret Atwood</td>
<td>1-3-91</td>
<td>3-1-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Howard Bell</td>
<td>1-5-91</td>
<td>3-8-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Phillip Oates</td>
<td>1-5-91</td>
<td>3-5-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pete Wilkins</td>
<td>1-9-91</td>
<td>3-9-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Anne Jones</td>
<td>1-6-91</td>
<td>3-8-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Gene Bowman</td>
<td>1-2-91</td>
<td>3-2-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Stu Howell</td>
<td>1-4-91</td>
<td>3-2-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>John Thompson</td>
<td>1-8-91</td>
<td>3-4-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ada McIntyre</td>
<td>1-2-91</td>
<td>3-2-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>June Morehouse</td>
<td>1-8-91</td>
<td>3-1-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Paul Jones</td>
<td>1-4-91</td>
<td>3-2-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Michael Flowers</td>
<td>1-5-91</td>
<td>3-4-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>JUNE CARNES</td>
<td>1-4-91</td>
<td>3-5-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Zach Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>1-81-91</td>
<td>2-4-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Beth Fleharty</td>
<td>1-3-91</td>
<td>4-3-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Mary Anne Weigel</td>
<td>1-2-91</td>
<td>e-6-91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff with Particular Ratings in a Criterion

Criterion # 1: Provides direction for the school.

The following staff were rated from 3 to 4 on this criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mike Smith</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>June Morehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Paul Jones</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Michael Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>June CARNES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Debra Gorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not found in roster.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Mary Anne Weigel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Margaret Atwood</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Howard Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pete Wilkins</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Anne Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Stu Howell</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>John Thompson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff Report

Compiled from information in summative evaluation data file.

**COMPOSITE REPORT - ALL BUILDINGS AND ALL EVALUATORS COMBINED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>CRITERION DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>AVG.</th>
<th>STD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides direction for the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for instructional management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for appropriate curricular development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides leadership for positive educational changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for staff development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manages fiscal resources carefully and consistently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotes a positive school climate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with the District Administration and Board of Education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with parents and community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrates professional responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assumes responsibilities outside the building as they relate to school matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supports District and building level regulations and policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participates in professional growth activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tolerates stress effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Proficiency Report

Compiled from information in summative evaluation data file.

REPORT FOR EVALUATOR * 1       J. C. Cooper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>CRITERION DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>AVG. STD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>RTG. DEV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotes a positive school climate.</td>
<td>0 0 3 2</td>
<td>3.4 .55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment.</td>
<td>0 0 4 1</td>
<td>3.2 .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for appropriate curricular development.</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tolerates stress effectively</td>
<td>0 0 5 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participates in professional growth activities.</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supports District and building level regulations and policies.</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assumes responsibilities outside the building as they relate to school matters.</td>
<td>0 0 5 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates professional responsibility.</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with parents and community.</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manages fiscal resources carefully and consistently.</td>
<td>0 0 4 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for staff development.</td>
<td>0 0 5 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides leadership for positive educational changes.</td>
<td>0 0 5 0</td>
<td>3.0 .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies.</td>
<td>1 0 3 1</td>
<td>2.8 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.</td>
<td>1 0 4 0</td>
<td>2.6 .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for instructional management.</td>
<td>1 2 2 0</td>
<td>2.2 .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides direction for the school.</td>
<td>1 2 2 0</td>
<td>2.2 .84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Development Report

Compiled from information in summative evaluation data file.

COMPOSITE REPORT - ALL BUILDINGS AND ALL EVALUATORS COMBINED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>CRITERION DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for instructional management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tolerates stress effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides direction for the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with parents and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participates in professional growth activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assumes responsibilities outside the building as they relate to school matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrates professional responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides leadership for positive educational changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with the District Administration and Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supports District and building level regulations and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for appropriate curricular development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides for staff development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotes a positive school climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manages fiscal resources carefully and consistently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Computer Assisted Teacher Evaluation / Supervision (CATE/S)

**Date:** 6-4-1991. **TIME:** 7:37.

**Summative Evaluation Report**

**NAME:** Margaret Atwood  
**ID:** 20  
**SER DATE:** 3—1—91

**EVALUATOR:** J. M. Mundy.  
**ID:** 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides direction for the school.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides for instructional management.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 3</td>
<td>Provides for appropriate curricular development.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provides leadership for positive educational changes.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provides for staff development.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 7</td>
<td>Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Manages fiscal resources carefully and consistently.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 10</td>
<td>Promotes a positive school climate.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with the District Administration and Board of Education.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with parents and community.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Demonstrates professional responsibility.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Assumes responsibilities outside the building as they relate to school matters.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Supports District and building level regulations and policies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Participates in professional growth activities.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tolerates stress effectively.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composite rating is 3.**

Ratings for criteria marked with a "*" are below standard; Professional Improvement Commitments will be assigned for these criteria.

**Comments:**
Summative Evaluation Report

NAME: Margaret Atwood  ID: 20  SER DATE: 3--1--91

Recommended Professional Improvement Commitments.

AREA # 1. Instructional Leader
CRITERION # 3. Provides for appropriate curricular development.
PIC: During April and May the principal will assign faculty and staff to positions as evidenced by a review of the assignments.
Manual: 
Compendium:

AREA # 2. Organizational Management
CRITERION # 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.
PIC: Throughout the year the principal will assess the performance of classified staff as evidenced by a log of activities.
Manual: 
Compendium:
PIC: During August the principal will develop a plan to provide for the safety of students and personnel as evidenced by the plan.
Manual: 
Compendium:
PIC: Throughout the year the principal will delegate appropriate responsibilities to staff as evidenced by a log and artifacts of the process.
Manual: 
Compendium:
PIC: Throughout the year the principal will provide administrative procedures for building operations as evidenced by artifacts of the process.
Manual: 
Compendium:
PIC: During August and September the principal will communicate clear procedures for student management to faculty, students, and parents as evidenced by artifacts of the process.
Manual: 
Compendium:
PIC: During May and June the principal will schedule programs, space, and staff as evidenced by the schedule.
Manual: 
Compendium:
PIC: During the spring semester the principal will develop short and long range plans that support the educational goals of the building and the District as measured by the plans.
Manual: 
Compendium:
Recommended Professional Improvement Commitments.

PIC: Throughout the year the principal will supervise the performances of classified staff as evidenced by artifacts of the process.
Manual:  
Compendium:  

AREA # 2 Organization Management  
CRITERION # 10. Promotes a positive school climate.  
PIC: The principal will exhibit positive reinforcement of student effort on an individual basis during the next semester as evidenced in a log of activities.  
Manual:  
Compendium:  

PIC: Throughout the year the principal will promote pride for the school as evidenced by a summary of the process.  
Manual:  
Compendium:  

PIC: Throughout the year the principal will develop an orientation packet for students about the multi-cultural nature of the school as evidenced by artifacts of the process.  
Manual:  
Compendium:  

PIC: During the first two months of school the principal will establish a plan which encourages collegial relationships among staff as evidenced by a log developed throughout the process.  
Manual:  
Compendium:  

PIC: The principal will use positive reinforcement with teachers throughout the year as evidenced by feedback from staff.  
Manual:  
Compendium:  

PIC: During the next year the principal will establish a process which promotes a positive school climate as evidenced by a review of the process with the evaluator.  
Manual:  
Compendium:  

PIC: Throughout the next year the principal will administer a plan for student discipline, in accordance with District policy, as evidenced by a review of the plan and the activities.  
Manual:  
Compendium:  

17 Professional Improvement Commitments were assigned.
APPENDIX I.
COMPENDIUM OF PROFESSIONAL PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITMENTS
A COMPENDIUM OF
VALIDATED
PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT COMMITMENTS
FOR
PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

Copyright© Rosemary D. Noel, 1991. All rights reserved.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of evaluation is the improvement of performance with improved instructional delivery as the broad goal. As in any school reform effort, increased student achievement is the targeted measurable outcome.

The intent of developing this Compendium is to provide principals and supervisors strategies which can be adapted to meet the needs of local school districts. Compiled for use either with the CATE/S software package or as an independent guide, the Compendium is based upon educational research.

Intended for cooperative use by the supervisor and evaluatee, the Professional Improvement Commitment (PIC) is designed to assist in improvement of performance during the next evaluation cycle. The Compendium of PICs can be used in the case of a principal who exhibits exemplary behaviors and wishes to enhance performance, or with a principal who demonstrates obvious need for improvement. The PIC, in conjunction with accompanying procedures, serves as a suggested plan to be adapted to meet a specific need of the individual principal. The PICs are referenced to sources which can be used in a practical sense to assist in planning to meet the selected objective. In case of an instance which is not met by a PIC, a blank form is provided at the end of the guide, intended to be adapted by the supervisor and principal in building a PIC to fit the particular situation.

Credit is given to the authors of the original Compendiums which this work replicated. *A Compendium of Validated Professional Improvement Commitments* (1985) by Stow, Manatt, Mitchell, & Hawana, and *Volume Two: A Compendium of Validated Professional Improvement Commitments* (1987) by Stow, Manatt, Peterson, Semones, & Stevenson were developed to accompany the CATE/S system for teacher evaluation. For this endeavor, which was intent upon improvement of principal performance, the format of the original compendiums was adopted, as well as definitions of the elements included on the PIC pages, which were taken practically word-for-word from *Volume Two.*
Each PIC includes these elements:

**AREA:** This is a grouping of behaviors.

**CRITERION:** A criterion is a specific teacher behavior.

**_DESCRIPTOR:** A subset of the specific teacher behavior is a descriptor which is the focus of the PIC.

**PIC:** This statement expresses the intent in specific, measurable language.

**PROCEDURES:** A plan-of-action has been identified which sequences how the PIC can be accomplished.

**TIMELINE:** The accomplishment of each step in the plan-of-action is placed in terms of weeks, months, or other time segments of the school year.

**MONITORING:** The element used to determine "How is it going?" [Decide the form that monitoring should take (formal or informal observations, work samples, etc.) and who should do the monitoring (supervisor, assistant superintendent, superintendent, etc.).]

**EVIDENCE:** Documentation which indicates that the PIC was accomplished.

**STANDARD:** The standard becomes the model for determining "how well" the PIC was accomplished.

**APPRAISAL METHOD:**

This element consists of comparing the evidence with the standard. A fair and objective judgement cannot be made if specifics are lacking in either the evidence or the standard.

**INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:**

The terms "fully," "partially," or "not accomplished" are used to indicate how well the PIC was accomplished.

**RESEARCH EVIDENCE:**

Specific references are noted liking the PICs to research found through a review of literature.
LIST OF AREAS, CRITERIA, AND PICS INCLUDED IN THE COMPENDIUM

AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 1. Provides direction for the school.

PIC #1 During faculty orientation, the principal will facilitate the identification and development of written building goal(s) as evidenced by the written goals and minutes from meetings.

PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will communicate to various publics the building's shared vision as evidenced by a log of communication and artifacts of the process.

PIC #3 Throughout the year the principal will communicate to staff members high expectations for student academic performance as evidenced by a log of communication and artifacts of the process.

CRITERION 2. Provides for instructional management.

PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will monitor implementation of the district instructional goals and objectives as evidenced by a log of activities and a plan for monitoring.

PIC #2 During the first quarter the principal will organize the teachers to monitor continuity of implementation of curricular goals and objectives, both between and among grade levels, as evidenced by a summary of activities.

PIC #3 During the next year the principal will monitor the implementation of curriculum based on student achievement data as evidenced by a log of activities.

PIC #4 Throughout the year the principal will ensure that instructional time is protected as evidenced by a log of activities.
CRITERION 3. Provides for appropriate curricular development.

PIC #1 During the spring semester the principal will facilitate the updating of present curricular offerings as evidenced by a log of activities and artifacts.

PIC #2 During April and May the principal will assign faculty and staff to positions as evidenced by a review of assignments.

CRITERION 4. Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies.

PIC #1 Throughout the school year the principal will evaluate the performance of teachers as evidenced by completion of the District evaluation process.

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will model effective teaching strategies as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PIC #3 During the next year the principal will promote professional and personal growth in individual teachers as evidenced by individual growth plans.

CRITERION 5. Provides leadership for positive educational changes.

PIC #1 During the next year the principal will establish a systematic process for program change as evidenced by findings of the process.

PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will facilitate program changes as evidenced by a summary of the changes.

PIC #3 During the year the principal will assist in developing a program of global education as evidenced by artifacts of the program.
CRITERION 6. Provides for staff development.

PIC #1 During the next year the principal will develop a plan for staff development in order to address instructional needs as evidenced by the plan.

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will develop a staff development plan to create current, effective educational practices as evidenced by the plan.

AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

PIC #1 During the spring semester the principal will develop short and long range plans that support the educational goals of the building and the District as evidenced by the plans.

PIC #2 During May and June the principal will schedule programs, space, and staff, as evidenced by the schedule.

PIC #3 During August and September the principal will communicate clear procedures for student management to faculty, students, and parents as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PIC #4 Throughout the year the principal will provide administrative procedures for building operations as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PIC #5 Throughout the year the principal will delegate appropriate responsibilities to staff as evidenced by a log of assignments.

PIC #6 During August the principal will develop a plan to provide for the safety of students and personnel as evidenced by the plan.
Throughout the year the principal will supervise the performances of members of classified staff as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

Throughout the year the principal will evaluate the performance of classified staff as evidenced by artifacts of completion of the components of the District evaluation process.

Throughout the year the principal will use effective problem-solving techniques in accordance with district policy as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

CRITERION 8. Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment.

The principal will monitor custodial operations throughout the year as evidenced by a log of activities.

Throughout the year the principal will report the need for facility repairs in accordance with district procedures as evidenced by the reports.

CRITERION 9. Manages fiscal resources carefully and consistently.

During the next year the principal will establish a system of fiscal management as evidenced by artifacts of the system.

CRITERION 10. Promotes a positive school climate.

During the next year the principal will establish a process which promotes a positive school climate as evidenced by a discussion with the evaluator.

During the next year the principal will implement a plan that provides for an atmosphere of cooperation, mutual trust, and positive staff morale as evidenced by a summary of the implementation process.
PIC #3  The principal will provide positive reinforcement to teachers for their efforts and accomplishments throughout the year as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PIC #4  During September and October the principal will establish a plan which encourages collegial relationships among staff members as evidenced by the plan.

PIC #5  Throughout the year the principal will implement a system which focuses pride for the school as evidenced by a summary of the process.

PIC #6  Throughout the year the principal will develop an orientation packet for students about the multicultural nature of the school as evidenced by the packet.

AREA III.  INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 11.  Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.

PIC #1  During the first week of the semester, the principal will clearly communicate behavioral expectations for students as evidenced by a review of activities.

PIC #2  Throughout the next year the principal will implement a plan for student discipline, in accordance with district policy, as evidenced by a record of implementing the plan.

PIC #3  The principal will exhibit positive reinforcement of student effort on an individual basis during the next semester as evidenced in a log of activities.

CRITERION 12.  Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.

PIC #1  During staff orientation, the principal will develop a plan for communicating expectations of the staff, as evidenced by a list of activities.
PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will provide positive reinforcement to the staff for their efforts as evidenced by a record of activities.

PIC #3 During the next year the principal will create opportunities for effective communication with members of staff as demonstrated by a record of interactions.

PIC #4 During the next year the principal will attend a series of conflict management workshops as evidenced by a summary of the sessions.

CRITERION 13. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with Board of Education, District and Building Administration.

PIC #1 Throughout the school year the principal will comply with Board policies and regulations as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

CRITERION 14. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with parents and community.

PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will promote parent and community participation in school activities as evidenced by a log of participation.

PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will inform parents and community regarding school related activities as evidenced by a log of communications.

PIC #3 Throughout the academic year, the principal will involve parents in resolving student problems, as evidenced by a log and artifacts of the process.

PIC #4 Throughout the year the principal will attend community meetings that are relevant to the position, as evidenced by a calendar and summary of meetings attended.
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 15. Demonstrates professional responsibility.
PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will complete duties in accordance with the job description as measured by a summary of activities.

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will communicate identified practices of confidentiality throughout the building as measured by a log of practices.

CRITERION 16. Assumes responsibilities outside the building as they relate to school matters.
PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will assume responsibilities for the supervision of off-campus student functions as evidenced by a calendar of events.

CRITERION 17. Supports District and building level regulations and policies.
PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will communicate District and building-level regulations and policies to members of staff as evidenced by a summary of staff meetings.

CRITERION 18. Participates in professional growth activities.
PIC #1 During the next year the principal will participate in professional activities (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, courses) for professional growth as evidenced by a summary of sessions.

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will compile an annotated bibliography of professional readings that pertain to instructional leadership as evidenced by the bibliography.

PIC #3 During the next year the principal will make professional presentations for civic and/or professional organizations as evidenced by a summary of activities.

PIC #1 Throughout the next year the principal will improve physical and mental health by enrolling and participating in a wellness program as evidenced by a record of activities.

PIC #2 Throughout the next year the principal will develop and implement a plan to maintain sound mental health as evidenced by a record of activities.

PIC #3 Throughout the next year the principal will develop and implement a plan to maintain sound physical health as evidenced by a record of activities.

PIC #4 The principal will attend a series of time management workshops during the next year as evidenced by a summary of the sessions.

PIC #5 The principal will attend a series of conflict management workshops during the next year as evidenced by a summary of the sessions.
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 1. Provides direction for the school.
(I.1.01)

PIC #1 During faculty orientation, the principal will facilitate the identification and development of written building goal(s) as evidenced by the written goals and minutes from meetings.

PROCEDURES:
1. Establish a representative building advisory stakeholders committee.
2. Schedule meetings.
3. Collect input from others.
4. Identify goal setting process.
5. Conduct meetings to discuss goals.
6. Summarize the meetings in writing.
7. Develop the goal(s).
8. Review written goal(s) and minutes from meetings with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The written goals and minutes from meetings.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the written goals and minutes with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Cook, 1990
• Lindelow & Heynderickx, 1989, pp. 291-314
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 1. Provides direction for the school.
(1.1.02)

PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will communicate to various publics the building's shared-vision as evidenced by a log of communication and artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Create techniques to use for communicating the vision.
2. Review the techniques with the evaluator.
3. Communicate the vision with various publics.
4. Log the techniques used.
5. Review the log and artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of communication and artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log of communication and artifacts of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Armistead, 1982
- Coursen & Thomas, 1989, pp. 252-288
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 1. Provides direction for the school.
(I.1.03)

PIC #3 Throughout the year the principal will communicate to staff members high expectations for student academic performance as evidenced by a log of communication and artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Define high expectations for student academic performance.
2. Solicit input from staff.
3. Develop a written statement of high expectations for student academic performance.
4. Post statement in all classrooms and other prominent places.
5. Compile log of communication and file artifacts.
6. Review log and artifacts with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of communication and artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log of communication and artifacts of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:  
- Manatt & Stow, 1984, p.36
- Bossow, 1990, pp. 5-7
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 2. Provides for instructional management.
(I.2.01)

PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will monitor implementation of the district instructional goals and objectives as evidenced by a log of activities and a plan for monitoring.

PROCEDURES:
1. Develop a plan for monitoring the implementation of instructional goals and objectives.
2. Communicate monitoring plan.
3. Compile log and file the plan.
4. Review log and plan with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of activities and a plan for monitoring.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log of activities and plan for monitoring with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE
- Doll, 1986, pp. 257-61
- English, 1987, pp.157-178
- Loucks & Lieberman, 1983
AREA I.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 2. Provides for instructional management.

PIC #2

During the first quarter the principal will organize the teachers to monitor continuity of implementation of curricular goals and objectives, both between and among grade levels, as evidenced by a summary of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Meet and review curricular goals and objectives with curriculum director.
2. Conduct grade level or inter-cross grade team meetings to discuss curricular goals and objectives.
3. Organize teachers for the monitoring process.
4. Implement the monitoring process.
5. Summarize the activities.
6. Discuss summary with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   - District policy
   - Building procedure
   - Research-based model
   - Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the summary with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   - Fully
   - Partially
   - Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
   - Doll, 1986, pp.154-62
   - English, 1987
   - Glatthorn & Spencer, 1986
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 2. Provides for instructional management.

PIC #3 During the next year the principal will monitor the implementation of curriculum based on student achievement data as evidenced by a log of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify types of data to use.
2. Gather data and analyze data.
3. Share results of the analysis with the staff.
4. Construct plan and schedule of monitoring activities.
5. Review plan and schedule with the evaluator.
6. Implement plan.
7. Compile the log of activities.
8. Review the log with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Doll, 1986, pp. 218-261
- English, 1987, pp. 75-82
- Loucks & Lieberman, 1983
AREA I.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 2. Provides for instructional management.

PIC #4 Throughout the year the principal will ensure that instructional time is protected as evidenced by a log of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Gather data for baseline.
2. Organize time equity committee.
3. Develop a plan for protecting instructional time.
4. Implement plan.
5. Compile log of activities.
5. Discuss the log with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Lindelow, Mazzerella, Scott, Ellis, & Smith, 1989, p. 207
- Manatt & Stow, 1984, pp.33-4
- Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, 1981, pp.2-5
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 3. Provides for appropriate curricular development.
   (I.3.01)

PIC #1 During the spring semester the principal will facilitate updating of the present curricular offerings as evidenced by a log of activities and artifacts.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify a planning team.
2. Define the process used to gather data.
3. Gather data.
4. Analyze data.
5. Use data to update curricular offerings.
6. Publish curricular offerings.
7. Review the log and artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of activities and artifacts.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the a log of activities and artifacts with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Doll, 1986, pp.123-172
   • Glatthorn & Spencer, 1986
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 3. Provides for appropriate curricular development.

PIC #2 During April and May the principal will assign faculty and staff to positions as evidenced by a review of assignments.

PROCEDURES:
1. Gather faculty and staff input.
2. Review hiring options.
3. Review and match programs and available faculty and staff.
4. Review steps 1, 2, and 3 with the evaluator.
5. Assign faculty and staff.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The review of assignments.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the assignments with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Seyfarth, 1991, pp. 72-75
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 4. Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies. (I.4.01)

PIC #1 Throughout the school year, the principal will evaluate the performance of teachers as evidenced by completion of the District evaluation process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review the District teacher evaluation model with the evaluator.
2. Review the district model and procedures with teachers during orientation.
3. Construct a calendar of evaluation tasks to be performed.
4. Schedule the formative components with teachers.
5. Gather data as scheduled.
6. Execute components.
7. Provide feedback to teachers.
8. Review completed components of the evaluation process with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The completion of the District evaluation process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the completion of the evaluation process with the District standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Manatt & Stow, 1984
- School Improvement Model, 1990
- Seyfarth, 1991, pp. 205-218
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 4. Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies.

(1.4.02)

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will model effective teaching strategies as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify teachers who will be involved.
2. Develop a plan for teaching the strategies.
3. Develop a schedule with the teachers.
4. Teach the classes.
5. Request feedback from students in the classes.
6. File artifacts.
7. Review artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the artifacts of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Hord, 1988
- School Improvement Model, 1990
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 4. Provides for improvement of instruction through the use of performance-based evaluation strategies.

PIC #3 During the next year the principal will promote professional and personal growth in individual teachers as evidenced by individual growth plans.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify potential growth area(s) with individual teachers.
2. Develop the individual growth plans.
3. Monitor the implementation of growth plans.
4. Assess the growth plan cooperatively with individual teachers.
5. Review completed individual growth plans with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)
MONITORING: (See Introduction)
EVIDENCE: The list of individual growth plans.
STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)
APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the individual growth plans with the standard.
INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished
RESEARCH EVIDENCE:  
   • Huling-Austin, Odell, Ishler, Kay, & Edelfelt, 1989
   • Manatt & Stow, 1984
   • Stow, 1985
   • Stow et al., 1985, 1987
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 5. Provides leadership for positive educational changes.
(I.5.01)

PIC #1 During the next year the principal will establish a systematic process for program change as evidenced by findings of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review the shared vision.
2. Identify the focus areas.
3. Develop a process to monitor the focus areas.
4. Monitor the focus areas.
5. Identify the area(s) that need changing.
6. Share findings with the evaluator.

TIMELINE:PIC(See Introduction)
MONITORING:PIC(See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The findings of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the findings of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
• Gorton, 1987, pp. 136-156
• Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991
• Hord, Rutherford, & Huling-Austin, 1987
• Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990, pp. 133-151
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 5. Provides leadership for positive educational changes.
(I.5.02)

PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will facilitate program changes as evidenced by a summary of the changes.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review the research about facilitating change.
2. Gather student achievement data.
3. Disaggregate and analyze data.
4. Disseminate findings about student achievement to staff.
5. Develop a plan with staff for changing programs.
6. Implement the plan.
7. Monitor the implementation and summarize the findings.
8. Review the summary with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of the changes.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the summary of the changes.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990, pp. 133-151
• Loucks-Horsley & Hergert, 1985
AREA I.

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 5. Provides leadership for positive educational changes.
(I.5.03)

PIC #3 During the year the principal will assist in developing a program of
global education as evidenced by artifacts of the program.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review the literature on global education.
2. Identify a committee of teachers who will develop the program.
3. Meet to discuss the components of the global education program.
4. Request consultants about multi-cultural and non-sexist issues to meet with the
   committee.
5. Develop the global education program.
6. Share artifacts of the program with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the program.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
    District policy
    Building procedure
    Research-based model
    Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the artifacts of the program with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
    Fully
    Partially
    Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Boston, 1991
                     • Anderson, 1991
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 6. Provides for staff development. (I.6.01)

PIC #1 During the next year the principal will develop a plan for staff development in order to address instructional needs as evidenced by the plan.

PROCEDURES:
1. Establish building advisory committee.
2. Administer needs assessment.
3. Compile the results of the needs assessment.
4. Discuss the results with the committee.
5. Develop the plan.
6. Review the plan with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The plan.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the plan with the standard.

INdICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Brandt, R., 1987
- DeRoche, 1985, pp. 147-166
- Dutweiler, 1989
- Joyce & Showers, 1983
AREA I. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

CRITERION 6. Provides for staff development.
(1.6.02)

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will develop a staff development plan to create current, effective educational practices as evidenced by the plan.

PROCEDURES:
1. Establish building advisory committee.
2. Identify relevant new developments and innovative strategies.
3. Share developments and strategies with the committee.
4. Promote sharing of ideas among staff members.
5. Develop the plan.
6. Review the plan with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The plan

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the plan with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Duttweiler, 1989
• Joyce & Showers, 1983
• Brandt, 1987
AREA II.  ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7.  Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

   (II.7.01)

PIC #1  During the spring semester the principal will develop short and long range plans that support the educational goals of the building and the District, as evidenced by the plans.

PROCEDURES:
   1. Identify members of a representative planning committee.
   2. Review the educational goals.
   3. Select a planning model.
   4. Develop the plans.
   5. Review the plans with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The plans.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the plans with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:  • Nebgen, 1990
                      • Cook, 1990
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

(II.7.02)

PIC #2 During May and June the principal will schedule programs, space, and staff, as evidenced by the schedule.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify programs that require space allocations.
2. Identify projected student enrollment.
3. Identify available space and staff.
4. Generate a list of alternatives.
5. Develop the schedule which includes staff and space assignments.
6. Review schedule with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The schedule.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the schedule with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Hughes & Ubben, 1989, pp.203-16
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

(PIC #3)
During August and September the principal will communicate clear procedures for student management to faculty, students, and parents as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify representative council.
2. Review procedures and make changes as necessary.
3. Develop student management procedures.
4. Present them during first student assembly.
5. Communicate procedures in handbooks and newsletters.
6. Review student management with evaluator.
7. File artifacts.
8. Review artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)
MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the artifacts of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

• Albert, 1989
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

(II.7.04)

PIC #4 Throughout the year the principal will provide administrative procedures for building operations as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review existing administrative procedures.
2. Develop additional administrative procedures, if necessary.
3. Include written procedures in staff handbooks.
4. Discuss procedures at staff meetings.
5. File artifacts.
6. Review artifacts with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal M ETHOD: Compare the artifacts of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

(II.7.05)

PIC #5 Throughout the year the principal will delegate appropriate responsibilities to staff as evidenced by a log of assignments.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify individual strengths and weaknesses of members of staff.
2. Establish a procedure for assigning responsibility.
3. Communicate responsibilities to staff.
4. Compile log of assignments.
4. Review log with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of the assignments.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the log of the assignments with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • DeRoche, 1987
                   • Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7 Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

(PIC #6)

During August the principal will develop a plan to provide for the safety of students and personnel as evidenced by the plan.

PROCEDURES:
1. Establish committee to review safety concerns.
2. Identify hazardous equipment or facilities.
3. Develop the plan.
4. Review plan with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The plan.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the plan with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Blauvelt, 1981
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

(PIC #7)

Throughout the year the principal will supervise the performances of members of classified staff as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review district job descriptions with classified staff as a group.
2. Discuss job descriptions with individuals.
3. Adjust assignments, work loads, and schedules as necessary.
4. Schedule and execute steps in the District evaluation system.
5. File artifacts of the process.
6. Review artifacts with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the artifacts of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • DeRoche, 1987
ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.

(II.7.08)

PIC #8 Throughout the year the principal will evaluate the performance of classified staff as evidenced by artifacts of completion of the components of the District evaluation process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review the District's evaluation procedures with members of classified staff.
2. Schedule the evaluation steps with classified staff.
3. Execute the evaluation procedures.
4. Gather data as scheduled.
5. Gather artifacts of completion of the components of the process.
6. Review artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: Artifacts of completed components of the District's evaluation process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare artifacts with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Stow, 1985
- DeRoche, 1987
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 7. Provides for the effective and efficient day-by-day operation of the school.
(II.7.09)

PIC #9 Throughout the year the principal will use effective problem-solving techniques in accordance with district policy as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review and discuss district policy with the evaluator.
2. Develop a plan of strategies for improving problem-solving techniques.
3. Review the plan with the evaluator.
4. Implement the plan.
5. Compile artifacts of the process.
6. Review artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the artifacts of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Gorton, 1987, pp 1-27
- Molnar & Lindquist, 1989, pp. 160-71
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 8. Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment.

(PIC #1) The principal will monitor custodial operations throughout the year as evidenced by a log of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review responsibilities of custodians as indicated in job descriptions.
2. Establish procedures with staff for reviewing custodial services.
4. Provide periodic evaluative feedback to individuals.
5. Compile log of activities.
6. Review log with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Hughes & Ubben, 1989, pp. 326-27
   • Lindelow, Mazzerella, Scott, Ellis, & Smith, 1989, pp. 189-207
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 8. Ensures that the school plant and facilities are conducive to a positive learning environment.  
(II.8.02)

PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will report the need for facility repairs in accordance with district procedures as evidenced by the reports.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review procedure for reporting needed repairs the evaluator.
2. Assess building for repairs.
3. Report and/or assign repairs according to district procedures.
4. Establish follow-up procedure for reporting completion of repairs.
5. Review reports with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The reports.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the reports with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Hughes & Ubben, 317-35
ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 9. (II.9.01)
Manages fiscal resources carefully and consistently.

PIC #1 During the next year the principal will establish a system of fiscal management as evidenced by artifacts of the system.

PROCEDURES:
1. Establish a building advisory committee to discuss and advise concerning budget considerations.
2. Develop a system of fiscal management.
3. Collect artifacts of the management system.
4. Review artifacts of the system with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the system.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the artifacts of the system with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Hymes, 1982
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 10. Promotes a positive school climate.
(II.10.01)

PIC #1 During the next year the principal will establish a process which promotes a positive school climate as evidenced by a discussion with the evaluator.

PROCEDURES:
1. Establish a building advisory committee to develop a process which promotes positive school climate.
2. Implement the process.
3. Evaluate the process.
4. Discuss the process and the evaluation of it with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The discussion with the evaluator.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the discussion with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Andrew, Park, and Nelson, 1985
- Sweeney, 1988
- Lindelow, Mazzerella, Scott, Ellis, & Smith, 1989, pp. 204-207
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 10. Promotes a positive school climate.
   (II.10.02)

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will implement a plan that provides for
an atmosphere of cooperation, mutual trust, and positive staff morale as
evidenced by a summary of the implementation process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review the literature pertaining to school climate.
2. Summarize the highlights.
3. Develop a plan which provides for an atmosphere of cooperation, mutual trust, and
positive staff morale.
4. Discuss the plan with the evaluator.
5. Implement the plan.
6. Summarize the implementation process.
7. Share the summary with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of the implementation process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare a summary of the implementation process with the
standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Andrew, Park, and Nelson, 1985
   • Johnson & Johnson, 1989
   • Lindelow, Mazzerella, Scott, Ellis, & Smith, 1989,
     pp. 204-207
   • Sweeney, 1988
ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 10
(II.10.03)

PIC #3

Promotes a positive school climate.
The principal will provide positive reinforcement to teachers for their efforts and accomplishments throughout the year as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
CELEBRATE SUCCESSES!
1. Review the literature pertaining to positive reinforcement.
2. Create a plan for using positive reinforcement.
3. Review the plan with the evaluator.
4. Implement the plan.
5. Seek feedback from staff about the implementation.
6. Compile artifacts of the process.
7. Review the artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the artifacts with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Adams & Bailey, 1989
- Lindelow, Mazzerella, Scott, Ellis & Smith, 1989, pp. 189-207
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 10. Promotes a positive school climate.

(II.10.04)

PIC #4 During September and October the principal will establish a plan which encourages collegial relationships among staff members as evidenced by the plan.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify needs of staff in regard to collegial relationships. Appoint committee to plan social interactions among staff.
2. Study these needs.
3. Develop a plan based on the needs.
4. Review the plan with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The plan.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the plan with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Andrew, Park, and Nelson, 1985
- Johnson & Johnson, 1989
- Lindelow, Mazzerella, Scott, Ellis, & Smith, 1989, pp. 204-207
- Sweeney, 1988
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 10. Promotes a positive school climate.
   (II.10.05)

PIC #5 Throughout the year the principal will implement a system which focuses pride for the school as evidenced by a summary of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Collect, analyze, and utilize input from staff members, students, and parents.
2. Develop a system.
3. Discuss the system with the evaluator.
4. Implement the system.
5. Summarize the implementation process.
6. Share the summary with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the summary of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Sweeney, 1988
AREA II. ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

CRITERION 10. Promotes a positive school climate.
(II.10.06)

PIC #6 Throughout the year the principal will develop an orientation packet for students about the multicultural nature of the school as evidenced by the packet.

PROCEDURES:
1. Prepare a list of relevant issues about the multicultural nature of the school.
2. Discuss the list with the evaluator.
3. Share the list with staff members.
4. Develop the orientation packet.
5. Share the packet with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The packet.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the packet with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Anderson, 1991
- Boston, 1991
- Gollnick & Chinn, 1986
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 11. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.
(III.11.01)

PIC #1 During the first week of the semester, the principal will clearly communicate behavioral expectations for students as evidenced by a review of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify behavioral expectations for students.
2. Review expectations with students verbally (e.g., assemblies).
3. Post expectations in the classrooms.
4. State expectations in writing (e.g., student handbook, newsletters).
5. Discuss the activities with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The review of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the review of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Albert, 1989
• Glasser, 1986
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 11. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.  
(III.11.02)

PIC #2 Throughout the next year the principal will implement a plan for student discipline, in accordance with district policy, as evidenced by a record of implementing the plan.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review present disciplinary procedures.
2. Develop a plan for student discipline.
3. Discuss the plan with staff and students.
4. Implement the plan.
5. Monitor the implementation of the plan and record progress.
6. Compile record of implementation.
7. Review the record with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The record of implementing the plan.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the record of implementing the plan with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Albert, 1989
- Canter, 1976
- Glasser, 1986
- Molnar & Lindquist, 1989
- National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1983
AREA III.  INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 11. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students.
(III.11.03)

PIC #3 The principal will exhibit positive reinforcement of student effort on an individual basis during the next semester as evidenced in a log of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review positive reinforcement techniques.
2. Identify those which will be used.
3. Implement positive reinforcement activities.
4. Compile log of activities.
5. Review log with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the log of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:  
- Albert, 1989
- Glasser, 1986
- Manatt & Stow, 1984, pp. 59-60
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 11. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with students. (III.11.04)

PIC #4 Throughout the year the principal will create opportunities for effective communication with students as evidenced by a record of interactions.

PROCEDURES:
1. Assess students' attitudes about the school.
2. Analyze findings.
3. Develop a plan to create opportunities for interaction with members of staff.
4. Review plan with the evaluator.
5. Implement the plan.
6. Record topics and times of interactions.
7. Review record with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The record of interactions.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the record of interactions.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
• Glasser, 1990, pp. 134-160
• Guild & Garger, 1985
• Manatt & Stow, 1984
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 12. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.
(III.12.01)

PIC #1 During staff orientation, the principal will develop a plan for communicating expectations of the staff, as evidenced by a list of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify expectations of the staff.
2. Develop a plan for communicating these expectations to members of the staff.
3. Review the plan with the evaluator.
4. Implement the plan.
5. Compile the list of activities.
6. Review the list with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)
MONITORING: (See Introduction)
EVIDENCE: The list of activities.
STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)
APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare list of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Andrew, Parks, & Nelson, 1985
   • Gorton, 1987, pp. 33-41
   • Smith & Andrews, 1989, pp. 46-49
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 12. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.
   (III.12.02)

PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will provide positive reinforcement to
the staff for their efforts as evidenced by a record of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review the literature pertaining to positive reinforcement.
2. Identify techniques and strategies to use with staff.
3. Review the strategies with the evaluator.
4. Record activities in which the techniques and strategies are used.
5. Review the record with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The record of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the record of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Andrew, Parks, & Nelson, 1985
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 12. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.
   (III.12.03)

PIC #3 During the next year the principal will create opportunities for effective
communication with members of staff as demonstrated by a record of
interactions.

PROCEDURES:
1. Assess staff attitudes about the school.
2. Analyze findings.
3. Develop a plan to create opportunities for interaction with members of staff.
4. Implement the plan.
5. Record topics and times of interactions.
6. Review record with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The record of interactions.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the record of interactions with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Andrew, Parks, & Nelson, 1985
   • Bozik, 1989
   • Haynes, 1988
   • Guild & Garger, 1985, pp. 16-25
   • Smith & Andrews, 1989, pp.46-7
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 12. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relations with staff.
(III.12.04)

PIC #4 During the next year the principal will attend a series of conflict management workshops as evidenced by a summary of the sessions.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review workshop options.
2. Identify the program which meets the principal's needs.
3. Enroll in the workshop series.
4. Summarize each session.
5. Discuss summary of the sessions with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of the sessions.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare summary of the sessions with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Gorton, 1987, pp. 95-116
- Lindelow & Scott, 1989, pp. 338-55
- Seyfarth, 1991, pp. 263-286
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 13. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with Board of Education, District and Building Administration.

(III.13.01)

PIC #1 Throughout the school year the principal will comply with Board policies and regulations as evidenced by artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review Board policies and regulations with the evaluator.
2. Develop plan for compliance.
3. Review plan with the evaluator.
4. Implement the plan.
5. Compile artifacts of the process.
6. Review artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the artifacts of the process with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
• Coursen & Thomas, 1989, pp. 287-8
• Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990, pp. 71-88
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 14. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with parents and community.
(III.14.01)

PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will promote parent and community participation in school activities as evidenced by a log of participation.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review Board policy concerning public relations.
2. Determine current level of participation by using a survey instrument.
3. Analyze and communicate survey results.
4. Develop a plan for parent and community involvement.
5. Execute the plan.
6. Compile a log of participation.
7. Review the log with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)
MONITORING: (See Introduction)
EVIDENCE: The log of participation.
STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log of participation with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Armistead, 1982, pp. 25-32
- Hunter & Lawrence, 1978
- Kimbrough & Burkett, pp.89-105
- Wayson et al., 1988
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 14. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with parents and community:

(III.14.02)

PIC #2 Throughout the year the principal will inform parents and community regarding school related activities as evidenced by a log of communications.

PROCEDURES:

1. Define procedures for submitting information to school publications and media.
2. Communicate procedures to members of staff.
3. Implement and monitor procedures.
4. Compile the log of communications.
5. Review the log with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of communications.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:

- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:

- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:

- Armistead, 1982
- DeRoche, 1985, pp.167-200
- Gorton, 1987, pp. 33-51
- Wayson et al., 1988
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 14. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with parents and community.

(III.14.03)

PIC #3 Throughout the academic year, the principal will involve parents in resolving student problems as evidenced by a log and artifacts of the process.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review and summarize the literature pertaining to parent involvement.
2. Establish procedures for including parents in resolving student problems.
3. Communicate procedures to teachers, students, and parents.
4. Share the literature summary and procedures with the evaluator.
5. Implement procedures.
6. Compile log and artifacts of the process.
7. Review the log and artifacts with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log and artifacts of the process.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log and artifacts with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Albert, 1989
• Hunter & Lawrence, 1978
AREA III. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

CRITERION 14. Demonstrates positive interpersonal relationships with parents and community.

(III.14.04)

PIC #4 Throughout the year the principal will attend community meetings that are relevant to the position, as evidenced by a calendar and summary of meetings attended.

PROCEDURES:
1. Identify community meetings.
2. Construct calendar of relevant meetings.
3. Attend meetings.
4. Summarize meetings.
5. Review calendar and summary of meetings attended with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The calendar and summary of meetings attended.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the calendar and summary with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • DeRoche, 1985, pp.167-200
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 15. Demonstrates professional responsibility.  
(IV.15.01)

PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will complete duties in accordance with the job description as measured by a summary of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review job performance responsibilities with the evaluator.
2. Implement the performance responsibilities.
3. Summarize the activities in which engaged.
4. Review the summary with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the summary of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Stow, 1985
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Criterion 15. Demonstrates professional responsibility. (IV.15.02)

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will communicate identified practices of confidentiality throughout the building as measured by a log of practices.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review board policy and legal statutes regarding confidentiality.
2. Review the literature to identify appropriate practices.
3. Discuss identified practices with the evaluator.
4. Communicate practices to staff members.
5. Compile log of the practices.
6. Review log with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The log of practices.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the log of practices with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 16. Assumes responsibilities outside the building as they relate to school matters.

(IV.16.01)

PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will assume responsibilities for supervision of off-campus student functions as evidenced by a calendar of events.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review policies regarding supervision of off-campus student functions.
2. Identify off-campus functions.
3. Develop calendar of events.
4. Delegate and monitor supervisory assignments.
5. Review calendar with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The calendar of events.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the calendar of events with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
AREA IV.  PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 17.  Supports District and building level regulations and policies.
   (IV.17.01)

PIC #1 Throughout the year the principal will communicate District and
building-level regulations and policies to members of staff as evidenced
by a summary of staff meetings.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review policies and regulations with the evaluator.
2. Communicate these to staff.
3. Place regulation and policy items on each staff meeting agenda.
4. Compile summary of each meeting.
4. Review summary with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of staff meetings.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the summary of staff meetings with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 18. Participates in professional growth activities.
    (IV.18.01)

PIC #1 During the next year the principal will participate in professional activities (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, courses) for professional growth as evidenced by a summary of sessions.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review options for professional growth.
2. Identify the ones which meet the principal's needs.
3. Construct a schedule of relevant activities to attend.
4. Review the schedule with the evaluator.
5. Enroll and participate in the sessions.
6. Summarize what was learned.
7. Discuss summary of the sessions with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of the sessions.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRASIAL METHOD: Compare the summary with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Toppins, 1990
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 18. Participates in professional growth activities. (IV.18.02)

PIC #2 During the next year the principal will compile an annotated bibliography of professional readings that pertain to instructional leadership as evidenced by the bibliography.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review the literature pertaining to instructional leadership.
2. Decide on relevant and important sources.
3. Discuss the sources with the evaluator.
4. Summarize the relevant readings.
5. Review the bibliography with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)
MONITORING: (See Introduction)
EVIDENCE: The bibliography.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the bibliography with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 18. Participates in professional growth activities.
(IV.18.03)

PIC #3 During the next year the principal will make professional presentations for civic and/or professional organizations as evidenced by a summary of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review presentation opportunities.
2. Choose topics to prepare for presentations.
3. Submit proposals to organizations.
4. Schedule and prepare presentations.
5. Review schedule with the evaluator.
6. Make presentations.
7. Summarize the experiences.
8. Review the summary with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the summary of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Hoff, 1988
- Parachin, 1990
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 19. Tolerates stress effectively
(IV.19.01)

PIC #1 Throughout the next year the principal will improve physical and mental health by enrolling and participating in a wellness program as evidenced by a record of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Consult professional counselor and/or physician, as appropriate.
2. Review wellness program options.
3. Identify wellness program in which to enroll.
4. Participate in program on a regular basis.
5. Record activities attended.
6. Discuss record with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The record of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the record of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Teplitz, 1984
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 19. Tolerates stress effectively
   (IV.19.02)

PIC #2 Throughout the next year the principal will develop and implement a plan to maintain sound mental health as evidenced by a record of activities.

   Procedures:
   1. Consult professional counselor.
   2. Develop a plan for enhancing mental health.
   3. Review plan with evaluator.
   4. Implement plan.
   5. Record the activities in which engaged.
   6. Discuss the record with evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)
MONITORING: (See Introduction)
EVIDENCE: The record of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRaisal METHOD: Compare the record of activities with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
   • Bennis, 1989, pp. 53-71
   • Covey, 1989
   • Dyer, 1989
   • McCurdy, 1983, pp. 92-94
   • Teplitz, 1984, Tape 3
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 19. Tolerates stress effectively
(IV.19.03)

PIC #3 Throughout the next year the principal will develop and implement a plan to maintain sound physical health as evidenced by a record of activities.

PROCEDURES:
1. Consult a physician.
2. Develop a plan for enhancing physical health.
3. Discuss plan with evaluator.
4. Implement plan.
5. Record activities in which engaged.
6. Discuss the record with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The record of activities.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
   District policy
   Building procedure
   Research-based model
   Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the record of activities.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
   Fully
   Partially
   Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: • Teplitz, 1984, Tape 2
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 19. Tolerates stress effectively

PIC #4 The principal will attend a series of time management workshops during the next year as evidenced by a summary of the sessions.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review workshop options.
2. Identify the program which meets the principal's needs.
3. Enroll in the workshop series.
4. Attend the sessions.
5. Summarize each session.
6. Discuss summary of the sessions with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of the sessions.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
- District policy
- Building procedure
- Research-based model
- Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the summary of the sessions with the standard.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
- Fully
- Partially
- Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE:
- Hughes & Ubben, 1989, 417-36
- Gorton, 1987, pp. 95-116
- National Association of Secondary Principals, 1988
- Smith & Andrews, 1989, pp. 135-156
AREA IV. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CRITERION 19. Tolerates stress effectively
(IV.19.05)

PIC #5 The principal will attend a series of conflict management workshops
during the next year as evidenced by a summary of the sessions.

PROCEDURES:
1. Review workshop options.
2. Identify the program which meets the principal's needs.
3. Enroll in the workshop series.
4. Summarize each session.
5. Discuss summary of the sessions with the evaluator.

TIMELINE: (See Introduction)

MONITORING: (See Introduction)

EVIDENCE: The summary of the sessions.

STANDARD: Please check one or more of the following:
District policy
Building procedure
Research-based model
Other (Please specify)

APPRAISAL METHOD: Compare the summary of the sessions.

INDICATORS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT:
Fully
Partially
Not accomplished

RESEARCH EVIDENCE: Gorton, 1987, pp. 95-120
                         Johnson & Johnson, 1988
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CRITERION:
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PROCEDURES:

TIMELINE:
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