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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The last two decades have ushered in a dramatic change in the entire concept of evaluation (Rebore, 1991). Effective evaluation of education personnel has been increasingly emphasized as a key factor in school improvement. The purpose of evaluation is now seen as twofold—to improve instruction and to provide for professional development (Stronge & Helm, 1991). Stronge and Helm (1991) contended that it is evaluation's larger mission to improve programs and services provided to students and other clients. The "systems" approach to management, which has been used extensively by industry, has shifted the emphasis away from the traditional concept of teacher evaluation to the broader concept of employee appraisal management.

Stronge and Helm (1991), considering the implications of the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, have defined evaluation as "...the process of determining the degree to which an employee's or a program's objectives have been achieved in order to improve continually the educational institution's ability to accomplish its mission" (p. 26). Before the organization can determine whether it has accomplished its mission, it must first define its mission, clarify its aims and objectives, and assess the extent to which those objectives have been achieved. Evaluation involves the development of a process that judges worth, measures the degree to which specified tasks are accomplished, or provides assistance in developing new programs or skills (Barber, 1985; DeRoche, 1987; Stronge & Helm, 1991). The Joint Committee on Standards
for Educational Evaluation has identified the basic attributes of sound evaluation of education personnel as: a) propriety standards that require that evaluations be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of the evaluatees and clients of the evaluations; b) utility standards that are intended to guide evaluations so that they will be informative, timely, and influential; c) feasibility standards that call for evaluation systems that are as easy to implement as possible, efficient in their use of time and resources, adequately funded, and viable from a number of other standpoints; and d) accuracy standards that require that the obtained information be technically accurate and that conclusions be linked logically to the data (Cangelosi, 1991; Stronge & Helm, 1991; Stufflebeam & Sanders, 1990).

Even though the systematic evaluation of teachers and professors has received considerable attention in both literature and practice since the 1970's, and the evaluation of administrators (principals and superintendents, primarily) since the early 1980's, very little effort has been devoted to the evaluation of the remaining professionals in education (Stronge & Helm, 1991). Stronge and Helm (1991) suggested that a major reason for this has been the perception by both professional support personnel and their supervisors that the numerous and diverse positions, each with their own numerous and diverse job responsibilities, made evaluation unmanageable. Stronge and Helm stressed, however, that the absence of a model for the evaluation of education support personnel would result in (a) the continuing attempt to force the use of various systems of evaluation, designed for other audiences and for which there is a poor fit, or (b) simply not evaluating these
individuals. Acceptance of either of these options would result in lost opportunities for both the employee and the educational organization. Because of the integral relationship between all employees and because one employee's performance can affect the performance of other employees, all personnel should be evaluated (Rebore, 1991). Organizations seriously committed to enhancing employee performance in the interest of providing better services and programs will demonstrate that commitment with a comprehensive evaluation system.

Statement of the Problem

The need for sound evaluation of education personnel is clear (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1988). In order to educate students effectively and to achieve other related goals, educational institutions must use evaluation to select, retain, develop, and compensate qualified personnel and to manage and facilitate their work. Current accountability and education movements have resulted either in mandates for or voluntary commitments to evaluation plans for all certified educators. Parents and taxpayers have been demanding more accountability at all levels of performance while employees are demanding accountability in the appraisal methods and techniques used in their evaluations. Administrators and supervisors are being asked to defend their evaluations and the procedures they used in making them (Rebore, 1991). Thus, the need for a sound conceptual model of evaluation for professional support personnel.

The problem to be addressed in this case study was whether each of the
following questions, based on theoretical and practical research on evaluating education personnel, could be answered affirmatively when used to develop and implement a performance evaluation system for an intermediate education agency (a service unit primarily funded by federal and state aid payments to ensure equal educational opportunities for children from birth to age 21):

1. Would the Board of Directors commit the time and financial resources that would be necessary for the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system?

2. Would the Board of Directors, evaluators, and evaluatees be able to reach agreement on the purpose of evaluation?

3. Would the development of a performance evaluation system occur collaboratively between evaluators and evaluatees?

4. Would the performance evaluation system address both evaluatee accountability and professional development?

5. Would the performance evaluation system be integrated with a staff development program?

6. Would the performance evaluation system address organizational philosophy and goals?

7. Would the performance evaluation system be congruent with existing board policies?

8. Would the performance evaluation system provide the flexibility needed for use with a variety of positions in one organization?
9. Would all staff receive training on the performance evaluation system?

10. Would all staff have the opportunity to provide feedback on the newly-developed performance evaluation system?

11. Would a variety of evaluation approaches be considered?

12. Would the clinical supervision model be implemented?

13. Would the performance evaluation system include evaluation procedures, with an accompanying timeline and evaluation cycle?

14. Would the performance evaluation system meet the legal protections necessary for evaluators and evaluatees?

15. Would the performance evaluation system meet the guidelines established by the 1988 Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation?

Purpose of the Study

Given the void in the availability of performance evaluation systems for professional support personnel in education, the purpose of this case study was to inductively analyze data obtained via observations, interviews, and written documents to answer specific questions regarding the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system that would be used with all certified and support personnel of an intermediate education agency.
Objectives of the Study

This research study had the following objectives:

1. Determine the functions of the performance evaluation system for an intermediate education agency;
2. Identify job titles for all positions in an intermediate education agency;
3. Identify critical work activities (CWAs) for each position in an intermediate education agency;
4. Develop comparison charts of CWAs in job-alike categories for an intermediate education agency;
5. Cluster CWAs into job-specific responsibilities for each position in an intermediate education agency;
6. Incorporate generic criteria and job-specific responsibilities into job descriptions for all positions in an intermediate education agency;
7. Design a summative evaluation report consistent with the job description for each position in an intermediate education agency;
8. Identify the number of employees evaluated by each evaluator in an intermediate education agency;
9. Develop a videotape that would subsequently be incorporated into a video-based instructional package for use by all employees, board members, and stakeholders of an intermediate education agency in the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system for the agency;
10. Implement a performance evaluation system with a representative group of
11. Survey the employees of an intermediate education agency for their satisfaction with the newly-developed performance evaluation system;

12. Revise the performance evaluation system of an intermediate education agency based on the feedback of the employees.

Research Questions

Although the qualitative methodology used in a case study does not typically lend itself to the testing of hypotheses, the following research questions were raised after interviewing the School Improvement Model (SIM) researchers regarding the process to be used in the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system for AEA 12. Is it possible to:

1. identify job-specific responsibilities for each position in an intermediate education agency that will satisfy each employee working in that position?

2. develop a job description for each position in an intermediate education agency that will satisfy each employee working in a given position?

3. design a summative evaluation report that can be used with each employee of an intermediate education agency that will include agency generic criteria as well as job-specific responsibilities for each position?

4. design a summative evaluation report that will satisfy the board, administration, evaluators, and evaluatees of an intermediate education agency?
5. develop a performance evaluation system that can be implemented with each employee of an intermediate education agency?

6. develop a performance evaluation system that will satisfy the board, administration, evaluators, and evaluatees of an intermediate education agency?

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumptions of this study included the following:

1. The development of a performance evaluation system was supported by the employees' union.

2. Individual employees recorded timelogging information accurately and independent of other employees in job-alike positions.

3. Critical work activities were identified by employees on the basis of their importance to the position rather than on the amount of time spent on the activity.

4. Job-specific responsibilities are representative of all employees in any given position in the intermediate education agency.

5. All representative groups of employees selected to implement the performance evaluation system during the test-and-try participated as requested.

6. All employees who had suggestions for revisions prior to finalizing the performance evaluation system responded on the designated survey.

7. This particular intermediate education agency is representative of other intermediate education agencies in Iowa.
Delimitations

This performance evaluation system was developed for Western Hills Area Education Agency (AEA) 12, located in Sioux City, Iowa. AEA 12 is an intermediate education agency that serves over 334,622 students in 28 public school districts, some private schools and shelter care school programs in 3,967 square miles within six counties in western Iowa. The agency employs over 185 individuals who work in one or more of its four divisions—Administrative Services, Special Education Services, Educational Services, and Media Services. The nine members of its Board of Directors are elected for three-year terms by the constituents of director districts. In addition to the central administrative offices located in Sioux City, there are five additional service centers located throughout AEA 12—Denison, Cherokee, Le Mars, Ida Grove and Onawa.

AEA 12 is one of 15 intermediate education agencies serving the 99 Iowa counties. Other states may also refer to these types of agencies as BOCES (Boards of Cooperative Education Services), ESUs (Education Service Units), CESAs (Centralized Education Service Agencies), or IEAs (Intermediate Education Agencies).

The initial groundwork for the development of a performance evaluation system for AEA 12 was begun during the 1989-90 school year by Professor Richard Manatt and the School Improvement Model (SIM) team from Iowa State University at the request of the chief administrator of AEA 12, Dr. Bruce Hopkins. Members of a stakeholders' committee wrote a philosophy of education, philosophy of
Consulting, and philosophy of administration for AEA 12. The functions of the performance evaluation system, performance evaluation procedures, performance evaluation timeline, and performance evaluation cycle were established during the first year of this project. This participant observer joined the project during year two (see Table 1 for a timeline of specific activities).

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.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are operationally defined as follows for the purpose of this study.

Climate: how people feel about working and learning in an organization; perceptions and reflections of attitudes

Comparison chart: a comparison of the time spent on critical work activities and all other activities for every person working in job-alike positions

Confirmation interview: a structured interview (or questionnaire) that produces evidence to confirm earlier findings

Critical work activities (CWAs): behaviors so important to job performance that, if not done, the job is not accomplished; identified by timelogging by all employees in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s)</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 1991</td>
<td>Critical work activity (CWA) interviews—all employees in job-alike groups (group consensus; verbal and written feedback).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer, 1991</td>
<td>Developed comparison charts; identified job-specific responsibilities for each of 53 job positions; prepared &quot;Who evaluates whom;&quot; contributed management action plan (MAP) form; compiled sample performance evaluation handbook and made revisions as appropriate; identified job titles for each position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 1991</td>
<td>Oriented job-alike groups to the newly developed system and materials; received written and verbal feedback; explained/encouraged test-and try participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 1991 -</td>
<td>Developed test-and-try written surveys for each of four AEA 12 divisions—Educational Services, Administrative Services, Media Services, Special Education Services; revised job-specific responsibilities based on feedback received at November 8th meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 1992</td>
<td>Wrote guided practice scenarios for follow-up evaluator training; revised &quot;Who evaluates whom.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6, 1992</td>
<td>Assisted with Advanced Evaluator Training, Level II; submitted after-action report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 1992</td>
<td>Assisted with Stakeholders' Committee meeting; met with Arletta Dawson and Professor Manatt regarding videotaping; submitted after-action report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 1992</td>
<td>Compiled test-and-try survey results; revised performance evaluation handbooks per notes taken at Stakeholders' Committee meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1992</td>
<td>Wrote and sent memo to each videotaping participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25, 1992</td>
<td>Assisted with videotaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21, 1992</td>
<td>Completed personal interviews with employees from each of the four divisions; made revisions in performance evaluation handbooks per Stakeholders' Committee approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 1993</td>
<td>Developed list of requested training topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29-30, 1993</td>
<td>Assisted with Stakeholders' Committee meeting; submitted after-action report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
job-alike positions

**Culture:** the level at which much of what matters in an organization's life happens; influences the day-to-day behavior of people in organizations; influences how people build their organizations; the underlying beliefs, values, and assumptions that are present—manifested through norms of behavior that serve to guide and direct group members

**Director district:** a geographical area that has been established by law based on the number of students residing within that area to ensure equal representation by the electors in the election of the board of directors for any given intermediate education agency in Iowa

**Education support personnel:** non-certificated personnel employed by an educational organization/institution

**Emergent design:** the design emerges as the research progresses; begins with a tentative design and allows for the adaptation of the design to include variables that were not anticipated prior to the start of the observation

**Ethnography:** the observation and study of human activity in its natural setting

**Formative evaluation:** the non-judgmental process of gathering information and providing continual feedback for the purpose of revision and improvement of performance; a means to an end

**Grounded theory:** theory that is "grounded" in the research or developed from the data; will not limit or bias the perceptions of the observer as might a priori theory

**Holistic inquiry:** the study of all elements present in the setting in which the inquiry
takes place; studying the whole setting in order to understand reality

**Inductive data analysis:** rather than focusing on testing preconceived hypotheses, the data is studied inductively in order to reveal unanticipated outcomes; the researcher gathers the data first and then tries to develop understanding and draw generalizations

**Intermediate education agency (IEA):** a service unit primarily funded by federal and state aid payments to ensure equal educational opportunities for children from birth to age 21; (also referred to as BOCES—Board of Cooperative Education Services; ESU—Education Service Unit; CESA—Centralized Education Service Agency; AEA—Area Education Agency)

**Management action plan (MAP):** a written plan prepared by each member of the management team by which progress toward agency goals is monitored and evaluated

**Professional development plan (PDP):** strategies developed by evaluators and evaluatees planning together to help improve the evaluatee’s job performance; also referred to as job improvement target (JIT), professional improvement commitment (PIC), and professional growth plan (PGP)

**Project action plan (PAP):** a written plan prepared by each employee of the agency, other than management, by which progress toward agency goals is monitored and evaluated

**Purposive sampling:** by purposely selecting a wide range of subjects to observe, the qualitative researcher will be more likely to uncover the full array of "multiple realities" relevant to an inquiry
Reliability: attribute of a performance evaluation system that demonstrates consistency over time in making evaluation decisions

Stakeholders' committee: local planning committee that advises the chief administrator and board of directors on the specifications, procedures, and staff development deemed necessary for an effective performance evaluation system for all certified and support personnel of the intermediate education agency

Standard professional review: a summative evaluation that uses data agreed on by evaluatees, evaluators, and administrators/supervisors; compares performance data for individuals with organization standards and expectations and checks to see if employees have met these standards; it should occur at least once every three years

Summative evaluation: an "end-of-cycle" assessment of the effectiveness of performance; an evaluation of the final product of a process that leads to decision-making

Validity: degree to which the evaluation process assesses the performance that it is intended to assess; the most important attribute of an performance evaluation system
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Even though evaluation has been defined in many ways by many people, there seem to be some common descriptors among the various definitions. Evaluation is an ongoing process that determines the degree to which a preestablished set of objectives have been met and assists with decision-making about what is needed to continually improve performance (DeRoche, 1987; Harris, 1986; Popham, 1987; Rebore, 1991; Stronge & Helm, 1991; Stufflebeam, et al., 1988). The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988), and Stronge and Helm (1991) further specified that the evaluation of this performance is relative to an institution's mission or purpose.

Purposes of Performance Evaluation

The purposes of evaluation are those reasons for which the evaluation process is undertaken; the effects are the results of the evaluation process. Effects may not always be related to the initial purposes of the process, but they are always related to the activities or practices carried out as part of the evaluation process. Although each position in an educational institution has a unique character, Rebore (1991) identified the following as universal reasons for evaluation, applicable to all educational institutions and all positions in those institutions. Evaluation:

1. fosters the self-development of each employee;
2. helps to identify a variety of tasks that an employee is capable of performing;
3. helps to identify staff development needs;
4. helps to improve performance;
5. helps to determine if an employee should be retained in the organization and how large a salary increase he or she should be given;  
6. helps to determine the placement, transfer, or promotion of an employee. (p. 192)

The ultimate goal of all educational institutions is to educate children and adolescents. A comprehensive evaluation system will include all the employees in a district or institution, not just the classroom instructors. For that reason, no comprehensive description of evaluation can be limited to the improvement of instruction. Even the "improvement of performance," although it would include administrators and professional support personnel, is a goal in pursuit of the larger mission of improving the programs and services provided to students and other clients (Stronge & Helm, 1991; Iwanicki, 1990).

History of Performance Evaluation

The appraisal of teachers' performance is as old as the education profession. However, for the most part, only three stages of historical development in American education during this century were concerned with the formal evaluation of teachers. During the 1920's, the efforts were primarily centered around analyzing whether a given teaching style correlated with the philosophy and psychology of William James or John Dewey. The second stage was more concerned with ascribing certain personality traits as being related to excellence in teaching. The final stage, which appeared in the 1960's and persisted through the 1970's, emphasized generic teaching behaviors that would be effective in all instructional settings. The research in this area coined such catch words as structured and task-oriented when speaking about
the types of teacher behavior that produced effective student outcomes. In 1976 the National Institute of Education, in a request for proposals, called for a new approach to the definition of effective teacher training. This signaled the growth of a movement to license teachers on the basis of competencies and performance rather than on the completion of a teacher education program at an accredited college or university. Obviously, such an approach is predicated on a preconceived notion of what constitutes effective teaching (Rebore, 1991).

When considering the nonteaching, nonadministrative professional support personnel in education in North America, the personnel evaluation marketplace merely offers up a void (Christianson, 1993; Iwanicki, 1993; Stephens, 1993; Stufflebeam, 1993). The Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation (CREATE), out of Western Michigan University—Kalamazoo, is currently working on several projects on teacher, school, administrator, and support staff evaluation for public and private schools, K-12 (Stufflebeam, 1993). Even though none of the CREATE projects are specifically addressing the evaluation of education support personnel in intermediate education agencies, their work with support staff evaluation may be applicable in the future.

The challenge for educational specialists is not one of revising existing evaluation systems, but of creating one. Personnel evaluation will not work without a framework within which to operate. The lack of a conceptual model of evaluation for professional support personnel is a serious detriment to an educational organization. Development of a sound model is not a matter of choice; rather, it is a
matter of necessity (Stronge & Helm, 1991).

Assumptions of Performance Evaluation

All education personnel within an institution should be evaluated; this appraisal of all employees is a continual and ongoing process (Rebore, 1991). No one model of evaluation is suitable for all educational institutions or for all education personnel within one institution. Variations in the size and complexity of educational organizations, different leadership styles of administrators and supervisors, and varying needs of individual employees require flexibility in applying evaluation procedures (AASA, 1989). The importance of open, two-way communication between employer and employee cannot be overlooked (O'Leary & Fenton, 1990; Rebore, 1991; Silver, 1982). The job description should be the consistent benchmark under which an individual was employed and is evaluated (Rebore, 1991). The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988) proposed the following guiding assumptions for the evaluation of education personnel:

1. The fundamental purpose of personnel evaluation or any other education activity must be to provide effective services to students and society.
2. Personnel evaluation practices should be constructive and free of unnecessarily threatening or demoralizing characteristics.
3. Personnel evaluations are vital for planning sound professional development experiences.
4. Disagreements about what constitutes good teaching, good administration, and good research may complicate personnel evaluation, but such disagreements are warranted.
5. Personnel evaluations vary in complexity and importance; consequently, applications of the standards may be crucial in some circumstances but out of place or even counterproductive in others. (p. 8)
Characteristics of Performance Evaluation

Performance evaluation should be consistent with organizational goals, interconnect with inservice training programs, and acquire top level commitment and resources (Thorson et al., 1987). An evaluation system for educational professionals must be sensitive to the ways employees fulfill their professional goals of teaching, research and/or service (AASA, 1989; Stronge & Helm, 1991). According to Furman (1987), it must provide education personnel with the following due process rights:

1. the right to know what standards of performance are expected;
2. the right to notice and feedback;
3. the right to a chance to improve;
4. the right to help to improve; and
5. the right to sufficient time to carry out prescribed improvement in a nonthreatening environment. (p. 77)

It is also organizationally appropriate and legally wise for a board to establish a policy statement on employee evaluation (Rebore, 1991). The evaluation system must satisfy the employees, the administrators, the community, and the board.

The employees' job responsibilities must be defined to correlate with and support the school/organizational mission and objectives; their own individual objectives likewise must correlate with and support the institutional mission and objectives. With the alignment of individual and organizational objectives, the evaluation of individual staff performance will provide significant information for evaluating the effectiveness of the organization's programs and services. Effective educational evaluation consists of a comprehensive personnel evaluation system that becomes a major component in the assessment of institutional progress toward
achieving institutional goals and missions (Stronge & Helm, 1991).

Eight critical attributes of effective evaluation systems that will help an evaluation system address the often conflicting needs of organizational accountability and individual growth (Conley, 1987):

1. All participants accept the validity of the system;
2. All participants thoroughly understand the mechanics of the system;
3. Evaluatees know that the performance criteria have a clear, consistent rationale;
4. Evaluators are properly trained in the procedural and substantive use of the system;
5. Levels of evaluation are employed, each with a different goal;
6. The evaluation distinguishes between the formative and summative dimensions;
7. A variety of evaluation methods are used;
8. Evaluation is a district/organization priority. (p. 61)

Trends in Performance Evaluation

At least partially as a result of the accountability and education reform movements, evaluation systems have come to be characterized by five major improvements as identified by Buttram and Wilson in 1987. These improvement trends include: a) linking evaluation systems to research on effective educator practices, rather than on individual organization’s values; b) providing improved training for evaluators; c) holding administrators more accountable for conducting evaluations; d) making evaluatees active partners in the evaluation process; and e) using evaluation-identified evaluatee deficiencies to focus staff development through inservice programs or workshops, suggested or required coursework, or collaborative supervision. McGreal (1992) stated that this staff development should
be mandatory, but that it be offered for different stages of development, i.e., novice vs. experienced teachers.

The use of individual formal teacher evaluation results as a guide to evaluation for school improvement or collective staff development is not common. School improvement and staff development in U.S. schools tend to be motivated by developments external to school districts. Although staff development may be directed at improving teachers' skills, the programs are at best only loosely connected with an analysis of the collective needs of teachers as revealed by the results of evaluations (Wise & Gendler, 1990).

Manatt (undated) identified additional trends in performance evaluation:

a) toward multiple data sets; b) away from nothing but clinical supervision;
c) toward pay-for-performance; d) toward mutual feedback, and e) away from single evaluator. Manatt contended that these trends will ultimately result in empowerment of employees, self-directed work groups, total quality management, and satisfying the internal customers.

Total Quality Management (TQM), a current trend in education proposed by W. Edwards Deming that may impact the evaluation of personnel, requires a change in philosophy: "The overwhelming challenge facing America today is the need to regain competitive position in world markets" (Leonard, 1990, p. ii). This overwhelming challenge has implications for all of our major institutions: business, government, education. The goal of TQM is to reduce the variation in learning and achievement, helping all students to learn, grow, and achieve to their fullest potential.
The focus is on process rather than on outputs or products.

Deming believed that most differences in workers' performance are caused by variations in the system rather than by workers themselves. Outputs are the result of individual skills, individual efforts, and effects of the system on that output. Thus, TQM puts an emphasis on studying and improving systems and processes, which are "...so often the source of the variation to begin with" (Leonard, p. 1.7).

Deming proposed that, due to this change to "systems" thinking, there is a need for fundamental structural changes in the way the business of education is conducted. Thus, 14 points were identified for management in industry, education, and government to follow in a transformation from the prevailing style of management to one of "optimism". Deming restated these 14 points as "14 Obligations for the Board of Education and Administration" (Figure 1). Among the points, those relevant to performance evaluation include: on-the-job training, leadership, eliminating numerical quotas/goals, no merit systems, eliminating annual ratings, education and self-improvement for all, and everybody working toward the transformation. Deming suggested that tests or inspections to improve quality are too late, ineffective, and costly—that quality comes from improvement of the process.

Deming believed that the job of boards and administration is not supervision, but leadership (understanding and managing intrinsic motivation). Deming (Leonard, 1990) stated:

The leader should coach and counsel, but not judge ... Intrinsic motivation is extinguished over time by extrinsic forces such as pay-for-performance, MBO, grades, and destructive competition among departments and ... groups ...
Restatement Of Deming's 14 Points As
"14 Obligations for the Board of Education and Administration"

1. Create constancy of purpose toward improvement of the entire school system and its services.
2. Adopt the new philosophy; we are in a new economic age.
3. Cease dependence on tests and grades to measure quality.
4. Cease dependence on price tag when selecting curricula, texts, equipment, and supplies for the school.
5. Improve constantly and forever every process for planning, teaching, learning, and service.
6. Institute more thorough, better job-related training.
7. Institute leadership (management of people).
8. Drive out fear.
9. Break down barriers between groups in the school system.
10. Eliminate the use of goals, targets, and slogans to encourage performance.
11. Closely examine the impact of teaching standards and the system of grading student performance.
12. Remove barriers that rob staff and administrators of pride of workmanship and rob students of the joy of learning.
13. Institute a vigorous program of education and self-improvement for everyone in the system.
14. Plan and take action to accomplish the transformation.

Figure 1. Restatement of Deming's 14 Points
(Leonard, J. F., 1990, p. 3.25)

Traditional practices of rating performance destroy teamwork, foster mediocrity, confound the teacher with other parts of the system, and foster short-term thinking—all detriments to continuing improvement. (p. 3.10)

An illustration of this destruction caused by the current educational system is shown in Figure 2.

Another current trend at federal, state, and district levels that will have implications for performance evaluation is the emphasis on outcomes. These outcomes can be student, employee, or organizationally-oriented. Outcomes-based evaluation (OBE) for students now has districts and states developing learner
These forces create fear, self-defense, competition, humiliation. Competition for highest grade in school. Play to win, not for fun. Learning and joy of learning are smothered. Beaten, humiliated, the student drops out of school; turns to drugs, jail. On the job, strive for high rating.

Extrinsic motivation crowds out intrinsic motivation, dignity, joy.

The forces shown another year by year the intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, dignity that one is born with. They rob people of pride and joy in work. He who enjoys his work is a joy to work with!

Figure 2. Destruction, according to Deming, caused by the current educational system (Leonard, J. F., 1990, p. 4)

outcomes and assessment strategies. This emphasis on learner outcomes will ultimately result in revised curriculum. Studying the outcomes of employees and school districts has caused educators to take a look at concepts such as minimum standards and a national report card. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) has initiated a new process, Outcomes accreditation: Focusing on
student success (OA). Even though OA will not directly affect the performance evaluation of education personnel, it will have indirect effects on staff performance. OA is a school-based staff development model that helps schools document the effectiveness of their programs (NCA, undated). The characteristics and advantages of OA are shown in Figure 3.

Components of a Performance Evaluation System

The development of a professional performance evaluation system includes the following steps (Lysiak & Perez, 1987; Manatt, 1988): 1) selection and training of the employees and administrators on the committee; 2) inservice training for the evaluation of education personnel; 3) establishing behaviors, criteria, and standards in a specified number of performance areas; 4) inservice training for administrators who will be using the new instruments; 5) pilot-testing the evaluation process with volunteer employees; 6) analyzing a questionnaire and interview data from a pilot test; 7) pilot-testing the revised evaluation process; and 8) making revisions for compliance with state laws.

Key questions that should be addressed in the development of the performance evaluation system include: "...a) What are your purposes? b) What are your criteria? c) How high are your standards? and d) How will you monitor and report performance?" (Manatt, undated, p. 1).

A logical and sequential performance evaluation process will enhance the potential of collecting quality information and of using it appropriately. The process
Characteristics and Advantages of Outcomes Accreditation (OA)

Characteristics
1. In OA, evaluation is linked with accreditation more directly. Evaluation and improvement planning are integral and essentially continuous ingredients in accreditation under the OA plan.
2. In an OA evaluation, specific target areas—some cognitive and some affective—are selected. Special attention (analysis and improvement planning) is given to these areas.
3. In OA a major focus is on outcomes. Baseline data are compiled so that after a specified period (up to three years) progress in the special target areas can be documented.
4. OA functions on a shorter cycle, usually three to five years. Further, involvement in self-analysis, improvement planning, and plan implementation are essentially continuous, with more frequent contact from an outside committee or team.
5. Because of the emphasis on outcomes in specific target areas, the process of OA is diagnostic/prognostic in nature. Cycle length depends on time allowed for the fruition of the improvement plan. If target goals have been met, new target areas are selected for the next cycle. If any target goals were not met, they may be continued along with some new target areas in the new cycle.
6. In the OA format, the end result of the process is a complete and integrated improvement plan. The improvement plan is a description of research-based strategies the school intends to use to reduce discrepancies between current and desired levels of student performance. Then the process continues with the implementation of the improvement plan and the annual assessment to check the trend of change in the target areas.
7. In OA "equity" as well as quality is a direct concern. Equity is attained when essentially all students improve as a result of the implementation of an improvement plan. Schools employ a technique called "disaggregation of data" as a means of identifying appropriate subgroups of students for separate assessment. Disaggregation is conducted in such a way that the students less likely to achieve in a selected target area are identified in the assessment.
8. The visiting team in OA is smaller than the typical traditional team. Its primary purpose is to validate the appropriateness of the target areas, procedures, and the improvement plan and to document enhanced student success. Contact with the team or with selected members of the team occurs two or three times during a five-year period.
9. A commonly utilized person in the OA process is the "resource specialist." This person, either from the school or external to the school, may function both as an assessment advisor and a process monitor.

Advantages
1. The OA model is an accountability system that evaluates how effectively the school is utilizing its human and material resources to enhance student success.
2. By emphasizing outcomes the OA format continually focuses attention on diagnosing process, improving program, and enhancing student success.
3. In OA, continual program assessment and improvement are the primary commitments of membership in NCA-COS.
4. In each OA cycle, specific target areas are selected so that the full improvement effort is a manageable task.
5. A special consideration in OA is equity—when quality student performance is achieved by all students who represent the complete diversity of the school. Teachers believe that all students can learn and that all teachers can learn to teach all kinds of students.
6. Because of the exhaustive full-cycle nature of the OA improvement process, the involvement of faculty in the process is an extraordinary staff empowering and development experience.

Figure 3. Characteristics and advantages of outcomes accreditation, (North Central Association Commission on Schools pamphlet, Tempe: AZ)
generally includes a formative and a summative component. Formative evaluation is the non-judgmental process of gathering information and providing continual feedback for the purpose of revision and improvement of performance (AASA, 1989; Barber, 1985; Cangelosi, 1991; DeRoche, 1987; Larson, 1983; Stronge & Helm, 1991). It is a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Specific formative activities include formal and informal observations, pre and post-observation conferences, coaching, and the collection of supporting data and input.

Summative evaluation is an "end-of-cycle" assessment of the effectiveness of performance, an evaluation of the final product of a process, that leads to decision-making. In the case of educational institutions, these accountability decisions are about selecting, retaining, promoting, compensating, and terminating staff (AASA, 1989; Barber, 1985; Bulcock, 1984; Cangelosi, 1991; DeRoche, 1987; Lane, 1990; Rieck, 1989; Stronge & Helm, 1991). The completion of the summative evaluation report and the summative conference are typically part of the standard professional review; however, McGreal (1992) contrarily suggested that no summative report be written for experienced teachers. Instead, McGreal contended that the evaluator and evaluatee should mutually select one to two teaching goals toward which the evaluatee will focus. These goals then become part of the evaluatee's professional growth plan.

A standard professional review is a summative evaluation that uses data agreed on by evaluatees, evaluators, and administrators/supervisors. In practice, it compares performance data for individuals with organization standards and
expectations and checks to see if employees have met these standards. The standard professional review should occur at least once every three years; prior to that the employees and employer should have developed a contract identifying the obligations of each. Educational organizations must provide job descriptions, minimum standards of competence, and specific criteria that will be used to judge competence in the professional review. The professional review is intended to satisfy the board, the administration, and the state that all professional employees are performing at least at the minimum level expected by their organization (Barber, 1985).

Models of Performance Evaluation

There are a multitude of approaches to professional performance evaluation (Table 2). School administrators generally realize that there is no one model of evaluation that is suited for all (AASA, 1989). Popham (1988) grouped evaluation models into five non-mutually exclusive categories: a) goal-attainment; b) decision-facilitation; c) judgmental models emphasizing outputs; d) judgmental models emphasizing inputs; and e) naturalistic models. The models are not always separately identifiable entities. Manatt (1990) identified the five most common models of teacher performance evaluation in grades kindergarten through twelve, in descending order by percentage of use: a) common law; b) clinical supervision; c) goal-setting; d) artistic; and e) input/output.

Developing an evaluation system is time-consuming, costly, and difficult to accomplish (Barber, 1985). Performance evaluation alone does nothing—linking
Table 2. Performance evaluation models/methods being implemented in the field of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model/Method</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological Field Method</td>
<td>Streich (1984)</td>
<td>Combines the checklist or rating sheet method of evaluation with clinical supervision to gain a comprehensive view of classroom life; the supervisor can reconcile organizational goals with individual needs to improve teacher performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder System</td>
<td>Manatt (1985)</td>
<td>Alternative form of teacher recognition and compensation that is based on teaching competencies, student achievement, student feedback, and professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product)</td>
<td>Stufflebeam and others (late 1960s)</td>
<td>Based on the view that the most important purpose of evaluation is not to prove but to improve; emphasis on improvement through formative evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development Approach</td>
<td>Costa (1988)</td>
<td>Based on the proposition that the basic teaching behavior is decision-making; the diagnosis and assessment of the teacher's capacity for self-modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint goal setting, series of teacher-evaluator conferences, classroom observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeTEK (The Developmental Evaluation Kit)</td>
<td>Harris (1986)</td>
<td>Treating teacher evaluation as a set of processes aimed primarily at helping teachers develop professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Supervision</td>
<td>Glatthorn (1984)</td>
<td>Essential thesis is that all teachers do not need clinical supervision and that experienced and competent teachers should have some options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties-Based Approach</td>
<td>Scriven (1988)</td>
<td>Uses multiple measures to determine how well both primary and secondary duties have been performed; focuses on assessing the level of achievement attained by the evaluatee for each duty to be evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation in stages; changes focus as teacher becomes more experienced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model/Method</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Evaluation</td>
<td>Gitlin (1981)</td>
<td>Employees are in the center of the process; the aim is personal and professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment-based Evaluation</td>
<td>Popham (1988)</td>
<td>Pooled professional judgment of educators who have been trained and certified to make defensible judgments regarding teachers' instructional competence and requires that multiple sources of evidence be considered in the context of a teacher's instructional situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBWA (Management By Wandering Around)</td>
<td>Hastings (late 1980s)</td>
<td>A technique used by several successful businesses for getting management out of the office and into constant, informal communication with employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBO (Management By Objectives)</td>
<td>Drucker (1960)</td>
<td>Uses behavior patterns to set goals; &quot;What are employees going to do and when are they going to do it?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Evaluator Approach</td>
<td>Hidlebaugh (1973)</td>
<td>Various &quot;publics&quot; with which the teacher associates must assist in the process of teacher evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-mediated Self-appraisal</td>
<td>Barber (1983)</td>
<td>Formative in nature and designed to improve the individual's teaching performance without threat or intimidation; combines peer review and self-appraisal; claims insurance of clear objectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP (Professional Support Personnel)</td>
<td>Stronge and Helm (1991)</td>
<td>Modified naturalistic setting for data collection; emphasis on outcomes-based performance appraisal, aligning performance objectives with both institutional goals and specific job responsibilities; and reliance on multiple sources of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM (School Improvement Model)</td>
<td>Manatt and Stow (1984)</td>
<td>Research-based organization renewal process; teacher performance criteria are based on teacher effectiveness research and used in a clinical supervision model for teacher evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQM (Total Quality Management)</td>
<td>Deming (1990)</td>
<td>A structured system for meeting and exceeding needs by creating organization-wide participation in the planning and implementation of continuous improvement processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Evaluation</td>
<td>Gitlin (1981)</td>
<td>Competency-based; the aim is to rank from best to worst rather than on a horizontal continuum of growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
performance appraisals to sound learning theory and skilled supervision succeeds (Manatt, 1989). Campbell, 1987, Furman, 1987, Gray and Diamond, 1989, Manatt, 1988, and NAESP, 1988, concurred that any performance evaluation model should include these elements: a) clarification of the reasons for conducting the study; b) identifying the information that is needed; c) selection of the procedures that will be used to collect and analyze the information; d) conducting data collection and analysis; e) reviewing and interpreting the information; f) establishing priorities and plans; and g) implementing the plans.

In order to address each of the eight critical attributes of effective evaluation systems as identified by Conley (1987), Stronge and Helm (1991) proposed an integrative evaluation model that reflects six distinct steps in the evaluation process for education support personnel: a) identify system needs; b) relate program expectations to job responsibilities; c) select performance indicators; d) set standards for job performance; e) document job performance; and f) evaluate performance (Figure 4). In addition, this professional support personnel (PSP) evaluation model reflects an emphasis on communication between evaluator and evaluatee throughout the evaluation cycle in order to effectuate a high-quality evaluation system that benefits both the organization and the individual.

The PSP model was developed to fill the gap in both evaluation theory and practical application of that theory. Three features account for the applicability of this model to the diverse personnel within educational and social services agencies: a) the emphasis on outcomes-based performance evaluation; b) the emphasis on
aligning individual performance objectives with both institutional goals and specific job responsibilities; and c) the reliance on multiple sources for gathering evaluative data (Table 3) rather than the heavy reliance on direct observation characteristic of most teacher evaluation systems (Stronge & Helm, 1991).

Criticisms of Performance Evaluation

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988) asserted that personnel evaluation has been ineffectively conducted in educational organizations, despite the centrality of the process. They further identified specific failures common to personnel evaluation practices. According to Stronge and Helm
Table 3. Evaluation process tools and data-collection techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools/techniques</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal records</td>
<td>Narrative reports of observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts</td>
<td>Materials sampling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiotaping</td>
<td>Recording the verbal interactions occurring in a situation/specific setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklists</td>
<td>Evaluate person against a uniform set of criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive coaching</td>
<td>Professional development approach that enables participants to recognize, perform, and coach for the cognitive process of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing</td>
<td>Joint review between evaluator and evaluatee of collected data/results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>Captures the ways multiple forces interact mutually within the cultural context to shape instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders' interaction analysis</td>
<td>Analyzes verbal interaction between teachers and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized portfolio system</td>
<td>A way to identify the quality and quantity of teaching and research that each discipline considers appropriate and valuable; includes a collection of materials demonstrating what the evaluatee has been doing and has accomplished, a plan outlining the evaluatee's goals and objectives, a description of support needed to reach the goals, and a description of the evidence that will demonstrate that those goals have been reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Supportive coaching between colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Demonstrating the desired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple data sets</td>
<td>Utilizing input from a variety of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratives</td>
<td>Reports of observations and data collected in written form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer rating tool</td>
<td>Predetermined list of behaviors that the observer will rate on a consistent scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer coaching</td>
<td>Non-threatening collegiality, colleagues working together to improve performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer evaluation</td>
<td>Supervisory technique rather than an evaluative technique; feedback from a peer generally used by the evaluatee for his/her own personal growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer sharing</td>
<td>The sharing of ideas, materials, techniques among colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective teaching</td>
<td>Carefully structured method of peer teaching; a formative technique.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools/techniques</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room map</td>
<td>A diagram of the room arrangement in which the behavior is occurring; notations of movement around the room are made by the observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective verbatim analysis</td>
<td>The verbatim recording of selected verbalizations that occur during an observation that can be analyzed to identify specific behaviors as well as patterns of behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td>Evaluatee assesses his/her own performance based on the same criteria as used by the evaluator; generally to be used by the evaluatee for his/her own personal growth; supervisory technique rather than an evaluative technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulated teaching</td>
<td>A staged teaching situation to demonstrate teaching style/behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation</td>
<td>Generally completed by high school students or older, to be used primarily by the evaluatee for his/her own personal growth; supervisory technique rather than an evaluative technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning objectives checklist</td>
<td>A skills list for any given curricular area that will be used to document the level to which any student has achieved the predetermined objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor observation</td>
<td>An on-site visitation by the evaluatee’s supervisor to observe and record behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests of student performance</td>
<td>Assessments or measures of any given student’s level of performance in an identified activity/subject area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-on-task analysis</td>
<td>Observation/documentation of the percentage of time any given student displays on-task behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotaping</td>
<td>Recording the behavioral interactions occurring in a situation/specific setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting team of experts</td>
<td>Group of individuals with background information/skills relative to the given setting who observe and provide feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1991), the practices often fail to:

1. screen out unqualified persons from certification and selection processes;
2. provide constructive feedback to individual educators;
3. recognize and help reinforce outstanding service;
4. provide direction for staff development programs; and
5. provide evidence that will withstand professional and judicial scrutiny. (p. 63)
Additional dominant criticisms of education personnel evaluation practices are that they have failed to provide evidence efficiently and at reasonable cost, aid institutions in terminating incompetent or unproductive personnel, and unify teachers and administrators in their collective efforts to educate students (Stufflebeam, 1988). Unless the Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988) are systematically applied, evaluation committees may fall prey to many serious errors, such as allowing conflicts of interest to influence results, wasting time and resources in gathering data that will not be used, engaging untrained evaluators, allowing political factors to distort processes and findings, or producing a controversial or legally unsound system.

An additional source of resistance to performance evaluation arises from a lack of awareness about how evaluation fits into an overall model for the effective management of people. This problem is particularly acute among managers without formal training in personnel administration. Knowing where performance evaluation fits and how it contributes to effective recruitment, selection, placement, training, utilization, and maintenance of personnel will increase the frequency and quality of its usage. The manager often has no conceptual framework for integrating performance evaluation into the mainstream knowledge about the behavior of people in the organization. Therefore, evaluation can erroneously be seen as merely a tool for administrative manipulation and little or no link to more basic knowledge about the causes of human behavior in organizations (Stronge & Helm, 1991).

To make performance evaluation a viable management tool, from a broader perspective, organizations and researchers must invest time in training managers in
performance skills, in developing system evaluations which take into account reliability, validity, and managerial goals, and in designing systems to meet specific organizational conditions and expectations (DeVries, 1983). Evaluators have been found to be more effective after training, and evaluator training appears to have a positive effect on evaluation procedures in use (Barber, 1985; Davis, 1984; DeVries, 1983; Faast, 1982; McIntyre, 1988; Stronge & Helm, 1991; Stufflebeam & Sanders, 1990; Sweeney, 1992).

Performance evaluation yields information that has power and influence in any organization. It is especially important that faculty view evaluation as a tool for their own personal growth rather than as a necessary and evil chore that permits the institution to judge them (Braskamp, 1989). Few evaluation systems please both teachers and evaluators—most evoke mistrust among teachers because of conflict in the purposes of evaluation (Barber, 1985). An evaluation system will have a set of explicit purposes, but its effects may extend into other areas of organizational life than those at which it is intentionally directed. These effects may manifest at the individual level, as teachers themselves experience the evaluation process; at the organizational level, as the process affects communication, performance, and sentiments within a school; and at the environmental level, as the process and practices may affect other institutions or the broader community (Natriello, 1990).
Related Research

The need for sound evaluation of education personnel is clear. The literature of evaluation, however, reflects the paucity of attention given either to theory or to the practice of evaluation of the diverse population of professional support personnel. Rather, the literature primarily addresses teacher evaluation and instructional effectiveness.

A brief review of literature on performance evaluation in the business or corporate world revealed many similar terms/phrases as those found in education. These included goal-setting, objectives, tracking results, human resource management, program evaluation, computer-assisted instruction, organizational change, subordinate feedback, coaching, behaviorally-anchored rating scales, self-evaluation, career development, pay-for-performance, merit pay, and compensation systems.

Newer evaluation approaches, both in education and in business, stress involvement in planning and decision-making by the one being evaluated (AASA, 1989; Rebore, 1991; Silverman & Wexley, 1984; Stronge & Helm, 1991). Collaborative and professional planning and implementation of the personnel evaluation system will help to ensure commitment to its credibility, propriety, and utility (AASA, 1989; Fenton & Nancarrow, 1989; Stufflebeam & Sanders, 1990). Glen (1990) reported that for performance evaluation in business, as in education: a) there should be agreement on the purposes of performance evaluation; b) it is time-consuming; c) the performance evaluation system should be integrated with other human resource systems; and d) the organizational culture is influential in
determining how effectively the performance evaluation process works. Fortune 500 companies reported the following problems with administering performance evaluations: 1) multiple use of the form; 2) subjectivity and inflated ratings; and 3) difficulties in defining objectives and in disseminating the evaluation to employees (Laird & Clampitt, 1985). It seems that the underlying thread of any performance evaluation system, whether it be for business or education, is the legality and defensibility of the decisions that are made.

Summary

Clearly, the need for personnel evaluations in educational institutions is pervasive, important, and multifaceted (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1988). Evaluation is an ongoing process that not only assists with decision-making about what is needed to improve individual performance, but also, is relative to the institution’s mission or purpose. The results of individual performance evaluations not only aid in decisions regarding placement, transfer, promotion, and/or compensation of each employee, but also help to identify the staff development needs of the organization. The ultimate goal of the performance evaluation system of any educational organization should be to improve the programs and services to students and other clients.

A conceptual model for the evaluation of education support personnel is needed. This model will vary according to the specific needs of the organization and its employees. However, research indicates that any model must provide for open,
two-way communication between employer and employee, should be constructive and free of unnecessarily threatening or demoralizing characteristics, and must be in compliance with state laws. In addition, the success of a performance evaluation system requires top level commitment and resources. Participants must understand the purpose of the evaluation system and all evaluators and evaluatees must be trained on the procedures of the system. It is understood that a variety of evaluation methods may be used.

A logical and sequential process will help to ensure that quality information is collected and used appropriately on all performance evaluations. The evaluation process typically includes both formative and summative components, self-evaluation, and the development of professional improvement plans. The process is cyclical and may be modified to meet individual and organizational needs. Employee involvement in evaluation planning and decision-making will help to ensure the success of the performance evaluation system for all education personnel of an educational organization.

Qualitative Research

Since this study combined action research and case study methodology, this chapter includes a brief review of literature on qualitative and quantitative research. Both quantitative and qualitative research approaches can be rigorous, systematic forms of empirical inquiry; however, a way of subtly distinguishing between the two approaches is to make use of Everhart's (1975) notion of "how?" (qualitative) vs. "how
well?" (quantitative). Qualitative researchers study what Bogdan (1982) called the "multiple realities" of a situation—how something is perceived and experienced by others.

**Characteristics of qualitative research**

Borg and Gall (1989) and Rogers (1984) identified characteristics that qualitative researchers associate with their methodology. These characteristics include the following beliefs:

1. Any social entity or institution is enormously complex and subtle;
2. Intensive study of a given phenomenon must occur over a long period of time in order for genuine understanding of the phenomenon to occur;
3. People and institutions must be studied holistically;
4. The most effective way to study a given phenomenon is through direct, on-site, face-to-face contact with the people and events in question;
5. The qualitative researcher seeks to understand the attitudes, values, beliefs, and underlying assumptions of those being studied, to understand how others view their world;
6. The basic function of the researcher is description that suggests a basic interest in process rather than product or output—qualitative researchers describe but do not judge or evaluate (although their data may well be used by others in an evaluative sense);
7. It is non-manipulative and does not lend itself to "experimental" research;
8. Study of a given situation begins without lists of specific hypotheses and objectives, selection of "instruments", and carefully defined areas or categories for investigation; and

9. Generalizable theory emerges from the study of specific settings, rather than prescribing and thus limiting the direction in which a given study may go.

**Qualitative research methodology**

Specific qualitative methodology, as identified by Borg and Gall (1989), includes:

1. holistic inquiry—the study of all elements present in the setting in which the inquiry takes place; studying the whole setting in order to understand reality;

2. using humans as data-gathering instruments—the use of researchers as observers; the rationale is that humans can be flexible to adapt to a complex situation as it evolves and can identify and take into account biases that result from the interactions and value differences between the "instrument" and the subject;

3. purposive, rather than random, sampling—the purposeful selection of a wide range of subjects to observe; the researcher will be more likely to uncover the full array of "multiple realities" relevant to an inquiry;

4. inductive data analysis—rather than focusing on testing preconceived hypotheses, the data is studied inductively in order to reveal unanticipated outcomes; the researcher gathers the data first and then tries to develop
understanding and draw generalizations;

5. development of grounded theory—theory that is "grounded" in the research or developed from the data; will not limit or bias the perceptions of the observer as might a priori theory;

6. emergent design—the design emerges as the research progresses; it begins with a tentative design and allows for the adaptation of the design to include variables that were not anticipated prior to the start of the observation;

7. interpretation of outcomes—the researcher usually attempts to reconstruct reality from the frame of reference of the subjects;

8. utilization of intuitive insights—researchers place an emphasis on the tacit or intuitive knowledge obtained from their interactions in the research situation;

9. emphasis on social processes—focus upon social processes and the meanings that participants attribute to social situations; and

10. confirmation interviews—structured interviews (or questionnaires) that produce evidence to confirm earlier findings.

Limitations of qualitative research

Borg and Gall (1989) and Rogers (1984) have also identified some limitations of qualitative research:

1. It is possible to limit, but not eliminate, observer bias;

2. Similar studies can be done, but exact replication is not possible;

3. Observers/interviewers cannot record everything that they experience; instead,
selected segments of reality are studied over long periods of time, thus giving the researcher a significant sampling of reality, but never all of it;

4. Most qualitative research consists of studies of single cases in limited settings and qualitative researchers are constantly faced with the problem of relating their "micro" studies to the "macro culture" at large;

5. Qualitative researchers must constantly make arbitrary choices about their sources of data;

6. It is difficult to do field studies in an educational setting—subjects may behave differently when an outsider is present; thus, masking their true behavior.

Summary

In summary, qualitative researchers participate and/or observe; do concentrated studies of individuals and/or groups; use quantifiable data and/or various forms of unobtrusive data; sometimes use sampling techniques; occasionally compare one group with another; and often combine methodologies of qualitative and quantitative research. Their studies may last from a few months to five or more years. Their goal remains, however, to observe and study human activity in its natural settings.
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study's combination of action research and case study methodology is more representative of qualitative research than quantitative research. Even though the term ethnography is the traditional participant-observer approach of many anthropologists and is indicative of qualitative research, Rogers (1984) contended that practitioners of qualitative research use a number of techniques that do not necessarily fit the ethnographic mode. Qualitative research, in its broad definition, suggests the use of a "wide range of techniques, that if used appropriately, can only increase our ability to study ourselves, our interactions with others, and our institutions" (Rogers, 1984, p. 94).

Characteristics of qualitative research applicable to this study were:

1. It was a study of a complex social entity, an educational institution;
2. The study was completed during part of a four-year project in AEA 12;
3. Part of the information was obtained through direct, on-site personal contact with the employees of AEA 12;
4. The research sought to understand the basic attitudes, beliefs, values, and underlying assumptions of the employees of AEA 12 as they related to the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system;
5. The researcher was interested in the process that was followed during the project as well as in the performance evaluation products that were developed—handbooks, job descriptions, and instructional videotapes;
6. A wide range of techniques was used for data collection throughout the study, i.e., observations, timelogging of critical work activities (CWAs), time analysis feedback sheets, comparison charts of CWAs within job-alike categories, discussions, personal interviews, a pilot test of the newly-devised process and materials, followed by the use of test-and-try surveys;

7. Specific hypotheses were not determined prior to beginning the study; however, specific objectives were identified;

8. The research questions posed at the onset of the study included the concept of "satisfaction" with various components/processes that were implemented—this would incorporate Everhart's (1975) notion of "how well?" and

9. There was some researcher judgment made regarding certain processes/products that were developed and implemented.

The specific qualitative research methodology implemented in this case study were: a) holistic inquiry; b) using humans as data-gathering instruments; c) purposive sampling; d) inductive data analysis; e) development of grounded theory; f) emergent design; g) interpretation of outcomes; h) utilization of intuitive insights; i) emphasis on social processes; and j) confirmation interviews.

The specific activities that were completed during this study are depicted as follows in chronological order and identified by qualitative methodology.
Introduction to the Project, 1989-90

Commitment

Methodology: Confirmation interview, holistic inquiry

During the 1989-90 academic year, Dr. Bruce Hopkins, Chief Administrator for AEA 12 in Sioux City, Iowa, contacted Professor Richard Manatt and the School Improvement Model (SIM) team from Iowa State University regarding the development of a performance evaluation system for the AEA. After obtaining information about the procedures, timelines, and financial obligations of this type of project, the Board of Directors of AEA 12 made the commitment to proceed with issuing a contract to Professor Manatt and the SIM team for their professional assistance with the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system for the intermediate education agency. In June, 1990, Professor Manatt met with a planning committee that had been selected by the AEA's administration to provide them with an overview of the ensuing project. This preliminary workshop set the stage for the following three years.

Year One, 1990-91

Stakeholders' committee

Methodology: Purposive sampling

The initial step of the project was the organization of a stakeholders' committee (Table 4) which would help to facilitate the process and would be the communication link between the SIM team and all agency employees. The
Table 4. Stakeholders' committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Certified/Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Benne</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Bobier</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Brodale</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Brown</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Brown</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arletta Dawson</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Happe</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Hall Happe</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Harrold</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Heeren</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Hopkins</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Hughes</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Kehrwald</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Duane Kent</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Lear</td>
<td>Uniserv Director</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Lyle</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mike McTaggart</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Monson</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Morgan</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ownby</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Pedersen</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Petersen</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Sparks</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Spence</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Stump</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Titus</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Troy</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneice Wagner</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Yamada</td>
<td>Special Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No longer serving on the committee, 1-6-93

The committee was comprised of representatives from each of the four divisions—Media Services, Special Education Services, Educational Services, and Administrative Services, and included both certified and support personnel. Their commitment and ownership toward this project would be vital to its success. The Stakeholders' Committee met on a regular basis (Table 5).
Table 5. Stakeholders' committee meeting dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Agenda Topic(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year One, 1990-91</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 1990</td>
<td>&quot;A total systems approach to performance appraisal,&quot; five key questions, feedback on choices, culture of the agency, administrative philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19, 1990</td>
<td>Administrative philosophy (continued), feedback on choices, alternate methods, a look ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 1990</td>
<td>Philosophy of consulting (continued), educational philosophy, performance criteria, the calendar for CWAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11, 1991</td>
<td>Refine philosophies of education and consulting, refine generic criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12, 1991</td>
<td>Define operational procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Two, 1991-92</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5, 1991</td>
<td>Handbook (to date), the cycle, a look ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11, 1992</td>
<td>Span of control, other critical issues, multiple data sets, instructions for follow-up, advanced evaluator training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 1992</td>
<td>Feedback re: pilot test, restructuring, transformation, Western Hills approach, bias in performance appraisal, summary and a look ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Three, 1992-93</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 1993</td>
<td>Additional instruments, e.g., advisory committee feedback, board evaluation, staff involvement, more training, articulation with long-range plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initial training**

**Methodology: Participant observation, anecdotal records**

In October, 1990, the Stakeholders' Committee was inserviced by Professor Manatt on "A Total Systems Approach to Performance Appraisal," effective teaching
behaviors, culture and climate, and was presented the following key questions that would help shape the supervision/evaluation system which would be developed:

1) What are your purposes? 2) What are your criteria? 3) How high are your standards? 4) How will you monitor and report performance? 5) How will you help employees get better at what they do? (What are your staff development needs?)

**Philosophy**

Methodology: Holistic inquiry, purposive sampling, intuitive insights, interpretation of outcomes, emphasis on social processes

The Stakeholders' Committee's first objective was to establish statements of belief (Appendix A). An activity in which participants were asked to indicate "agree-disagree" on thirty-seven administrative philosophy questions (Appendix B) helped to shape this statement of beliefs. The Functions of the Performance Evaluation System were then established (Appendix C). In addition to this, a Philosophy of Education (Appendix D), a Philosophy of Consulting (Appendix E), and a Philosophy of Administration (Appendix F) were written for AEA 12 by the Stakeholders' Committee. The philosophies were developed by addressing key questions that were presented by Professor Manatt (Appendix G). Each of these philosophies was to be directly related to the overall mission of the agency (Appendix H). All subsequent activities in the development and implementation of the performance evaluation system would be guided by them.

The Performance Evaluation Procedures (Appendix I) and the accompanying Performance Evaluation Timeline (Figure 5) and Performance Evaluation Cycle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TARGET DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation (returning employees)</td>
<td>Prior to October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation (new employees)</td>
<td>First two weeks of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Observations</td>
<td>Minimum of 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Conferences</td>
<td>Within one week following each observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Observations</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Conferences</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Data and Input</td>
<td>All three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Evaluation Report (SER)</td>
<td>By the last contract day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Conference</td>
<td>By the last contract day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor Professional Development Plan</td>
<td>During the non-SER years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor accomplishment of Agency goals</td>
<td>During the non-SER years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the non-SER years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Performance evaluation timeline

(Figure 6) were also defined and refined by the Stakeholders’ Committee by responding to key questions (Appendix J) presented by Professor Manatt and Professor Stow, Co-Director of SIM. Generic criteria applicable to all employees of the agency were developed during the meeting on January 11, 1991 (Table 6). These criteria were later revised into Alternative Generic Criteria: Classified Staff by a subcommittee of the Stakeholders’ Committee (Table 7). They were revised a second time in the fall of 1992 by a subcommittee of the Stakeholders’ Committee to include all agency personnel (Table 8).
Figure 6. Performance evaluation cycle
Table 6. Generic criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERIC CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Provides leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Initiates goals and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uses creative problem-solving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstrates high expectations for self and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Initiates new ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provides motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assists others in enhancing or developing individual strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Promotes a positive climate with the Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Articulates the vision of the Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Formulates a mission statement for the &quot;department.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Promotes the belief that all students can and will learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Manages responsibilities.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervises and/or monitors job responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assists in developing plans for future needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keeps informed about the appropriate job-related programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Handles multiple tasks concurrently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administers policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Organizes effective office/position and time management practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adheres to Agency policies, completes assigned duties accurately and in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Selects appropriate channels for resolving concerns/problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Plans an appropriate schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establishes priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Maintains records and submits reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encourages, models, and maintains high standards of conduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Maintains and organizes a flexible calendar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Maintains office functions that are oriented to the needs of staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Establishes systematic procedures for accomplishing goals and objectives.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Forecasts needs, conditions, and availability of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determines priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizes and assigns resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establishes timelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arranges systematic details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Implements established plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Promotes the programs of the Agency.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Implements public relations activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Works toward involving others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Makes recommendations for new policies directed toward improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participates in the Agency's programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Practices effective participatory management techniques.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishes and uses procedures for obtaining input from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluates the effectiveness of the decision-making procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Serves as a role model when interacting with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Promotes the team concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attends appropriate meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Helps the team solve problems and reach objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERIC CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Is consistently on time and well-prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reviews complexities of both sides of issues and encourages consideration of consequences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. **Demonstrates human relations skills.**
1. Contributes to harmony and unity within the organization.
2. Interacts and relates effectively with others.
3. Provides a climate for open communication.
4. Adapts to and supports organizational change.
5. Demonstrates fairness and consistency in dealing with others.
6. Acknowledges the rights of others to hold differing views and values.
7. Uses discretion in handling situations that require confidentiality.
8. Demonstrates effective two-way communication.
9. Processes written and oral communications effectively.
10. Returns phone calls promptly.
11. Encourages and practices effective communication with others.
12. Communicates clearly, concisely, and logically.
13. Uses effective listening skills.
14. States ideas logically.

G. **Engages in professional growth activities.**
1. Participates in staff development.
2. Stays current with job-related trends.
3. Plans professional growth activities which are based on professional needs.

Table 7. Alternative generic criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE GENERIC CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFIED STAFF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To the extent possible within the position, the employee will*
1. support the Agency mission.
2. get along with others.
3. support strategic goals.
4. promote a positive climate.
5. maintain high standards of conduct.
6. select appropriate channels for resolving conflict.
7. complete assigned duties accurately and in a timely manner.
8. be consistently on time and well-prepared.
9. adapt to and support organizational change.
10. demonstrate effective communication skills.
11. engage in professional growth activities.
Table 8. Generic criteria (revised)

The generic criteria (lettered items A-G) are the same for all Western Hills employees. The indicators (numbered items) serve merely as examples of behavior that would demonstrate the criteria. These will vary depending on the person's position.

A. Provides leadership.
   1. Sets goals and objectives.
   2. Uses creative problem-solving.
   3. Holds high expectations for self and others.
   4. Initiates new ideas.
   5. Provides motivation.
   6. Assists others in enhancing or developing individual strengths.
   7. Promotes a positive climate within the Agency, with clients and the public.
   8. Articulates the vision of the Agency.
   9. Promotes the belief that all students can and will learn.
  10. Assists Agency clients and visitors.

B. Manages responsibilities.
   1. Handles multiple tasks concurrently.
   2. Administers and adheres to policies.
   3. Practices effective time management.
   4. Completes assigned duties accurately and in a timely manner.
   5. Selects appropriate channels for resolving conflict, concerns and problems.
   6. Plans an appropriate schedule.
   7. Maintains records and submits reports.
   8. Encourages, models, and maintains high standards of conduct.

C. Establishes systematic procedures for accomplishing goals and objectives.
   1. Forecasts needs, conditions, and availability of resources.
   2. Determines priorities.
   3. Organizes and assigns resources.
   4. Establishes timelines.
   5. Arranges systematic details.
   6. Implements established plans.

D. Promotes the programs of the Agency.
   1. Implements public relations activities.
   2. Works toward involving others.
   3. Makes recommendations for new policies directed toward improvement.
   4. Participates in the Agency's programs.
   5. Supports the agency mission, strategic goals and programs.
Table 8. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERIC CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Practices effective participatory management techniques.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishes and uses procedures for obtaining input from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluates the effectiveness of the decision-making procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Serves as a role model when interacting with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Promotes the team concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attends appropriate meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Helps the team solve problems and reach objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is consistently on time and well-prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reviews complexities of both sides of issues and encourages consideration of consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Demonstrates human relations skills.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Contributes to harmony and unity within the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gets along with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provides a climate for open communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adapts to and supports organizational change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrates fairness and consistency in dealing with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supports the rights of others to hold differing views and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Uses discretion in handling situations that require confidentiality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Returns phone calls promptly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Encourages and practices effective communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Uses effective listening skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Handles phone calls in a professional, courteous manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Engages in professional growth activities.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participates in staff development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stays current with job-related trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plans professional growth activities which are based on professional needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timelogging**

*Methodology: Data collection, purposive sampling, interpretation of outcomes*

In an effort to determine the critical work activities of every position in AEA 12, each employee was asked to complete a two-week timelogging activity during February, 1991. Instructions for the procedures and expectations of this activity were provided by Professor Manatt in January, 1991 (Appendix K). This
information was then collected, mailed to the SIM office, and analyzed by the SIM team for time emphasis, tasks not described in the respective job descriptions, differences across the same job title, priorities, and terms used to describe specific tasks. This information was eventually incorporated into the performance evaluation handbook for each position.

Critical work activities

*Methodology: Interpretation of outcomes, confirmation interviews, participant observation, anecdotal records*

The individual employee timelogging analyses (Appendix L) were returned in May, 1991, at meetings of job-alike groups of employees. The purposes of these meetings were to have each employee check his/her analysis for accuracy and to reach consensus as a job-alike group on the critical work activities for their position in the agency (Appendix M). This information would ultimately be reviewed against the job description for any given position to develop the summative evaluation report for that respective position.

Comparison charts

*Methodology: Interpretation of outcomes*

During the summer of 1991, comparison charts of time spent by each employee on the critical work activities for each position within AEA 12 were developed (Table 9).
Table 9. Comparison chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. CRITICAL WORK ACTIVITY</th>
<th>AUDIOLIST 1</th>
<th>AUDIOLIST 2</th>
<th>AUDIOLIST 3</th>
<th>OVERALL PCT. AVE.</th>
<th>RANK OF OVERALL PCT. AVE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank 1. Performs general office duties</td>
<td>1 38.66 25.43</td>
<td>6 7.08 4.43</td>
<td>9 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>9.95 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administers audiological tests</td>
<td>2 26.50 17.43</td>
<td>1 52.66 32.91</td>
<td>3 22.25 14.64</td>
<td>21.66 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participates in professional development</td>
<td>3 19.00 12.50</td>
<td>8 2.41 1.51</td>
<td>6 7.75 5.10</td>
<td>6.37 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prepares written reports</td>
<td>5 11.58 7.62</td>
<td>2 44.33 27.71</td>
<td>2 22.33 14.69</td>
<td>16.67 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interprets test results</td>
<td>7 9.58 6.30</td>
<td>3 21.25 13.28</td>
<td>4 17.25 11.35</td>
<td>10.31 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Maintains diagnostic amplification equipment</td>
<td>8 8.66 5.70</td>
<td>5 13.66 8.54</td>
<td>7 2.50 1.64</td>
<td>5.29 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conducts research</td>
<td>9 0.75 0.49</td>
<td>7 4.25 2.66</td>
<td>9 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>1.05 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Spends time on intra-agency referrals</td>
<td>10 0.50 0.33</td>
<td>9 0.25 0.16</td>
<td>7 2.50 1.64</td>
<td>0.71 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6 10.25 6.74</td>
<td>1 43.66 28.72</td>
<td>11.82 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 137.73 90.60 | 161.05 100.68 | 134.74 88.64 | **93.31**

*Total percentage may equal more than 100% because some activities have been logged under more than one critical work activity.*

Abstracted from a complete set of comparison charts for each job position in AEA 12
Job-specific responsibilities

**Methodology:** Participant observation, anecdotal records

From the feedback on critical work activities and from the data obtained from the comparison charts came the identification of job-specific responsibilities for each position in AEA 12. These job-specific responsibilities (Table 10) were added to the current job description (Figure 7) for each position in AEA 12, for future adoption by the Board of Directors. The job-specific responsibilities would be incorporated into the respective summative evaluation report (Appendix N) for each position in AEA 12.

**Year Two, 1991-92**

**Draft handbook and sample instruments**

**Methodology:** Observation, anecdotal records, confirmation interviews, purposive sampling, interpretation of outcomes

A draft handbook and sample summative evaluation reports were presented to the Stakeholders' Committee in September, 1991. The draft handbook, a sample management action plan (MAP) (Figure 8), a sample project action plan (PAP) (Figure 9), the Chief Administrator's Performance Evaluation Handbook (Appendix O) and an analysis of the number of employees evaluated by each evaluator in AEA 12 ("Who's evaluating whom") (Table 11) were then presented to the Board of Directors in October, 1991. Suggestions for revisions were noted and later incorporated into the handbook. In November, 1991, the revised materials were presented to AEA 12 administration and to all employees in job-alike group
Table 10. Job-specific responsibilities (audiologist)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB-SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES (AUDIOLOGIST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Prepares and conducts effective student and hazardous area evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gathers and reviews all pertinent data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uses valid and reliable tests, measures, and equipment to determine hearing status and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conducts diagnostic studies to identify school problem areas and student needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formulates timely, sound recommendations for prevention and remediation of hearing loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Provides audiology services to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structures services using assessment data and team recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establishes effective working relationships with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provides hearing aid workups to include ear mold impressions, testing and hearing aid analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conducts orientation counseling, guidance and auditory training for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinates appropriate referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Serves on multi-disciplinary teams and committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Serves as a member of multi-disciplinary assessment teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participates in IEP development conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assures follow-up of students and correction of hazardous conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Functions as a resource consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Consults with staff, parents and appropriate agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provides resources for research purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assists school staff in developing hearing conservation strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provides advice on program planning and curriculum development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Refers clients to other agencies and serves as liaison to those agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knows applicable laws, regulations, guidelines and research findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conducts meaningful research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provides services as an advocate for students and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ensures that each child requiring special education receives an appropriate special education program or service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abstracted from a complete set of job-specific responsibilities for each job position in AEA 12
Position Title: Audiologist
Reports To: Supervisor, Educational/Audiological Services

BASIC FUNCTION

The audiologist has the responsibility to provide hearing conservation services in their assigned schools. The services include prevention of hearing impairments, identification of pupils with hearing loss, cooperative medical referral and follow-up of hearing loss, and special education counseling and recommendations.

BASIC RESPONSIBILITIES

1) Administer appropriate audiological (pure tone air/bone, impedance) tests to preschool and school age students who fail school screenings.

2) Classify hearing losses and interpret test results to parents, students, AEA staff and appropriate school personnel.

3) Prepare and distribute written reports regarding individual students hearing status to parents, LEA's, AEA personnel, or other appropriate agencies.

4) Provide hearing aid workup to include ear mold impressions, audiometric testing and hearing aid analysis on students with wearable amplification.

5) Determine through proper evaluation, in coordination with other appropriate personnel, each hearing-impaired pupil's needs for special education and develop the necessary and appropriate special education program consistent with needs.

6) Provide prevention services which involves educating the public, school personnel, and other interested people of the need for and knowledge about early detection and prevention of hearing impairment.

7) Implement policies and guidelines established by the Hearing Conservation/Educational department, Division of Special Education, Western Hills AEA 12, local school districts, and the State Department of Public Instruction.

8) Prepare and distribute to the supervisor, narrative and statistical summaries of services provided during the school year.

9) Performs other related duties as assigned.

Figure 7. Job description
(Abstracted from a complete set of job descriptions for each job position in AEA 12)
MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN (Administrator)  

GOAL STATEMENT:  
(Write a separate plan for each project)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>PROJECT COORD</th>
<th>TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>EST. COST</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Signature of Person Responsible  

Fully Accomplished:  
Partially Accomplished:  
Not Accomplished:  

Completion Date:  

Figure 8. Management action plan (administrator)
# Project Action Plan

**GOAL STATEMENT:**
(Write a separate plan for each project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>PROJECT COORD</th>
<th>TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>EST. COST</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion Date:</th>
<th>Signature of Person Responsible</th>
<th>Fully Accomplished:</th>
<th>Partially Accomplished:</th>
<th>Not Accomplished:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 9. Project action plan
Table 11. "Who's evaluating whom"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF PERSONS EVALUATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Hopkins</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneice Wagner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Delzell</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Derochie</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Pedersen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Lux</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Brown</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Wilson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ownby</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Spence</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists/Social Work Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Happe</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Monson</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Petersen</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arletta Dawson</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lending Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Derochie</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Grubel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Library/Curriculum Lab</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryon Sitler (new hire)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meetings. The proposed handbooks were color-coded according to the four divisions of the agency—Media Services, Special Education Services, Educational Services, and Administrative Services—and each included: a Philosophy of Education; a Philosophy of Consulting; a Philosophy of Administration; Functions of the Performance Evaluation System; Performance Evaluation Procedures; a Performance Evaluation Timeline; a Performance Evaluation Cycle; Performance Areas, Criteria, and Descriptors; a Summative Evaluation Report; and a Professional Development Plan form (Appendix P) for a given position within a division.

Test-and-try

Methodology: Purposive sampling, interpretation of outcomes, intuitive insights, written surveys

Each evaluator was asked to solicit volunteers to participate in a test-and-try of the newly-created performance evaluation system from November 11, 1991, through February 29, 1992. Professor Manatt recommended that at least two employees in each position be used, if possible. The short cycle test-and-try should include: 1) a work-site visit; 2) a coaching session; and 3) completion of the summative evaluation report, including the professional development plan. After the test-and-try, a written survey which was color-coded according to the four divisions of the agency was distributed to each employee (Appendix Q). The input obtained was used to determine if the newly-developed performance evaluation system was suitable for the agency's purposes. In March, 1992, the input was shared with the
Stakeholders' Committee, who, in turn, decided if changes in the system should be recommended.

**Training**

*Methodology: Purposive sampling, interpretation of outcomes, participant observation, anecdotal records, intuitive insights*

An education personnel evaluation training packet, "Systems Booklet," was developed and presented to the AEA 12 evaluators and Stakeholders' Committee during January, 1992 (Appendix R). It included information on the definition, assumptions, and basic attributes of education personnel evaluation, the Professional Support Personnel (PSP) Evaluation Model (Stronge & Helm, 1991), the Total Systems Approach to Evaluation (Manatt, 1988), and a sample of other education personnel evaluation systems. After reviewing the span of control for AEA 12 evaluators ("Who's evaluating whom"), Professor Manatt suggested the use of multiple data sets and possibly, multiple evaluators.

When it is time to renew an evaluator's certification, Advanced Evaluator Training, Level II, is required by the state. It is a minimum of 15 hours of training and was provided by Professor Manatt during March and April, 1992, for those staff members who would be evaluating any AEA 12 employee. The training included guided practice scenarios (Appendix S) and information on the public employee's rights of procedural (proper calendar) and substantive (reasonable and fair) due process. The acronym NEAT was shared: N—notice (job description, what to expect); E—explanation (summative evaluation report, what to do to get better);
A—assistance (coaching, feedback); and T—time (time to improve). A meeting was held in March, 1992, with the Stakeholders' Committee to provide them with Advanced Evaluator Training, Level II. The topics of restructuring, transformation, outcomes-based evaluation, alternative types of assessment including authentic assessment, and gender bias were also discussed.

**Videotaping**

*Methodology: Participant observation, purposive sampling, inductive data analysis, intuitive insights*

The concept of a video-based instructional package was discussed with the Board of Directors and administrators at a meeting in February, 1992. The script outlines for the videotaping (Appendix T) were presented to the stakeholders at a meeting in March, 1992. Volunteers were requested and selected from each of the four divisions of AEA 12 in the spring of 1992. Procedural guidelines and script outlines were prepared and distributed to each participant prior to the July, 1992, videotaping. Each division’s summative conference script outline included the following: setting the stage, discussing a summative evaluation report, developing the professional development plan, and providing closure. Administrative Services also included a script outline for the formative conference: setting the stage, discussing the formative components, and providing closure. The specific areas of concern to be addressed by each division included: Educational Services - scheduling; Special Education Services - district rapport; Media Services - time and quality; and Administrative Services - prioritizing. The AEA 12 media specialist provided the
equipment and technical assistance for the videotaping. Final copies are maintained by the AEA to be developed into a video-based instructional package for use with staff development in performance evaluation.

Year Three, 1992-93

Revisions

Methodology: Confirmation interviews, purposive sampling, holistic inquiry, interpretation of outcomes

At the recommendation of Professor Stow, Co-Director of SIM, individual interviews with representatives of the four divisions of AEA 12 were conducted in the fall of 1992. The representatives were identified by their respective division and were invited to meet individually with members of the SIM team to answer questions regarding the test-and-try of the previous winter (Appendix U). This feedback was incorporated into the final revisions of the performance evaluation system.

Acceptance by stakeholders' committee

Methodology: Holistic inquiry, purposive sampling, intuitive insights, emphasis on social processes, confirmation interviews

The Stakeholders’ Committee met in September, 1992, to review progress to date, discuss proposed criteria changes, and determine plans for the 1992-93 school year. A subcommittee of the Stakeholders’ Committee had previously been established to discuss the generic criteria; some committee members felt that these criteria did not apply to all support personnel. A different subcommittee was established at the September meeting to revise the generic criteria a second time.
Once that subcommittee completed its task, they took their recommendations to the Stakeholders' Committee for their approval. Once approved, the revised generic criteria were incorporated into the performance evaluation handbook for each position in the agency. It was also recommended during this session that the generic criteria and the management action plan (MAP) should be part of the Chief Administrator's Performance Evaluation Handbook. Agreement to proceed with requesting board approval of the performance evaluation system was obtained from the Stakeholder's Committee.

The Stakeholders' Committee determined that it would need to address the following issues during a January, 1993, workshop: 1) When should the cabinet be surveyed with the form, "Feedback from the Cabinet" (Appendix V)? 2) Who will be members of the cabinet? 3) How shall feedback be used at levels other than the cabinet level? Additional topics to be discussed included board evaluation, staff involvement and training, and articulation of long-range strategic plans.

**Board approval**

*Methodology: Confirmation interview*

Board approval for the performance evaluation system was received in February, 1993; the 53 summative evaluation reports did not need to be approved individually. All of the information was sent to the AEA on computer disk so that ongoing revisions could be made as they implemented their newly-developed performance evaluation system.
Follow-up topics/training

Methodology: Inductive data analysis, holistic inquiry, purposive sampling, participant observation, anecdotal records, emphasis on social processes

A retreat for the Board of Directors and administrative team was held in February, 1993. The Board had expressed interest in having an additional instrument created to provide feedback from an advisory council for the chief administrator’s evaluation. The Board intended to begin implementation of the chief administrator’s performance evaluation procedures instrument during the 1992-93 school year. Board evaluation was another issue that was discussed. Professor Manatt suggested the use of self-evaluation by the Board. Assistance with long-range strategic planning, studying the culture of the organization, and forming vertical leadership teams as part of a transformation process for the agency were also requested by the Board.
CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

A performance evaluation system for an intermediate education agency in Sioux City, Iowa, was developed and implemented as the result of this project between Western Hills Area Education Agency 12 and Professor Manatt and the School Improvement Model (SIM) team from Iowa State University.

The problem in this case study was whether a series of questions, based on theoretical and practical research on evaluating education personnel, could be answered affirmatively when used to develop a performance evaluation system for an intermediate education agency (Table 12).

Status of the Objectives

The status of the objectives for this research study were:

Objective 1

*Determine the functions of the performance evaluation system for an intermediate education agency.*

See Appendix C for the functions of the performance evaluation system.

Objective 2

*Identify job titles for all positions in an intermediate education agency.*

Job titles were identified for 53 positions in the agency. Some job titles were changed following the timelogging and CWA/time analysis activity. Some positions with similar titles had different job-specific responsibilities and required revisions. Subsequently, separate job descriptions and performance evaluation handbooks
Table 12. Case study problem: Could each of the following questions be answered affirmatively in the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system for an intermediate education agency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Would the Board of Directors commit the time and financial resources that would be necessary for the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system?</td>
<td>Feedback from participants included the need for more &quot;time&quot; for training and for the development and implementation of the performance evaluation system; however, the Board of Directors committed the time initially indicated as necessary by Professor Manatt and the SIM team.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Would the Board of Directors, evaluators, and evaluatees be able to reach agreement on the purpose of evaluation?</td>
<td>The Functions of the Performance Evaluation System is included in each performance evaluation handbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would the development of a performance evaluation system occur collaboratively between evaluators and evaluatees?</td>
<td>There were 10 evaluators out of the 29 members of the Stakeholders' Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Would the performance evaluation system address both evaluatee accountability and professional development?</td>
<td>The accountability issue was addressed through the coordination between generic and job-specific responsibilities, job descriptions, and the summative evaluation reports. Professional development plans are a vital component in the performance evaluation system. Each evaluatee/evaluator pair jointly develops a professional development plan (PDP) for the evaluatee based on the information included on his/her summative evaluation report.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Would the performance evaluation system be integrated with a staff development program?</td>
<td>At the end of year three of the project, a staff development program had not been developed or implemented that would address the areas of need as identified via the summative evaluation reports. However, staff development was provided by Professor Manatt during the project on topics such as effective teaching behaviors, criterion-referenced measures, culture and climate, education personnel evaluation, restructuring, transformation, outcomes-based evaluation, alternative types of assessment, and gender bias. A sample management action plan (MAP) was shared with the Board of Directors during year three and additional information regarding the use of a MAP was requested by the administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Would the performance evaluation system address organizational philosophy and goals?</td>
<td>The agency's mission was reviewed at the onset of the project.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would the performance evaluation system be congruent with existing board policies?</td>
<td>The board is currently in the process of revising all policies; the policies for evaluation of the chief administrator, certified staff and support personnel will be congruent with the newly-developed performance evaluation system.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Would the performance evaluation system provide the flexibility needed for use with a variety of positions in one organization?</td>
<td>The performance evaluation system developed and implemented with AEA 12 yielded performance evaluation handbooks for each of the 53 positions in the agency. Each handbook included information relevant to every employee, i.e., Philosophy of Education; Philosophy of Consulting; Philosophy of Administration; Functions of the Performance Evaluation System; Performance Evaluation Procedures; Performance Evaluation Timeline; Performance Evaluation Procedures; Performance Evaluation Timeline; Performance Evaluation cycle; Performance Areas, Criteria, and Descriptors; Summative Evaluation Report; and Professional Development Plan.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Would all staff receive training on the performance evaluation system?</td>
<td>Training was provided to all staff on timelogging, critical work activities and their relationship to job-specific responsibilities and job descriptions, and using the summative evaluation report (SER) and the professional development plan (PDP).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Would all staff have the opportunity to provide feedback on the newly-developed performance evaluation system?</td>
<td>Each staff member was provided the opportunity to provide written feedback on the draft handbook via a color-coded survey. The number of persons responding from each division: Media Services—17, Special Education Services—5, Educational Services—12, Administrative Services—8.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Would a variety of evaluation approaches be considered?</td>
<td>Collaborative supervision, differentiated supervision, peer coaching, self-evaluation, student evaluation, and self-directed evaluation were discussed with the Stakeholders' Committee; some of the different approaches were also discussed with the Board of Directors.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Would the clinical supervision model be implemented?</td>
<td>Most of the members of the Stakeholders' Committee seemed to feel the most comfortable with the clinical supervision model. They were familiar with the pre- and post-observation conferences, formal and informal observations, written</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. (Continued)</td>
<td>reports, and the summative evaluation conference. Management and project action plans would be implemented in conjunction with the clinical supervision model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Would the performance evaluation system include evaluation procedures, with an accompanying timeline and performance evaluation cycle?</td>
<td>Yes, each was included (Appendix I) (Figure 5) (Figure 6).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14. Would the performance evaluation system meet the legal protections necessary for evaluators and evaluatees? | Professor Manatt shared the acronym NEAT which represents a list of legal concerns the evaluator must address when dealing with the "reluctant" worker:  
N = Notification of what is wrong, what is lacking in performance  
E = Explanation of how to perform up to standards  
A = Assistance that the employee must be given, i.e., aid for punctuality, productivity, interpersonal relations, and/or good health habits regarding substance abuse, weight control, etc.  
T = Time for the employee to show improvement (substantive due process)  
Information regarding the public employee's procedural and substantive due process rights were also discussed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | X   |    |
| 15. Would the performance evaluation system meet guidelines established by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988)? | Propriety standards - The philosophies and procedures that were developed and the training that was provided stressed that the evaluations must be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of the evaluatees.  
Utility standards - The procedures and timeline for evaluation and the consistency between job descriptions and job-specific responsibilities will help to ensure that the evaluations are informative, timely, and influential.  
Feasibility standards - The philosophies, procedures and timelines will assist with the ease of implementation, and the efficiency of time and resources.  
Accuracy standards - The timelogging and CWAs and the respective feedback from all employees of the agency helped to ensure that the information obtained was technically accurate and that conclusions on the performance evaluations will be linked logically to the data.                                                                                                                   | X   |    |
were made (i.e., secretaries, clerks, consultants).

**Objective 3**

*Identify critical work activities (CWAs) for each position in an intermediate education agency.*

The identified critical work activities were incorporated into the job-specific responsibilities and summative evaluation reports for each of the 53 positions in the agency.

**Objective 4**

*Develop comparison charts of CWAs in job-alike categories for an intermediate education agency.*

All employees who participated in the timelogging activity were scheduled to attend the CWA analysis and feedback meetings. Time spent on identified CWAs did not automatically indicate the importance of any given activity; it simply indicated which tasks received the most emphasis from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**Objective 5**

*Cluster CWAs into job-specific responsibilities for each position in an intermediate education agency.*

It was possible to cluster at least three CWAs for each position in the agency whenever multiple persons worked in job-alike positions. Those activities identified by an individual which could not be clustered with any other person's CWAs, were included under "other" on the CWA analysis sheet. It is understood that there is likely to be variation among all employees in any job-alike position in the agency as
to how they allocate/spend their time, i.e., the amount of travel time during a work
day for any given individual is partly determined by the location and geographic size
of their assignment.

Objective 6

Incorporate generic criteria and job-specific responsibilities into job descriptions
for all positions in an intermediate education agency.

The job descriptions included job-specific responsibilities but did not include
the generic criteria; this information was included in the performance evaluation
handbook for each position in the agency. Even though the agency had spent time
revising job descriptions prior to this project, many of them had to be revised a
second time to be consistent with the identified job-specific responsibilities and
summative evaluation reports. There were some employees who indicated they had
not seen and were not aware of a job description for their particular position. Others
complained that they had to work on revising job descriptions "again" and with the
current changes being made in special education due to revised legislation on the
Renewed Service Delivery System (RSDS), job responsibilities and job descriptions
would need to be revised continually.

Objective 7

Design a summative evaluation report consistent with the job description for each
position in an intermediate education agency.

Some specific questions that were raised regarding the summative evaluation
report included:
1. Could the descriptors be pulled out of the handbooks and put into a separate booklet to eliminate the "additive" concept in evaluation ratings?

2. Could the summative evaluation report (SER) be transformed to a memo/letter with all other data included in the formative evaluation components?

3. Could the formal observation component be eliminated for different support personnel positions and replaced with the data obtained from informal observations?

4. What is the definition of "data" on the levels of performance?

(Professor Manatt reiterated that each descriptor relates to a specific criterion, for both generic and job-specific responsibilities.)

Objective 8

*Identify the number of employees evaluated by each evaluator in an intermediate education agency.*

The span of control for any evaluator ranged from one to 35. However, when posed with the possibility of implementing multiple evaluators as one way to build equity into any evaluator's responsibilities, there were strong feelings expressed by members of the Stakeholders' Committee and the administration to leave the span of control as it was. Specific feedback from individuals was that persons wanted to be evaluated by someone with training and expertise in their field. The implementation of multiple evaluators would not provide for this. It was also suggested that the travel time and distance between assignments for any given evaluator be taken into consideration when assigning evaluator responsibilities since, for some, evaluating
one-third of their assigned employees each year was not feasible; again, this was not
viewed as a viable option for the aforementioned reason. A member of the
Stakeholders’ Committee expressed that the current span of control leads to self-
directed evaluation.

**Objective 9**

*Develop a videotape that would subsequently be incorporated into a video-based instructional package for use by all employees, board members, and stakeholders of an intermediate education agency in the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system for the agency.*

The videotape included a scenario of a formative evaluation conference for
Administrative Services and scenarios of summative evaluation conferences for each
of the divisions of the agency. The comment was made that it was difficult in some
positions to focus on "education" issues rather than on "business" issues.

**Objective 10**

*Implement a performance evaluation system with a representative group of employees of an intermediate education agency.*

The newly-developed performance evaluation system was implemented on a trial
basis during a three-month period. Professor Manatt had recommended that two
volunteers from each position in the agency participate in the test-and-try, and as a
minimum, each volunteer should participate in an on-site visit and a coaching session.
The two persons should complete a summative evaluation report (SER) and a
professional development plan (PDP). Feedback revealed that no one completed the
test-and-try as specified.
Objective 11

*Survey the employees of an intermediate education agency for their satisfaction with the newly-developed performance evaluation system.*

All employees were provided with a color-coded survey to complete following the test-and-try. (The original intent had been to administer the survey to only the test-and-try participants, but due to the low number of participants, it was decided that each employee would be asked to complete the survey.) Forty-two persons responded, with the breakdown by division as follows: Administrative Services—8; Special Education Services—5; Educational Services—12; and Media Services—17. (The Director of Special Education indicated that the surveys had not been distributed to all of his staff due to short "turn around" time.) Several persons responding to the survey indicated that they had participated in certain components of the clinical supervision model during the school year, but it was not clear if that participation was due to their regular full-cycle evaluation with the AEA or due to the test-and-try (Table 13).

Verbal feedback was also obtained through personal, one-to-one interviews with representatives from each division of the agency selected by the administration (not all representatives had participated in the test-and-try) (Table 14).

Objective 12

*Revise the performance evaluation system of an intermediate educational agency based on the feedback of the employees.*

It was suggested by a member of the Stakeholders' Committee that the 53
Table 13. Test-and-try survey feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback/comment</th>
<th># Persons with response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do not agree that &quot;one unsatisfactory on any criterion will give an overall rating of unsatisfactory.&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hard to collect data on motivation, setting priorities, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not satisfied with format and wording of job description—no suggested changes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Generic criteria should be reviewed for appropriateness for all classified staff.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not sure if revised job description had been seen.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Performance criteria could be more complete and specific.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unaware of test-and-try.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Waste of time and money.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Should review processes one at a time; review orientation conference; stakeholders need to review all procedures.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Need to revise job-specific responsibilities.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Need more assistance on self-evaluation and how to record feedback conference.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Forms inadequate for gathering data.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. &quot;Meets expectations&quot; and &quot;meets standards&quot; are inconsistent with each other.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Delete language about schools/districts (replace with &quot;agency&quot;).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Personal interview feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th># Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the performance evaluation system manageable and practical?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the procedures and instruments adequate for collecting the data</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needed for evaluating performance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your job-specific responsibilities adequately and fairly represent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your role in the Agency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments:

a. comfortable with the new job description
b. timelogging helped
c. scheduled observations may not always be appropriate—it is good that the evaluator is given flexibility on the timeline and selecting ways of collecting the data
d. some job-specific responsibilities don't involve everyone, but that's okay
e. to be manageable, generic criteria need to be changed for classified staff, i.e., include NA (not applicable) or possibly have separate generic responsibilities for classified vs. certified staff
f. there should be no unsatisfactory (indicator of level of performance)—only needs improvement
g. this is similar to past practice
h. the process has enhanced employee/supervisor communication; overall, a positive experience
i. similar to what we've been through
j. have not heard anything negative
k. personally prefer this organized approach
l. much more appropriate than a checklist
m. ownership—when help to select goals, want to work at it more
n. excellent process—much needed
o. when will it start?
p. difficult at first (managing time), but it makes sense
different summative evaluation reports be included in separate handbooks for the 53 respective positions; one master copy of the entire handbook would be provided to the Stakeholders' Committee. Each handbook was color-coded by division, with individual summative evaluation reports identified by division and position, and included: Philosophy of Education; Philosophy of Consulting; Philosophy of Administration; Functions of the Performance Evaluation System; Performance Evaluation Procedures; Performance Evaluation Timeline; Performance Evaluation Cycle; Performance Areas, Criteria, and Descriptors; Summative Evaluation Report; and Professional Development Plan.

Some components of this project which were not specific objectives but created questions/concerns that needed to be addressed during the case study included the generic criteria and training. Following is specific feedback on each, plus general comments regarding the entire process.

Generic Criteria

Suggestions for changes to the generic criteria included: a) change them so they would be appropriate for all employees of AEA 12; b) weigh these criteria according to the expectations of different positions; c) allow NA (not applicable) as a level of performance on each summative evaluation report; or d) provide different descriptors for the generic criteria for support personnel than for certified staff.
Training

Even though Evaluator Training Level I is a prerequisite for Advanced Evaluator Training Level II, there were some Level II participants who had not completed Level I. The reason for this was that evaluator training, which is mandated by the state, had not initially been provided to non-certificated education personnel; yet, there are non-certificated personnel in the intermediate education agency who evaluate other education personnel. All employees of AEA 12 who would be evaluating other AEA 12 employees were invited to complete Level II training as part of this project. They received a letter for their personnel files from Professor Mannat, rather than a certificate from the state—to document completion of the training.

Other feedback regarding the evaluator training was that the pretest was written in "teacher" and "school" terms. It was requested that the posttest be modified to include education support personnel and to have an "agency" focus.

Additional types of training were requested: intensive assistance, coaching, collaborative supervision for school social workers, vertical leadership teams, technology as targets from growth, differentiated supervision, clinical supervision, multiple data sets, peer videotaping and feedback, multiple evaluators, criterion-referenced measures (criteria-referenced testing combined with authentic assessment), outcomes-based evaluation, what could be structured into the evaluation process to address bias, the conference process, observations, time management, and writing professional growth plans.
General Comments

The issue resurfaced, "How do we reduce the fear that this project's intent is to fire people?" An assistant director expressed concern about the ability to see the "whole picture" of this project and requested that survey feedback be provided to each division. A request was made to develop a checklist to aid with record-keeping by evaluators for each evaluatee (Figure 10). Feedback indicated that this performance evaluation system was "not a lot different" than the current system used by AEA 12 (pre-observation conference, visitation, post-observation conference), but that all of the procedures were not currently generalized to all of the different positions in the AEA. An AEA 12 employee noted that this is an ongoing process and that time would be needed to continually address and revise job descriptions and the summative evaluation reports.

The chief administrator's suggestions for future consideration included: reviewing the Board of Directors' Code of Ethics ("What should their involvement be in macromanagement?") and involving staff members in more planning with the stakeholders. Questions were also raised by Professor Manatt and the Stakeholders' Committee: a) How should the desired changes for vertical leadership teams be modeled for staff? b) How could more participation in evaluation be implemented? c) How can long-range strategic plans be incorporated into the performance evaluation system? d) How could more parent involvement (more direct than consultative) be included in performance evaluation, i.e., four- or five-item family report cards implemented on a uniform basis?
### PERFORMANCE EVALUATION Documentation Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluatee's Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Evaluator's Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### I. Individual/Professional Growth Planning Conference
(set goals, review criteria, discuss procedures, agree upon timelines, review due process, and discuss the goals of the Agency)

- **A. Self-evaluation (returning employees—prior to October 1)**
- **B. Self-evaluation (new employees—first two weeks of employment)**

#### II. Formative Component

- **A. Formal Observations (minimum 1-3) with Feedback Conferences within one week following each observation**
- **B. Informal Observations with Feedback Conferences within one week following each observation**
- **C. Supporting Data and Input (all three years) (state type of data and date for each)**

#### III. Summative Component

- **A. Summative Evaluation Report (SER) (by last contract date)**
- **B. Summative Conference (by last contract date)**

**Non-SER Years (mini-cycle)**

- **A. Monitor and evaluate progress toward Agency goals**
- **B. Monitor and evaluate progress toward PGP**

---

Figure 10. Documentation checklist
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Even though effective evaluation of education personnel has been increasingly emphasized as a key factor in school improvement, there is little available research or information on the evaluation of education support personnel; specifically, education support personnel employed by an intermediate education agency. Current trends in evaluation suggest that all personnel of an organization be involved in the evaluation process. It is understood that no one model of evaluation is suitable for all employees within an organization; the evaluation procedures may vary according to: 1) the size and complexity of the educational organization; 2) the different leadership styles of administrators and supervisors; and 3) the needs of the individual employees.

The purpose of evaluation for education personnel is seen as twofold—to improve instruction and to determine staff development needs. It is an ongoing process and requires open, two-way communication between evaluator and evaluatee. Evaluation should be directly related to the mission, goals, and objectives of the educational institution and interconnect with inservice training programs. The training of evaluators and evaluatees is a necessary component. The basic attributes of sound evaluation of education personnel, as identified by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988), are propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy. Adherence to these standards will help to ensure that the educational institution accomplish its mission.
Summary

This case study was part of a project between Western Hills Area Education Agency (AEA) 12, an intermediate education agency located in Sioux City, Iowa, and Professor Manatt and the School Improvement Model (SIM) team from Iowa State University. The purpose of the study was to inductively analyze data obtained via observations, interviews, and written documents to answer specific questions regarding the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system for all of the agency's employees. The qualitative research methodology included holistic inquiry, using humans as data-gathering instruments, purposive sampling, inductive data analysis, development of grounded theory, emergent design, interpretation of outcomes, utilization of intuitive insights, emphasis on social processes, and confirmation interviews.

The staff at Western Hills included 185 certified and support personnel. Each employee works for one of four divisions: Administrative Services, Educational Services, Special Education Services, or Media Services. Representative certified and support personnel from each of the four divisions served as members of the Stakeholders' Committee. This committee helped to facilitate the process and was the communication link between the SIM team and all agency employees.

Specific activities included in the development and implementation of the performance evaluation system included:

1. the development of philosophies and procedures;
2. employee timellogging and the identification of critical work activities (CWAs)
for each of 53 positions in the AEA, and the subsequent revision of job
descriptions;

3. the development of a summative evaluation report that included both generic
and job-specific responsibilities for each position;

4. training of all evaluators and evaluatees in the use of the summative evaluation
report and in writing professional development plans (PDPs);

5. a test-and-try of the performance evaluation system by representatives of the
agency's four divisions;

6. written and verbal feedback from employees on the draft performance
evaluation handbook, with consequent revisions;

7. the development of a videotape that would subsequently be incorporated into a
video-based instructional package for use by the agency; and

8. final approval of the performance evaluation system by the nine-member Board
of Directors.

The Stakeholders' Committee recommended, and the Board of Directors
approved, a performance evaluation system based on the more conventional clinical
supervision model of evaluation, in conjunction with management and project action
plans. The three-year performance evaluation cycle included formative and
summative components, self-evaluation, and professional development plans
collaboratively written by evaluators and evaluatees.

Specific challenges during the project included:

1. acceptance of generic criteria by the Stakeholders' Committee that were
deemed appropriate for all agency employees—this required the initial writing of
the generic criteria and two subsequent revisions by subcommittees of the
Stakeholders’ Committee; some stakeholders would have preferred that certified
and support personnel each have their own generic criteria or that NA (not
applicable) be included as a level of performance on the summative evaluation
report;

2. acceptance of the levels of performance on the summative evaluation report—
dissatisfaction with the definition of "unsatisfactory" ("one unsatisfactory on any
criterion will give an overall rating of unsatisfactory") was expressed by some
employees;

3. employee frustration with "a lack of communication" between agency
supervisors/administration and staff regarding expectations of the project and
employee participation;

4. the lack of "buy in" to the process, and subsequent performance evaluation
system, by some AEA staff members;

5. fear expressed by some staff members that the primary purpose of the project
was to terminate employment for some employees (even though this project was
partially the result of a request by the employees' union);

6. a variation in, or lack of, employee support for the different AEA 12
administrators;

7. the lack of guidance/facilitation of expected behaviors/activities between
Stakeholders' Committee and Board of Directors' meetings and the on-site visits
by SIM team members; and

8. inconsistent behavior indicating a lack of sensitivity toward the needs of education support personnel of an intermediate education agency, i.e., reference to "teachers," "schools," "instruction," and "management" in the Advanced Evaluator Training Level II and in the descriptors for generic criteria; in the use of Phase III funds for certified personnel participation in the project (but no compensation for support personnel).

Due to the lack of a staff development program in the agency, training and/or informational sessions were requested by the stakeholders in the following areas:

a) coaching; b) the conference process; c) writing professional development plans;
d) differentiated supervision; e) multiple data sets; and f) outcomes-based evaluation.

Conclusions

The results of the study indicate that it is possible to develop and implement a performance evaluation system which can be used with all certified and support personnel in an intermediate education agency. However, it is also evident that the underlying culture of an organization, and the communication and working relationships between supervisors/administration and staff contribute to the understanding and ultimate acceptance of a performance evaluation system.

The research questions posed at the onset of the study and their responses were as follows:

*Is it possible to*

1. identify job-specific responsibilities for each position in an intermediate
education agency that will satisfy each employee working in that position? Job-specific responsibilities for each position were determined by analyzing the results of the timelogging/CWA analysis in job-alike groups of employees. Each employee was provided the opportunity to provide individual feedback via survey regarding the draft copy of job-specific responsibilities; revisions were made as requested. Some job-alike positions required separate job-specific responsibilities and thus, separate job descriptions and summative evaluation reports, i.e., secretaries, clerks, consultants. Personal interviews were held with a cross-section of employees selected by the administration prior to seeking acceptance by the Stakeholders’ Committee and board approval.

Is it possible to
2. develop a job description for each position in an intermediate education agency that will satisfy each employee working in a given position?

Job-specific responsibilities that were not previously included in the job description for each position were added, in italics, to the bottom of each job description. This information is to be submitted to the Board of Directors for their approval prior to the end of the 1992-93 school year.

Is it possible to
3. design a summative evaluation report that can be used with each employee of an intermediate education agency that will include agency generic criteria as well as job-specific responsibilities for each position?

A summative evaluation report was designed for each of the 53 positions in AEA 12. Each report included the agency generic criteria as well as job-specific responsibilities for a given position.
4. design a summative evaluation report that will satisfy the board, administration, evaluators, and evaluatees of an intermediate education agency?

The Stakeholders' Committee—comprised of representative administrators, evaluators, and evaluatees—expressed acceptance of the summative evaluation report prior to submitting it to the Board for approval in February, 1993.

5. develop a performance evaluation system that can be implemented with each employee of an intermediate education agency?

The performance evaluation handbook developed for each position in AEA 12 included: Functions of the Performance Evaluation System; Philosophy of Education; Philosophy of Consulting; Philosophy of Administration; Performance Evaluation Procedures; Performance Evaluation Timeline; Performance Evaluation Cycle; Performance Areas, Criteria, and Descriptors; Summative Evaluation Report; and Professional Development Plan. The section of the handbook unique to each position, the Performance Areas, Criteria, and Descriptors, not only contained the generic criteria for all employees, but included job-specific responsibilities for a given position.

6. develop a performance evaluation system that will satisfy the board, administration, evaluators, and evaluatees of an intermediate education agency?

Following acceptance of the performance evaluation system by the representative Stakeholders' Committee, the Board of Directors gave their approval at a meeting in February, 1993.
Even though all employees were provided opportunities to participate verbally and in writing in the development and trial implementation of the performance evaluation system as it related to each respective position, participation was limited. This made it difficult to determine their level of satisfaction. Feedback suggested different reasons for this limited participation:

1. short turn-around time between requests and due dates (the AEA and SIM team were both responsible, at times, for this);
2. no written master plan of the project timelines/expectations;
3. lack of communication between supervisors and subordinates;
4. unclear understanding of expectations, i.e., individual feedback vs. group or division feedback (the Stateholders' Committee and Board of Directors did not receive copies of the SIM team's minutes of the meetings);
5. a feeling that participation would be a waste of time—limited effect on decision-making;
6. the fear that the purpose of the new evaluation system and the summative evaluation reports was to terminate employment for given staff members;
7. limited employee involvement between visits from Professor Manatt; and
8. AEA 12 supervisors were given the responsibility of selecting participants.

Responses to questions/concerns posed throughout the project but not included in the specific research questions, are discussed as follows. First, the Advanced Evaluator Training Level II provided for each evaluator in the agency did not appear to be appropriate for all of the participants. Feedback indicated that
since not all participants were certificated employees, each had not completed the prerequisite Level I training. In addition, the pre- and post-tests were written in reference to "teachers" and "school districts" rather than "education personnel" and "agency;" the posttests were thus rewritten to be more applicable to the evaluators in AEA 12.

Second, even though the span of control for each evaluator was discussed as "Who evaluates whom" and the numbers of evaluatees for any given evaluator ranged from one to 35, there were no recommendations and subsequent decisions made that would address this equity issue. Also, the situations of multiple evaluators for a given employee and evaluators responsible for a multitude of job positions were not addressed.

Third, training tapes were developed; however, there was no current plan of action for the design of video-based instructional packages and their implementation with agency employees or other agencies.

Fourth, it was apparent that flexibility in the application of evaluation procedures was necessary in order to meet the needs of education personnel who work in a variety of job positions within one agency. For example, feedback indicated that certain job positions did not lend themselves to observations or shadowing as formative evaluation techniques; multiple data sets in those instances were deemed by both evaluator and evaluatee as more appropriate. However, this flexibility in procedures necessitates a wider variety of staff development training/inservice options to ensure awareness and competencies by evaluators in
each of the procedures. This need for a staff development program was also apparent at the implementation stage of the project—it was the consensus of the Stakeholders' Committee at the January 29, 1993, meeting that an overview of the entire performance evaluation system was needed by those AEA employees who would be inservicing the remainder of the Western Hills staff.

Finally, this particular agency did not currently have a staff development program/model in place to address these issues. The geographical size served by the agency was prohibitive for ongoing, organization-wide conventional staff development. The time and distance employees must travel within the agency on any given day limited the amount of time that could be spent on team planning/collaboration/staff development. As a service organization, the employees planned their schedules to be of the greatest benefit to the school districts which they serve. This wide variation of schedules among employees was also prohibitive to conventional staff development activities.

Limitations

The limitations relative to this study were as follows:

1. This study occurred in one intermediate education agency in Iowa; thus, the results cannot be generalized to any other intermediate education agency, in or out of the state of Iowa.

2. The review of literature revealed no "accepted" model of performance evaluation for education support personnel; specifically, education support personnel employed by an intermediate education agency.
3. There were no follow-up studies of performance evaluation systems used by intermediate education agencies identified in the literature; thus, there is no basis for determining the long-term success of this newly-developed performance evaluation system for AEA 12.

4. Since this was not a longitudinal study, the success of the implementation of the newly-developed performance evaluation system for AEA 12 could not be determined.

5. The researcher was not a participant-observer in the initial stages of the development of the performance evaluation system. Thus, the researcher's perceptions from the introduction of the project (1989-1990) through the timelogging activity in year one (1990-1991) were based on interviews with SIM researchers, after-action reports, and minutes of the Stakeholders' Committee and Board of Director meetings.

Discussion

A review of the different models of evaluation for education personnel revealed that there is currently one model of evaluation available for education support personnel; however, the review of literature indicated that no model specifically addresses performance evaluation in an intermediate education agency. The characteristics of Stronge and Helm's (1991) Professional Support Personnel (PSP) model were incorporated into the performance evaluation system for AEA 12:

1. a modified naturalistic setting for data collection;
an emphasis on outcomes-based performance evaluation;

3. the alignment of performance objectives with both institutional goals and specific job responsibilities; and

4. the reliance on multiple sources of data.

The six steps of this integrative evaluation model were included in the development and implementation of the performance evaluation system for AEA 12:

a) identify system needs; b) relate program expectations to job responsibilities;

c) select performance indicators; d) set standards for job performance; e) document job performance; and f) evaluate performance. The key questions recommended by Manatt (undated) were addressed in the development of the evaluation system:

1) What are your purposes? 2) What are your criteria? 3) How high are your standards? 4) How will you monitor and report performance?

The new performance evaluation system, which followed a clinical supervision model in conjunction with management and project action plans, incorporated the trend of multiple data sets for education evaluation systems as identified by Manatt (undated); however, it did not address the trends, pay-for-performance or multiple evaluators. The new system was consistent with Deming's "no merit systems" and "education and self-improvement for all" in that it provided for individual professional development plans, but was inconsistent with Deming's "no annual ratings." The Advanced Evaluator Training Level II provided for AEA 12 evaluators, stressed the importance of the coaching process; however, evaluators are still expected to "pass judgment" on an employee's performance and to assess progress toward identified
goals on each employee's professional development plan. Could it be that Deming's belief that "traditional practices of rating performance destroy teamwork, foster mediocrity..." was being evidenced in the culture of this organization? Will the agency proceed with a study and implementation of outcomes-based assessment or investigate Deming's philosophy of Total Quality Management to "drive out fear" and transform the current style of AEA 12 management?

Communication and working relationships between divisions, between evaluators and evaluatees, between the Board and the administration seem to be areas in need of improvement, not only in the development and implementation of this performance evaluation system, but in general. Due to the organizational structure of the agency and the geographical size and subsequent locations of branch offices, developing and maintaining open, two-way communication will most likely be an ongoing challenge. A communication plan with specific expectations shared by the leadership of the agency may be necessary to ensure at least a minimal level of communication among all agency employees. The new advances in technology, i.e., computer networking or fiber optics, may help to facilitate communication in the future, regardless of time and distance between employees in the various branch offices.

Improved communication may also be one step toward increasing the trust level between administration and staff. The culture of the organization was referred to frequently, primarily by the chief administrator whose belief was that some of the "fear of being terminated" stems from the culture of the organization. Dr. Hopkins,
Chief Administrator for AEA 12, shared with the Stakeholders' Committee that employee empowerment and communication among employees are the keys to the success of the newly-developed performance evaluation system. Administrators must be leaders who are capable of facilitating employee empowerment and open communication while maintaining their ability to make decisions that will impact the success of any organizational change.

Epilogue

Since the Board of Directors of AEA 12 approved the newly-developed performance evaluation system in February, 1993, they have also approved and implemented the Chief Administrator's Performance Evaluation Handbook. At a March 12, 1993, planning session with Professor Manatt, they requested that the "Feedback from the Cabinet" and the "Superintendents' Advisory Council Feedback" performance evaluation handbooks include an NA (not applicable) column as a response mode. The Board also gave approval for Professor Manatt and the SIM team to update all job descriptions, incorporating the italicized job-specific responsibilities into the text of the respective job descriptions. A Stakeholders' Committee meeting has been scheduled for April 14, 1993, and a training session for all AEA 12 evaluators for May 21, 1993. All AEA 12 employees will be "reoriented" to the newly-developed performance evaluation system at an August 18, 1993, meeting, prior to its full implementation during the 1993-94 academic year.
Recommendations for Practice

Recommendations for practice for any intermediate education agency include:

1. Involve as many staff as possible in the early stages of the development of a performance evaluation system;

2. Develop and implement a communication plan that will include providing information to all agency employees on a regular basis;

3. Assess the culture and climate of the organization on a regular basis and identify action plans based on the results;

4. Set goals and timelines at the onset of the project and adhere to them;

5. The expectations for all staff should be communicated and modeled by all agency administrators on an ongoing basis;

6. Develop and implement a staff development program or series of inservices/workshops on an ongoing basis to address individual and organizational needs;

7. Field test the newly-developed performance evaluation system for an academic year, with revisions made based on feedback from participants;

8. Select the test-and-try participants rather than ask for volunteers, to ensure representation and participation from each division;

9. Consider alternative levels of performance, i.e., is NA (not applicable) a viable option given the diverse job positions within an intermediate education agency? and

10. Explore the possibility of utilizing technology in the implementation of any
performance evaluation system, i.e., the generation of professional
development plans, the tabulation of data.

Suggested questions for any intermediate education agency to address prior to
initiating the development and implementation of a performance evaluation system;
a) should the process be facilitated by someone from outside the agency and begin
with the formation of a stakeholders' committee similar to this study, or b) could it
be facilitated by an agency employee utilizing the handbooks from this study and
implemented without any, or with a minimal number of, stakeholders' committee
meetings?

Recommendations for AEA 12

1. Continue to explore other models of evaluation, i.e., collaborative supervision
   and differentiated supervision;

2. Develop and implement a staff development program for agency employees,
   including such topics as coaching, the conference process, writing professional
   development plans, multiple data sets, and outcomes-based evaluation;
   technology, i.e., CD roms, fiber optics, video-based instructional packages, can
   be implemented that will address the restrictions placed on AEA 12 due to
   large geographical size;

3. Develop and implement an agency-wide communication action plan;

4. Study the culture and climate of the agency and develop action plans, as
   appropriate;
5. Request feedback on the newly-developed performance evaluation system on an ongoing basis and make revisions as appropriate; and

6. Examine the differences in feedback received from the four divisions over the next five years—is there a difference between the divisions in the success of the evaluation system and, if so, what factors might account for those differences?

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Even though similar studies could be completed, the case study does not allow for exact replication. Additional case studies in the area of performance evaluation systems for intermediate education agencies and/or education support personnel would help to either support or refute the findings and recommendations identified in this study. More specifically, additional case studies might address the following research questions:

1. Is it possible to incorporate a "menu" approach to performance evaluation (a variety of evaluation models/techniques) in an effort to best meet the diverse needs of the employees of an intermediate education agency?

2. Could individualized performance outcomes be identified for each employee of an intermediate education agency, with the evaluation system then designed according to the needs of each employee?

3. Would the assessment of the culture of an organization prior to the development of a performance evaluation system help to determine the type of evaluation system that would best meet the diverse needs of the employees of
an intermediate education agency?

Regardless of the approach, organizations seriously committed to enhancing employee performance in the interest of providing better services and programs to students and other clients will demonstrate that commitment with a comprehensive performance evaluation system for all certified and support personnel.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Christianson, L. (1993). A telephone interview with the executive secretary of AAESA (American Association of Educational Service Agencies) regarding the evaluation of education support personnel, performance appraisal systems used by intermediate education units, and training for supervisors of intermediate education units.


Ferrare, J. P. (1993). Personal interview regarding the models of evaluation being taught in educational administration classes at Drake University and the availability of information on the evaluation of education support personnel, Des Moines, IA.


Holloway, L. (1993). Personal interview regarding the training of supervisors and the performance appraisal system used by Heartland Area Education Agency 11, Johnston, IA.


Iwanicki, E. F. (1993). Personal interview regarding the availability of information on the evaluation of education support personnel and performance evaluation systems used by intermediate education units. Storrs, CT.


Stephens, E. R. (1993). Personal interview regarding the availability of information on the evaluation of education support personnel and performance evaluation systems used by intermediate education units. College Park, MD.


Stufflebeam, D. L. (1993). A personal interview with the office assistant for CREATE (Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation) regarding the evaluation of education support personnel and performance appraisal systems used by intermediate education units. Kalamazoo, MI.


ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

How do you say "thank-you" and begin to acknowledge all of the individuals who help you to achieve a goal that at one point was only a dream? Earning a doctorate was once something that only "other" people achieved. It has now become a reality for me through the encouragement of so many colleagues, family members and friends. Dr. Buchanan planted the seed; then Dr. Grabinski, Dr. Ferrare and my staff at school joined him in encouraging and supporting me throughout the process. My husband, Duane, was quietly patient and understanding. It was the pride that I felt from Duane and my parents that gave me a great sense of motivation. My parents had given me the foundation many years ago to value my education and to strive for whatever goal I set before me. I can only hope that my example will help to influence others in the same way.

Dr. Manatt—my guide, my encourager, my critic, my friend—helped to make this all possible for me. Dr. Manatt and my other committee members—Dr. Ebbers, Dr. Mulford, Dr. Netusil, and Dr. Stow—were always there to answer questions, provide materials that I requested, ask thoughtful questions, encourage and express genuine interest in my project and in me, as an individual. I have learned so much more from each of them and from my coursework and opportunities through my doctoral program than any paper or project could ever show.

A special thank-you to Dr. Robinson for his willingness to help me out with
my final orals and to Katy, Gordon, Marjorie and Judy for their much appreciated "technical" assistance.

I have grown professionally and personally—thank-you to each of you for allowing me to do so.
APPENDIX A: STATEMENTS OF BELIEF
STATEMENTS OF BELIEF

1. Leadership, facilitation, services.
2. Work together for children.
3. Communication between teachers, administrators, students, parents, and community.
4. Parents are important to educational system.
5. High expectations - expect the best from us.
6. Being there... presence of our team (interdisciplinary--more than one focus based on individual needs).
7. Openness and honesty (schools, staff, media).
8. Inter-division collaboration (i.e., technology).
9. Educate and empower parents.
10. Parents, teachers, administrators serves as "scouts".
11. All students can learn.
12. Satisfying place to work (safe place to be different; interest and trust in each other as human beings).
13. We serve everyone and do all things (or we do the most we can, the best we can).
15. Extremely multi-talented (high level of expertise); we are appreciated.
16. Wide variety and high level of skills to bring to schools - communication necessary between LEAs and AEA.
17. Serve an advocacy role (interpreters, linkage between handicapped/gifted and talented and AEA).
18. Highly diverse group of people who want to grow (we are empowered--there's a multitude of teams).
20. "Possibilities" is an area of motivation. Celebrate differences and have courage of convictions. Artistic agency.
APPENDIX B: AGREE-DISAGREE STATEMENTS ON PHILOSOPHY OF ADMINISTRATION
AGREE-DISAGREE STATEMENTS ON PHILOSOPHY OF ADMINISTRATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Read each statement once. Check whether you agree (A) or disagree (D) with each statement. Then in your small groups try to agree or disagree unanimously with each statement as a group. If your group cannot reach agreement or disagreement, you may change the wording in any statement enough to promote unanimity.

KEY: "A" = Agree "D" = Disagree

I. WHAT IS ADMINISTRATION?

1. Administration is something defined as an art, as a science, or as a process. Actually it embodies each of these.

2. An administrative philosophy which does not emphasize and constantly utilize in proper balance these four constituent elements and administrative activities: (a) planning, (b) execution, (c) appraisal, and (d) interpretation, is doomed to failure.

3. Good administration is primarily human manipulation in a socially acceptable manner.

4. Since the school administrator’s basic task is to create an environment in which subordinates can contribute to the full range of their talents, he/she has a primary responsibility to uncover and challenge creative resources.

5. Administrators are people who usually have had superior success as classroom teachers.

6. Successful administration really is a matter of having a winning personality. One could be an efficient building manager yet fail as an administrator.

7. There is prestige associated with being considered an executive who is “administratively in charge.”

II. WHO SHOULD DECIDE?

8. Participative management sounds good but is too time consuming to permit needed and respective action.

9. An administrator is hired to make decisions and should be capable of doing so without making great demands for teacher involvement.
10. Routine decisions should be made by administrators, but the greater the importance of a decision, the greater the efforts should be made to gather input from others.

11. If faculty time is usurped in gaining their insights, then the administrator is obliged to utilize their views.

12. Teachers clearly desire involvement in decision-making on all matters which are of any real significance.

III. CENTRAL VS. BUILDING ADMINISTRATION

13. Since a building level administrator has a closer relationship with the staff, he/she must have a more personal, more immediate, and more intense concern for maintaining and improving morale.

14. The major need for a building level administrator is for technical and human relation skills, while at the central office the administrator's effectiveness depends largely on human relations and conceptual skills.

15. Central office administration is a separate and distinct entity, thus the individuals performing administrative duties at that level must work within a philosophical framework distinctively different than that for building administrators.

16. The same basic competencies for administrative success apply to all levels of school administration.

17. Central office administrators tend to prefer building administrators who are good managers over those who are instructional leaders.

18. Building level administrators, along with the "directors" on the central office staff, should be knowledgeable of the strengths and weaknesses of various programs and be skilled in bringing about improvement in them.

IV. The Principal

19. A principal should be knowledgeable in, and be able to demonstrate techniques of working with, students on both a large and small group basis in developing realistic student government along with social and recreational activities for the students.
20. Elementary and secondary principalships are so clearly different in scope and responsibility that the same expectations cannot apply.

21. Building level administrators must be thoroughly knowledgeable about current teaching methodologies and strategies.

22. It is essential that building level administrators teach periodically to demonstrate their capability.

23. A building level administrator should not pretend to be a "master" teacher but stick to building and program management.

24. If the community does not observe a well-run building, it loses confidence in other operations of the school.

25. Schools in the district should be organized so that the principal is the chief administrator of the building, therefore is held responsible for all management details.

26. Each building level administrator should have a philosophy of administration which has been cooperatively developed by staff/administration and custom-tailored for that building "community."

V. HOW TO MANAGE

27. Subordinates will exercise responsible self-direction and self-control in the accomplishment of worthwhile objectives that they understand and have helped establish.

28. The heart of an educational program is the staff. Administrative personnel should provide leadership in improving instruction and see that staff members have the necessary time, sufficient materials, and proper working condition for the performance of their functions.

29. Administrators can gain staff acceptance and support, best through clearly established organizational procedures and efficient office management.

30. The majority of personnel are capable of exercising far more initiative, responsibility, and creativity than their present jobs or work circumstances require or allow.
31. Staff members appreciate administrators who clearly inform them of organizational goals and insist that they work toward those goals.

VI. THE PUBLIC

32. Since a low degree of public understanding will limit the effectiveness of the school, administrators are obliged to make public relations their top priority goal.

33. School administrators are first and foremost guardians of the public interest and, therefore, must promote that administrative role at the expense of the interests of their staffs.

34. Generally speaking, schools are not well managed and are not very responsive to the desires of the community public(s).

VII. THE SUPERINTENDENT

35. At the top level of administration, the conceptual skill becomes the most important.

36. A superintendent should represent the students since board members represent various adult pressure groups in the community.

37. A superintendent should primarily be a politician so that he/she can help the community set their goals and reach them.
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FUNCTIONS OF THE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM

The Western Hills Area Education Agency has developed a performance evaluation system for all personnel to serve the following functions:

1. To provide for quality performance through cooperative planning and professional development to meet Agency needs.
2. To facilitate professional growth and supply information that will lead to modification of assignments.
3. To ensure professional, ethical, and competent performance.
4. To reinforce superior performance.
5. To validate the Agency's employee selection process.
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WESTERN HILLS AREA EDUCATION AGENCY

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

The Area Education Agency is a multifunctional intermediate agency whose primary purpose is to affect the quality of educational services to children and provide assistance to local education agencies. The Agency also enhances community planning, regional planning, and networking of agencies and institutions. Among the functions of this agency are: service, leadership, planning, development, coordination, demonstration, and the pooling of ideas, personnel, and resources. The Agency provides assistance to local school districts in meeting state and federal mandates. Close collaboration with Local Education Agencies (LEA) is imperative. The Agency also serves various publics including parents, teachers, institutions of higher education, social agencies, and others.

Students are the reason why this Agency exists. It is the responsibility of the Agency to enhance learning opportunities for each student within each LEA. The Agency encourages local districts to teach lifelong learning, to foster strong student self-concepts, and to develop positive attitudes and beliefs through creating a climate in which students can achieve academically, socially, emotionally, and culturally. Agency personnel serve as motivators, facilitators, and mentors to the district personnel.

Because education is unending, the Agency must stay on the cutting edge of staff development and technology as well as serve as a resource in these areas. Continuing education is of prime importance. The Agency serves as a mechanism for self-renewal through processes such as participatory management and performance appraisal.
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WESTERN HILLS AREA EDUCATION AGENCY

PHILOSOPHY OF CONSULTING

Consulting is both an art and a science. Consulting, a major responsibility of every Agency employee, is a process with the purpose of promoting positive change that enhances learning. Consulting requires discipline-specific expertise and collaboration with appropriate publics to meet specific needs. Consultants assist in the development of an action plan that can 1) mutually define the issues, concerns, and opportunities, 2) provide selection of possible alternatives, 3) assist with the implementation, and 4) assess the outcomes.

Consultation is a vehicle to provide educational program options, recommendations, leadership, and support in the most efficient and effective manner.

Consultants have a high degree of technical skills. Most important to the role of consultant, however, is having the ability to lead, listen, communicate, and provide meaningful direction for outcomes.
APPENDIX F: PHILOSOPHY OF ADMINISTRATION
ADMINISTRATION

Administration may be viewed as a process of leadership which is both an art and a science. Administrative philosophy must emphasize and utilize four constituent elements and administrative activities. They are planning, implementation, appraisal, and interpretation. The task is to create an environment in which staff contribute to the full range of their talents. A primary responsibility is to challenge staff to discover and develop their creative resources. The Agency leaders are expected to be knowledgeable of programs being provided.

PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT

Agency staff desire involvement in decision making on matters which are of significance to them. Participatory management is the preferred style for this Agency.

The same basic competencies for administrative success apply to all levels of administration. Administrators must have professional competencies in their area of responsibility and have personal, immediate, and intense concern for maintaining and improving morale.

LEADERSHIP

Administrative personnel are expected to provide leadership in improving services and see that staff have the resources including, but not limited to, necessary time, sufficient materials, and proper working conditions for the performance of their job responsibilities. Administrators will clearly inform staff of organizational goals and assist them in working toward these
goals. Administrators will offer encouragement and establish a positive climate which promotes individual and organizational goals. The staff will exercise responsible self-direction and self-control in the accomplishment of objectives.

**ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL**

Administrative personnel must provide the essential vision, leadership, and political support to create the definitive culture which assures a positive climate for staff.

The Chief Administrator works with the Board, administrative staff and staff associations to carry out the mission of the agency.

The Chief Administrator maintains a clear vision of the Agency purpose and function and assures the Agency climate is consistent with its stated values. The Chief Administrator provides leadership in developing programs that implement the Agency's goals.

The Chief Administrator represents the agency with external groups to foster understanding and support and further Agency goals.
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PHILOSOPHY OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

I. What should the primary purpose be?

II. What are other purposes of this process?

III. Why is it important that this process be a cooperative effort?

IV. How should evaluation data be used—
   A. in making personnel decisions?
   B. in planning staff development programs?
   C. other?

V. What should the expected outcome of the evaluation process be?

VI. Why should an effective performance evaluation process include
   A. research-based criteria?
   B. formative evaluation procedures?
   C. summative evaluation procedures?
   D. provisions for due process?
I. What should the purpose of an intermediate agency be? To what extent should it reflect the belief that the agency serves students?

A. Define excellence. (Should this be the primary goal?)

B. How should the agency be responsible for the learning environment in the schools it serves?

C. Should the agency ensure that all students attain mastery levels of learning? Why or why not?

II. What should the agency do in regard to programs for students in the schools it serves?

A. Should school district programs encourage development of attitudes? Why or why not?

B. Should school district programs foster healthy self-concepts? Why or why not?

C. Should students be skilled applicants when they graduate from the high schools? Explain.

D. Should the agency assist school districts when mastery levels of learning are identified? Explain.

III. Should the agency assume responsibility for helping districts teach students how to cope with a changing society? Explain.

IV. Education is an unending process. What does this mean to an intermediate agency? How should this statement be clearly identifiable within the agency?
Philosophy of Consulting

I. What is consulting - an art? a science? or a process?

II. What is the primary purpose for employing consultants in an intermediate agency?

III. What is their most important role?

IV. How much involvement should these persons have
   A. in the selection of teaching methods and procedures for improvement of instruction?
   B. with the development of curriculum in the districts being served?
   C. with monitoring the implementation of curriculum in the districts being served?

V. Persons serving in this role need a high degree of
   A. technical skills?
   B. conceptual skills?
   C. human relations skills?
APPENDIX H: MISSION STATEMENT
Mission Statement

The mission of Western Hills Area Education Agency is to assist area educators in helping all learners reach their potential by equitably providing specialized services, leadership and resources which can be offered most efficiently and effectively on a regional or cooperative basis.
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PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Performance evaluation for all employees in Western Hills Area Education Agency is an on-going, three-year cycle with certain components optional by discipline. The person to whom the employee reports on the organizational chart is responsible for the evaluation process. The evaluation procedures provide the framework for assessing an employee’s performance as it relates to the established criteria.

The cycle begins with an Individual/Professional Development Planning Conference, which includes a self-evaluation. Following that activity there are two components in this process: formative and summative. The formative component includes observations, feedback conferences, and supporting data and input. These data provide the opportunity for feedback to assist with improving performance. In the summative component information is used from the formative data to make professional judgments about the quality of job performance in accordance with the established criteria. Summative evaluation includes a report and an end-of-cycle conference.

I. Individual/Professional Growth Planning Conference/Self-Evaluation

A. This conference will take place prior to October 1 of each school year for returning employees and within the first two weeks for new employees.

B. The conference is held to set goals, review criteria, discuss procedures, agree upon timelines, review due process, and discuss the goals of the Agency.
C. It provides the opportunity for two-way communication.

D. A self-evaluation allows one to review his/her performance and to establish goals.

II. Formative Components

A. Observations
   1. Formal observations will be mutually scheduled.
   2. When informal observations are used as a part of the evaluation, the evaluator will inform the evaluatee as to the time it begins and its focus.
   3. The minimum number of formal observations during a cycle ranges from one (1) to three (3). Either party may request more observations.
   4. The evaluator observes the evaluatee’s job functions, performance, and productivity and identifies strengths and areas for growth.

B. Feedback Conferences (Formal Observations)
   1. A feedback conference will follow each observation.
   2. The purpose is to review the data that were gathered, enriching the employee’s capabilities.
   3. These conferences will have both immediate feedback after an observation followed by a written summary within a week.

C. Supporting Data and Input
   1. These are important because they help the evaluator arrive at conclusions during the summative components.
2. Work samples should be pertinent to the job and relate to the criteria in the system. They will vary according to the position.

3. Relevant feedback from the clients being served, both solicited and unsolicited, may be used. The feedback will be shared if used.

III. Summative Components

A. Report

1. At the end of the cycle the evaluator reviews the data which were gathered and completes the summative evaluation report.

2. The report is to be completed no later than the last contract date of the employee's work year.

B. Conference

1. A summative conference is held at the end of the cycle to discuss the evaluatee's performance relative to the evaluation criteria.

2. This conference is to be held no later than the last contract date of the employee's work year.

IV. A mini-cycle of the evaluation process will be conducted during the non-SER years. Components will include: (1) monitoring and evaluating progress toward Agency goals, and (2) monitoring and evaluating progress toward the Professional Development Plan.

V. Due Process

A. All parties have had representation in the design and development of the evaluation system. Knowledge and
understanding of performance expectations are provided for employees in AEA 12 through distribution of this handbook.

B. Every employee is provided an opportunity for familiarization with the system, its procedures, and its use.

C. Employees are provided rebuttal opportunity as a part of each reporting cycle.

D. All reports of unsatisfactory performance must be in writing and must enumerate shortcomings in a specific manner.

E. Each employee is provided access to the file of his/her evaluation reports located in the Agency's officially designated personnel file.
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**KEY QUESTIONS**

**Operational Procedures**

I. On a 1-5 scale, how do you feel about including the following components for a person who is on full-cycle evaluation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Planning Conference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Formative Components (Data gathering)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Scheduled Observations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nonscheduled Observations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback Conferences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support Data and Input</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Work samples</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Feedback from peers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feedback from &quot;others&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unsolicited feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Summative Components:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Report/Conference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Growth Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. WHO is primarily responsible for the supervision/evaluation process for each person who is on-cycle?
III. Should there be other persons who provide input into the process?
   Yes  No  Explain.

IV. How frequently should persons be on full-cycle evaluation?
   Annually
   Once every two years
   Once every three years

V. If the cycle is other than annual, should there be a mini-cycle process?
   Yes  No  If yes, what components of the full-cycle should be included?
DEFINITION OF COMPONENTS IN THE SUPERVISION/EVALUATION CYCLE

I. Planning Conference
   A. When?
   B. Purpose?

II. Self-Evaluation
   A. When?
   B. How to be used?
   C. Form to use?

III. Formative Components
   A. Scheduled Observation
      1. How many?
      2. Purpose?
   B. Nonscheduled Observation
      1. How many?
      2. Purpose?
   C. Feedback Conference
      1. How many
      2. How soon after observation?
      3. Purpose?
   D. Supporting Data and Input
      1. Why?
      2. What are work samples?
3. How are feedback data gathered from peers? "others"?
4. How is unsolicited feedback used?

IV. Summative Components

A. Report/Conference
   1. When?
   2. Purpose?

B. Professional Growth Plan
   1. Purpose?
   2. How many?
   3. When written?
APPENDIX K: TIMELOGGING INSTRUCTIONS
INSTRUCTIONS

In a process of systems analysis, time allotments and priorities can be examined after Critical Work Activities (CWAs) have been defined. Time analysis reveals overlooked activities, suggests ways to combine categories of activities, and affords comparison of how educational professionals actually spend time performing activities for approximately 20 working days. The SA-1 and SA-2 documents are used to facilitate the compilation of time allotments.

The following steps are necessary to complete the timelogging process:

1. On the Management Status Report Form (SA-1), you will:
   a. Fill in the appropriate information (name, agency, position) in the upper left hand corner.
   b. Indicate the timelogging dates which have been chosen on the appropriate blanks.
   c. Write the day and date in the slashed boxes along the row titled, Critical Work Activity. (Please see the example on page 3.)

2. Make informal notes in your pocket datebook, appointment calendar, or through your secretary, about how your time is spent during the timelogging period. (Systems Analysis experts generally agree that only 70 to 80 percent of his/her time will be entered on a log. The other 20 percent is too varied to include.)

3. List the critical work activities for your position in the left-hand column. The actual number of minutes devoted to each activity is recorded each day. Remember there are two types of time: (1) minutes during the normal work day, and (2) minutes outside the normal work day. Be sure to circle all minutes outside the normal work day. (Record only blocks of time which are 15 minutes or longer.)
4. Add across the row all of the minutes you spent during the normal work day and place that total in the first total column.

5. You will then add all minutes outside the normal work day and place that total in the second total column.

6. On the Data Summary Sheet (SA-2) you will:
   (a) List the same critical work activities as on SA-1 on the left column.
   (b) Count and record the total number of "normal work days" devoted to each activity.
   (c) Count and record the number of "outside normal work days" devoted to each activity.
   (d) Record the number of normal work day minutes (Column 1) devoted to the activity.
   (e) Record the minutes devoted to each activity outside the normal work day (Column 2).

All SA-1 forms and Data Summary Sheets will be forwarded to the chairperson of the Stakeholders' Committee. The chairperson will mail the forms to the School Improvement Model Projects Office. The items will be compared with the philosophy statements, as well as the job description and the criteria for evaluation instruments will be identified. The reporting professional should retain a copy to identify professional improvement commitments, to compare time summaries with colleagues, and to show a benchmark for further monitoring.

**Management Status Report Form - Data Collection Sheet**

**Name:** Jeri Case  
**Agency:** Manfield #12  
**Position:** School Psychologist  

**Timekeeping Dates:** From March 19 - Through March 28, 19-

**Directions:** Enter the number of minutes spent on each activity under the appropriate day. Any minutes spent outside the normal work day must be circled. Column 1 will equal the total minutes spent on an activity during Normal Work Day. Column 2 will equal the total minutes spent on an activity during "Outside Normal Work Day." Record blocks of time 15 minutes or longer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Work Activity</th>
<th>Column 1 Total Minutes Normal Work Day</th>
<th>Column 2 Total Minutes Outside Normal Work Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains all case records</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX L: INDIVIDUAL TIMELOGGING ANALYSES
CRITICAL WORK ACTIVITY MONITORING: FEBRUARY 1 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 1991
POSITION: AUDIOLOGIST
RANK ORDERED BY PERCENT OF TOTAL TIME. 19 OF 20 DAYS, 152 OF 160 HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL WORK ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME DEVOTED TO ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Performs General Office Duties</td>
<td>38.66 25.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administers Audiological Test</td>
<td>26.50 17.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participates in Professional Develop.</td>
<td>19.00 12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Performs Written Reports</td>
<td>11.58 7.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinates Activities of BHSM</td>
<td>10.25 6.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interprets Test Results</td>
<td>9.58 6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maintains Diagnostic Ampl. Equipment</td>
<td>8.66 5.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Travels (Reimbursed)</td>
<td>7.25 4.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Travels</td>
<td>5.00 3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conducts Research</td>
<td>0.75 0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Spends Time on Intra-Agency Referrals</td>
<td>0.50 0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provides Prevention Services</td>
<td>0.00 0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Days:** 19 of 20 Days, 152 of 160 Hours

**Percent Devoted to Activity:** 90.61%

**Total Hours:** 11.25

**Signature:** Suzanne Howlett 6-6-91
WESTERN HILLS AREA EDUCATION AGENCY

CRITICAL WORK ACTIVITY MONITORING: FEBRUARY 1 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 1991
POSITION: AUDIOLOGIST
RANK ORDERED BY PERCENT OF TOTAL TIME. 20 OF 20 DAYS, 160 OF 160 HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL WORK ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME DEVOTED TO ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

161.05 100.66%  5.91

DAN DAILEY
CRITICAL WORK ACTIVITY MONITORING: FEBRUARY 1 THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 1991
POSITION: AUDIOLOGIST
RANK ORDERED BY PERCENT OF TOTAL TIME. 180 OF 20 DAYS, 152 OF 160 HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL WORK ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME DEVOTED TO ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Implements Policies and Guidelines</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prepares Written Reports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administers Audiological Test</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interprets Test Results</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administers Audiological Test</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Travels (Reimbursed)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Participates in Professional Development</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maintains Diagnostic Ampl. Equipment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spends Time on Intra-Agency Referrals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provides Prevention Services</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Travels</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conducts Research</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                                      |            | 134.74 | 88.64%  |      |         |      |      | 3.58 |

TINA FINCH
APPENDIX M: CWA/TIME ANALYSIS FEEDBACK
CWA/TIME ANALYSIS FEEDBACK

NAME

ORGANIZATION

POSITION

INTERVIEWER(S)

DATE

The CWA logging was done to determine your time emphasis, tasks not described in your job description, differences across the same job title, priorities, and terms you use to describe your tasks. These activities will be incorporated into the evaluation system for your position.

1. After reviewing your CWA chart, please indicate what other activities would be typical for your position, but would be done at another time of the year.

2. Are there any activities that should be dropped because they are not typical of your job?

3. The critical work activities (CWAs) will be reviewed against the job description to develop the instrument for your position. Which five or six activities should be given consideration as criteria for your position?

4. Please indicate any suggestions you might have for changes on your position description on the pink sheet enclosed in your file.
POSITION DESCRIPTION SUGGESTIONS

Functions to add:

Functions to delete:
APPENDIX N: SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT
Western Hills Area Education Agency

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT
Special Education Services
(Audiologist)

| Name | Evaluatee's Signature | Date | Evaluator's Signature | Date |

Directions: Place a check in the column that best describes the evaluatee's performance on that criterion. When "Exceeds Expectations," "Needs Improvement," or "Unsatisfactory" is given, comments need to be written to support the rating.

Definitions - - Levels of Performance

| Exceeds Expectations: | Data show that outstanding performance is clearly obvious. |
| Meets Expectations:   | Data show that performance on this criterion is part of integrated behavior. |
| Needs Improvement:    | Data show that either quality or consistency of performance does not meet agency standard. |
| Unsatisfactory:       | Data show that there is insufficient knowledge or application of this criterion. (One unsatisfactory on any criterion will give an overall rating of unsatisfactory.) |

Complete archived data available in N233 Lagomarcino Hall, Iowa State University
I. A. Provides leadership.

1. Sets goals and objectives.
2. Uses creative problem-solving.
3. Holds high expectations for self and others.
4. Initiates new ideas.
5. Provides motivation.
6. Assists others in enhancing or developing individual strengths.
7. Promotes a positive climate within the Agency, with clients and the public.
8. Articulates the vision of the Agency.
9. Promotes the belief that all students can and will learn.
10. Assists Agency clients and visitors.

I. B. Manages responsibilities.

1. Handles multiple tasks concurrently.
2. Administers and adheres to policies.
3. Practices effective time management.
4. Completes assigned duties accurately and in a timely manner.
5. Selects appropriate channels for resolving conflict, concerns and problems.
6. Plans an appropriate schedule.
7. Maintains records and submits reports.
8. Encourages, models, and maintains high standards of conduct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Provides leadership.</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Manages responsibilities.</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. C. Establishes systematic procedures for accomplishing goals and objectives.

1. Forecasts needs, conditions, and availability of resources.
2. Determines priorities.
3. Organizes and assigns resources.
4. Establishes timelines.
5. Arranges systematic details.
6. Implements established plans.

I. D. Promotes the programs of the Agency.

1. Implements public relations activities.
2. Works toward involving others.
3. Makes recommendations for new policies directed toward improvement.
4. Participates in the Agency’s programs.
5. Supports the agency mission, strategic goals and programs.
PERFORMANCE AREA I. Generic Criteria (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Establishes systematic procedures for accomplishing goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluatee Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Promotes the programs of the Agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator Comments:</td>
<td>Evaluatee Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. E. Practices effective participatory management techniques.

1. Establishes and uses procedures for obtaining input from others.
2. Evaluates the effectiveness of the decision-making procedures.
3. Serves as a role model when interacting with others.
4. Promotes the team concept.
5. Attends appropriate meetings.
6. Helps the team solve problems and reach objectives.
7. Is consistently on time and well-prepared.
8. Reviews complexities of both sides of issues and encourages consideration of consequences.

I. F. Demonstrates human relations skills.

1. Contributes to harmony and unity within the organization.
2. Gets along with others.
3. Provides a climate for open communication.
4. Adapts to and supports organizational change.
5. Demonstrates fairness and consistency in dealing with others.
6. Supports the rights of others to hold differing views and values.
7. Uses discretion in handling situations that require confidentiality.
8. Returns phone calls promptly.
9. Encourages and practices effective communication with others.
10. Uses effective listening skills.
11. Handles phone calls in a professional, courteous manner.
Audiologist
Western Hills Area Educational Agency
Summative Evaluation Report

PERFORMANCE AREA I. Generic Criteria (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Practices effective participatory management techniques.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator Comments: __________________________ Evaluatee Comments: __________________________

F. Demonstrates human relations skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Demonstrates human relations skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator Comments: __________________________ Evaluatee Comments: __________________________
I. G. Engages in professional growth activities.

1. Participates in staff development.
2. Stays current with job-related trends.
3. Plans professional growth activities which are based on professional needs.
PERFORMANCE AREA 1. Generic Criteria (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Engages in professional growth activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Engages in professional growth activities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator Comments: | Evaluatee Comments:
II. A. Prepares and conducts effective student and hazardous area evaluations.

1. Gathers and reviews all pertinent data.
2. Uses valid and reliable tests, measures, and equipment to determine hearing status and problems.
3. Conducts diagnostic studies to identify school problem areas and student needs.
4. Formulates timely, sound recommendations for prevention and remediation of hearing loss.

II. B. Provides audiology services to students.

1. Structures services using assessment data and team recommendations.
2. Establishes effective working relationships with students.
3. Provides hearing aid workups to include ear mold impressions, testing and hearing aid analysis.
4. Conducts orientation counseling, guidance and auditory training for students.
5. Coordinates appropriate referrals.
PERFORMANCE AREA II. Job Specific Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Prepares and conducts effective student and hazardous area evaluations.

Evaluator Comments: | Evaluatee Comments:

B. Provides audiology services to students.

Evaluator Comments: | Evaluatee Comments:
II. C. Serves on multi-disciplinary team and committees.

1. Serves as a member of multi-disciplinary assessment teams.
2. Participates in IEP development conferences.
3. Assures follow-up of students and correction of hazardous conditions.

II. D. Functions as a resource consultant.

1. Consults with staff, parents and appropriate agencies.
2. Provides resources for research purposes.
3. Assists school staff in developing hearing conservation strategies.
4. Provides advice on program planning and curriculum development.
5. Refers clients to other agencies and serves as liaison to those agencies.
6. Knows applicable laws, regulations, guidelines and research findings.
7. Conducts meaningful research.
8. Provides services as an advocate for students and parents.
9. Ensures that each child requiring special education receives an appropriate special education program or service.
PERFORMANCE AREA II. Job Specific Responsibilities (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Serves on multi-disciplinary team and committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator Comments: | Evaluatee Comments: |
|-------------------|---------------------|

D. Functions as a resource consultant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluator Comments: | Evaluatee Comments: |
|-------------------|---------------------|


APPENDIX O: CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION HANDBOOK
WESTERN HILLS
AREA EDUCATION AGENCY
SIoux City, Iowa

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION HANDBOOK
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR

DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY BY THE WESTERN HILLS AREA EDUCATION AGENCY STAKEHOLDERS' COMMITTEE AND THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT MODEL TEAM AT IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY.

NOVEMBER 16, 1992
Performance evaluation of the chief administrator is an integral and integrated part of the well-established management system based on objectives and plans-of-action that is utilized by the Western Hills Area Education Agency. The chief administrator evaluation is a sub-component of the management system which enhances it. At the same time, it parallels the performance evaluation system for Agency personnel.

Following is a suggested time schedule that incorporates the chief administrator performance evaluation into the existing management program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>In Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All year</td>
<td>Systematic input from Superintendents' Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Designated Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - January</td>
<td>Refining input</td>
<td>Agency Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - February</td>
<td>Input received</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Feedback from Cabinet</td>
<td>Cabinet members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>Agency goals approved</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Management contract developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Board goals developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chief Administrator
Summative Evaluation Report
Western Hills Area Education Agency
Sioux City, Iowa

Chief Administrator's Name

Years of Experience in Agency

Board President's Signature Date

Chief Administrator's Signature Date

General Instructions

This evaluation is divided into three sections.

Section A comprises general performance traits and characteristics.

Section B consists of the performance factors compiled from the position description, critical work activities, and the Agency's administrative philosophy, none of which will vary greatly from year to year.

Section C contains the specific objectives agreed to by the reviewing authorities and the incumbent as requiring special emphasis during the evaluation period.

Instructions for Using Chief Administrator's Instrument

The Chief Administrator's form is not signed by the board member--only a compiled summary is shared by the Board President with the Chief Administrator. After the conference, the Board President should sign the compilation, obtain the Chief Administrator's signature, and the document should be placed in the Chief Administrator's personnel file.
APPRAISAL SCALE

Use the following numerical scale to indicate your appraisal of the individual's performance in meeting his/her principal accountabilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsat.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Meet.</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Unsatisfactory: Performance is clearly below acceptable level. Does not meet standards.
2. Meets Minimum Expectations: Performance comes close to being acceptable, but the need for further development is recognizable. Needs improvement.
3. Meets Expectations: Performance is acceptable, satisfactory, sufficient.
4. Exceeds Expectations: Performance is noticeably better than "acceptable".
5. Outstanding: Outstanding performance is clearly obvious to all. (A special category to recognize exemplary Agency performance.

OVERALL RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A.</th>
<th>General Performance Characteristics</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section B.</td>
<td>Performance Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section C.</td>
<td>Performance on Specific Goals/Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total

Final Rating (Grand Total/3)
### SECTION A. GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Organizes the activities of the board and Administrative Team toward the accomplishment of the Agency's goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Communicates a system of norms, values and understandings which supports inter-agency cooperation and maximizes team work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Functions effectively in complex roles and situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Provides symbolic leadership in which the Agency's communications provide impetus to the Agency's programs. Provides clear, concise, and positive verbal and written communications which are consistent with the Agency's expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Provides leadership, vision, and direction in working with the Agency's Board and Administrative Staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ensures and reports compliance of board policy relating to the Agency's operations and the state and federal laws, rules and regulations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section A - Average Score
SECTION B. PERFORMANCE FACTORS

I. Improving the Agency's Performance

1. Directs the dissemination of professional information in the areas of educational research, curriculum and assessment, and technology to improve the quality of decision making in area schools.

2. Monitors and makes recommendations for services of the three divisions (special education, media, and educational services).

3. Demonstrates the ability to implement educational innovations and redefine to improve the performance of the educational program.

4. Organizes a process for reviewing the program performance in each of the divisions.

5. Promotes staff development activities appropriate to meet the goals of the Agency and staff.
Chief Administrator  
Summative Evaluation Report  
Western Hills Area Education Agency  
Sioux City, Iowa

1. Unsatisfactory: Does Not Meet Agency Standards  
2. Meets Minimum Expectations: Needs Improvement  
3. Meets Expectations: Meets Agency Standards  
4. Exceeds Expectations: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations  
5. Outstanding: Exemplary Performance

SECTION B. PERFORMANCE FACTORS

II. Working with the Board

6. Works with the Board Secretary and President of the Board to assure that the Board agenda is consistent with the Agency’s needs.  
   1 2 3 4 5

7. Works with the Board in the Chief Administrator’s evaluation conference to assure that the Chief Administrator/Board goals are current and consistent with the Agency’s planning.  
   1 2 3 4 5

8. Demonstrates leadership, courage, and conviction in working with the Board.  
   1 2 3 4 5

9. Leads the Board in the identification of primary issues to assure that their deliberations are effective.  
   1 2 3 4 5

10. Assists the Board in the adoption of Board understandings, policies, and procedures which enhance Board growth and encourage effective participation and quality decision-making by Board members.  
    1 2 3 4 5

11. Makes decisions which enhance the Agency’s mission and which improve the Agency’s performance on stated and assumed goals.  
    1 2 3 4 5
Chief Administrator  
Summative Evaluation Report

Western Hills Area Education Agency  
Sioux City, Iowa

1. Unsatisfactory: Does Not Meet Agency Standards  
2. Meets Minimum Expectations: Needs Improvement  
3. Meets Expectations: Meets Agency Standards  
4. Exceeds Expectations: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations  
5. Outstanding: Exemplary Performance

SECTION B. PERFORMANCE FACTORS

III. Developing Staff Personnel

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Effectively implements and monitors the performance evaluation system for all staff members.

13. Provides opportunities for professional growth to all staff.

14. Recruits, employs, and assigns highly competent staff based on a clear statement of Agency needs (job descriptions, Agency culture, and other performance related criteria).

15. Assigns Agency responsibilities to administrative staff based on their competencies and ability to perform the assigned task.

16. Demonstrates positive professional relationships with Agency personnel.

IV. Managing Operations

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Provides for advanced planning and space utilization making recommendations on renovations, closings, construction of satellite offices.
SECTION B. PERFORMANCE FACTORS

IV. Managing Operations (cont.)

18. Demonstrates ability to organize staff for smooth and efficient operations while attaining Agency goals.

19. Ensures that there is an objective evaluation of programs, practices, and personnel.

20. Works with the Board to determine economic settlement levels for collective bargaining which are in the best interest of the Agency.

21. Works with the division directors, Board members and management team negotiators to assure that salary settlements and negotiated language are consistent with the welfare of the Agency.

22. Provides leadership in assuring that the Agency's involvement with the Superintendent's Advisory Council, local area boards, and state level agencies is consistent with the Agency's program needs:
Chief Administrator
Summative Evaluation Report

Western Hills Area Education Agency
Sioux City, Iowa

1. Unsatisfactory: Does Not Meet Agency Standards
2. Meets Minimum Expectations: Needs Improvement
3. Meets Expectations: Meets Agency Standards
4. Exceeds Expectations: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations
5. Outstanding: Exemplary Performance

SECTION B. PERFORMANCE FACTORS

V. Working with the Community

23. Actively participates in AEA programs which address the Agency's funding, legislative and inter-agency roles.

24. Gains respect and support of the community on the conduct of the Agency's operations.

25. Solicits and gives attention to problems and opinions of all groups and individuals associated with the Agency.

26. Presents a positive image of the Agency by establishing open communication with local districts, communities, Agency personnel and media.

VI. Professional and Personal Development

27. Makes candid observations and inquiries when given the opportunity to express opinions.

28. Demonstrates a commitment to significant current issues in education, strives to stay informed and actively strives to provide leadership in and towards a meaningful education agenda.
Chief Administrator Western Hills Area Education Agency
Summative Evaluation Report Sioux City, Iowa

1. Unsatisfactory: Does Not Meet Agency Standards
2. Meets Minimum Expectations: Needs Improvement
3. Meets Expectations: Meets Agency Standards
4. Exceeds Expectations: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations
5. Outstanding: Exemplary Performance

SECTION B. PERFORMANCE FACTORS

VI. Professional and Personal Development (cont.)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Maintains high standards of ethics, honesty and integrity in all personal and professional matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Participates in professional growth activities.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B - Average Score

Sections A and Section B Comments:

Evaluator:

Evaluatee:
Chief Administrator
Summative Evaluation Report
Western Hills Area Education Agency
Sioux City, Iowa

1. Unsatisfactory: Does Not Meet Agency Standards
2. Meets Minimum Expectations: Needs Improvement
3. Meets Expectations: Meets Agency Standards
4. Exceeds Expectations: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations
5. Outstanding: Exemplary Performance

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE ON SPECIFIC GOALS/OBJECTIVES

(List here those specific objectives agreed to at the start of the year, using the same rating system on performance.)

LONG RANGE GOALS

1. The administrator and Board will strive to utilize a collaborative approach to the management of the Agency.

2. The Board, with the assistance of the Chief Administrator, will participate in the development of a new performance appraisal system through Iowa State University.

3. The Chief Administrator and Board will continue their joint efforts to assure that the Strategic Planning Program and the reports of the Action Teams are implemented.

4. Individual Board members and the Chief Administrator will work to keep each other informed on the deliberation of any state committees or planning committees relating to AEA services on which they serve.

5. The Chief Administrator, with the assistance of the Administrative Cabinet, will design a set of strategies aimed at informing LEA boards of AEA services.
Chief Administrator
Western Hills Area Education Agency
Sioux City, Iowa

1. Unsatisfactory: Does Not Meet Agency Standards
2. Meets Minimum Expectations: Needs Improvement
3. Meets Expectations: Meets Agency Standards
4. Exceeds Expectations: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations
5. Outstanding: Exemplary Performance

SECTION C. PERFORMANCE ON SPECIFIC GOALS/OBJECTIVES

(List here those specific objectives agreed to at the start of the year, using the same rating system on performance.)

LONG RANGE GOALS (cont.)

6. The Board and Chief Administrator will be kept informed of planning activities and implementation activities pertaining to the Special Education Renewed Services Delivery System (RSDS). Western Hills will submit its RSDS proposal to the Department of Education during the 1990-91 school year for implementation of the plan during the 1991-92 school year.

Section C - Average Score

Sections C Comments:

Evaluator:

Evaluatee:
Audiologist

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

PERFORMANCE AREA: (check one)  

- General Criteria  
- Job Specific Responsibilities

Criterion from Summative Evaluation Report on which Professional Development Plan is based:

I. GOAL (general intent)

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

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

Complete archived data available in N233 Lagomarcino Hall, Iowa State University
IV. PROGRESS CHECKS: (How is it going?)

Evaluator's Comments:

V. DOCUMENTATION/APPRaisal Method FOR FINAL ACCOMPLISHMENT:

(How will you know it was done?)

Evidence:

Expectation:

Appraisal Method: The evidence and the expectation will be compared to determine how well the PDP was accomplished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator's Comments:</th>
<th>Evaluatee's Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_ Fully Accomplished</td>
<td>_ Not Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Partially Accomplished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ Not Accomplished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mini-Cycle Evaluation
Overall Rating

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory

Signature Date

Signature Date
APPENDIX Q: TEST-AND-TRY SURVEY
An important reason for conducting a test-and-try of your newly-developed performance evaluation system was to determine if it is suitable for your agency and to make revisions as needed. To accomplish this task, a survey has been created to gather input from those who participated. This input will be shared with the Stakeholders' Committee and they will decide if changes in the system should be recommended.

1. Is your job description adequate and up-to-date? Yes ___ No ___. If No, explain.

2. Are the performance criteria (items being evaluated) clear? Yes ___ No ___. If your answer is No, please list those which should be reviewed (i.e., I.A., II.B.) What is your recommendation(s) for change?

3. Can data be gathered about the criteria? Yes ___ No ___. If your answer is No, please list those for which data cannot be gathered (i.e., I.A., II.B.).

4. Should any criteria be deleted? added? Yes ___ No ___. If Yes, please list.

5. Are the operational procedures practical? Yes ___ No ___. If No, explain.
   Orientation Conference Written Report
   Self-Evaluation Summative Conference
   Observations (Formal and Informal) Professional Development Plan
   Supportive Data and Input Feedback Conference(s)
6. Which operational procedures were you involved in this school year? (see question 4) Please list.

7. Are the forms adequate for gathering and recording data in this evaluation system? Yes ___ No ___. If No, explain.

8. Do changes need to be made in the Summative Evaluation Report or Conference? Yes ___ No ___. If Yes, explain.

9. If you have used the Professional Development Plan form, do any changes need to be made? Yes ___ No ___. If Yes, explain.

General Comments:

RETURN TO MS. WAGNER IN A SEALED ENVELOPE WITH YOUR NAME ON THE OUTSIDE FOR CHECK-OFF. THANKS. DICK MANATT.

Abstracted from a complete set of performance evaluation surveys for each of the divisions of AEA 12.
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION TRAINING

Western Hills AEA 12
Sioux City, Iowa

January 10, 1992
March 6, 1992
WESTERN HILLS AREA EDUCATION AGENCY 12
Educational Personnel Evaluation Training

TRAINING OUTLINE

I. Objectives (transparency)

Each participant will become familiar with:
A. The definition, assumptions and basic attributes of educational personnel evaluation
B. The Professional Support Personnel Evaluation Model (Stronge and Helm, 1991)
C. The Total Systems Approach to Evaluation (Manatt, 1988)

II. Review of literature

A. Definition of evaluation (transparency)
B. Assumptions and attributes of educational personnel evaluation

III. "Educational Personnel Evaluation Model"

IV. Sample educational personnel evaluation systems

A. PMSA System (Peer-Mediated Self-Appraisal System)
B. Design-Execution Performance Model
C. Judgment-based Evaluation
D. Duties-based Evaluation
E. Measurement-based Evaluation
F. Cognitive Development View
G. Total Systems Approach

V. Performance Appraisal Training Evaluation
EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION TRAINING
Western Hills AEA 12

AGENDA

Introduction

The Need for Educational Personnel Evaluation
The Failures of Educational Personnel Evaluation
The Role of Evaluator of Educational Personnel

Training Objectives

Review of Literature

Definition of Evaluation
Assumptions and Attributes of Educational Personnel Evaluation

Professional Support Personnel Evaluation Model

Total Systems Approach to Evaluation

Training Evaluation
A. Introduction (transparencies #1, #2, #3)

1. (#1) The need for educational personnel evaluation—
   "In order to educate students effectively and to achieve other related goals, educational institutions must use evaluation to select, retain, and develop qualified personnel and to manage and facilitate their work." (Stufflebeam)

2. (#2) The failures of educational personnel evaluation--(Stufflebeam)
   Dominant criticisms of education personnel evaluation practices are that they have failed to:
   a. Screen out unqualified persons from certification and selection processes
   b. Provide constructive feedback to individual educators
   c. Recognize and help reinforce outstanding service
   d. Provide direction for staff development programs
   e. Provide evidence that will withstand professional and judicial scrutiny
   f. Provide evidence efficiently and at reasonable cost
   g. Aid institutions in terminating incompetent or unproductive personnel
   h. Unify, rather than divide, educational personnel and administrators in their collective efforts to educate students

3. (#3) The role of evaluator of educational personnel—(DeRoche)
   In order to assist you in your role as evaluator the following suggestions should be considered:
   a. Assess your current knowledge about evaluation
   b. Improve your knowledge and attitude about evaluation
   c. Find out how other evaluators plan for evaluation
   d. Determine what skills you have and what you will need for evaluating your agency's programs and personnel
   e. Find out what knowledge and skill your staff have about evaluation
   f. Compare your current evaluation procedures with those suggested by research
   g. Promote a positive view of evaluation in the agency and community
   h. Encourage self-evaluation techniques among educational personnel, including students
B. Training Objectives (transparency #4)

Each participant will become familiar with:
1. the definition, assumptions and basic attributes of educational personnel evaluation
2. the Professional Support Personnel Evaluation Model (Stronge and Helm, 1991)
3. the Total Systems Approach to Evaluation (Manatt, 1988)
C. Review of Literature (transparencies #5, #6, #7, #8)

1. (#5) Operational definition—"the systematic assessment of a person's performance and/or qualifications in relation to a professional role and some specified and defensible institutional purpose"
   a. Formative evaluation—ongoing, descriptive, non-judgmental, and performed to help individuals perform better; performed to help managers make better decisions
   b. Summative evaluation—comparative, judgmental, performed at the end of an evaluation cycle
   c. Four key questions that must be asked for every educational personnel evaluation:
      1. What are our criteria?
      2. How high are our standards?
      3. How should we monitor and report progress?
      4. How shall we help the evaluatee improve after we have identified a profile of strengths and weaknesses?

(#6) How Formative Evaluation Differs From Summative Evaluation in Performance Appraisal of the Education Professional

2. (#7) Assumptions
   a. The fundamental purpose is to provide effective services to students and society.
   b. Practices should be constructive and free of unnecessary threatening or demoralizing characteristics.
   c. They are vital for planning sound professional development experiences.
   d. Disagreements about what constitutes a good job may complicate personnel evaluation, but such disagreements are warranted.
   e. They vary in complexity and importance.

3. (#8) Basic attributes of sound evaluation
   a. Propriety—evaluations are conducted ethically and legally and with concern for the welfare of students, other clients and educational professionals.
   b. Utility—evaluations are informative, timely and influential.
   c. Feasibility—evaluation systems are as easy to implement as possible, efficient in their use of time and resources and adequately funded.
   d. Accuracy—data obtained are accurate and clearly connected to the conclusions drawn from those data.
D. Professional Support Personnel Evaluation Model (transparencies #9-17)
(#9 Circle Graph)

(#10) PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL EVALUATION MODEL

I. Identify system needs
   A. Develop system of needs identification
   B. Examine current programs and personnel
   C. Relate evaluation to needs identification

II. Relate program expectations to job responsibilities
   A. Identify job responsibilities
   B. Develop job descriptions from job responsibilities

III. Select performance indicators
   A. State performance objectives
   B. Describe performance indicators
   C. Select performance indicators

IV. Set standards for job performance
   A. Defining standards
   B. Creating standards
   C. Evaluating standards

V. Document job performance
   A. Determine sources of documentation
   B. Identify framework for analyzing job artifacts

VI. Evaluate performance
   A. Identify purposes of the evaluation conference
   B. Plan for the evaluation conference
   C. Conduct the evaluation conference
E. Total Systems Approach to Evaluation (transparencies #17-#22)

1. (#17) Total Systems Approach—flowchart
2. (#18) Steps in the Performance Evaluation Process  
   a. Formative Evaluation Process  
      Step 1—Self-Evaluation Form  
      Step 2—Planning/Goals-Setting Conference  
         (#19) Professional Growth Plan  
      Step 3—Preobservation Conference  
         (#20) Observation Data Report  
      Step 4—Observation  
      Step 5—Postobservation conference  
         (#21) Postobservation Conference Analysis  
   b. Summative Evaluation Conference
3. (#22) Legal Do's and Don'ts
APPENDIX S: GUIDED PRACTICE SCENARIOS
Mary Bloom is a young, single woman who was employed by your agency as a data entry operator following high school graduation eight years ago.

You are beginning to look through her folder as you prepare for the first of two conferences that you will hold with her in preparation for her summative evaluation. You review her strengths, opportunities for growth, and MAP that are part of her profile of performance. There is documentation that Mary meets the public very well and displays excellent communication and social skills as she takes orders and assists clients via telephone. She has a reputation for her willingness to "go the extra mile" for clients in order to locate the materials they request. The item on her professional growth plan that addresses the accuracy of her work has not been achieved. She continues to overlook or miss problems as she inspects materials entering and leaving her area. Data is frequently entered into the computer incorrectly. However, since clients are unaware of the source of the problem when they receive inaccurate or inadequate materials, they continue to ask for Mary by name when calling in to the agency for assistance with media materials.

You have fifteen minutes to outline the plan for your conference with her. The members of your team will then be asked to conduct a fifteen-minute mock conference. One member of your triad will be the appraiser, one member will be the appraisee, and one member will be the process observer, completing the structured feedback instrument, "Post Observation Conference Analysis".
Guided Practice
Special Education Services
"The Psychologist"

You are responsible for evaluating Timothy Ladd, a psychologist who has been with the agency for two years. Tim was a graduate assistant in the psychology research department at Big City University while he was working on his master's degree. He has a wife and two small children. His wife is a former teacher but is staying home with the children at the present time.

You are preparing for the first of two conferences that you will hold with Tim in preparation for his summative evaluation. As you look through his folder, you review his strengths, opportunities for growth, and MAP. You notice that Tim is very punctual and thorough on written evaluation reports. He seems to be very knowledgeable of evaluation instruments, their uses, and their guidelines for administration and scoring. His diagnoses of individual student strengths and weaknesses appear to be on target. Even though Tim has done a good job on his MAP, he seems to be experiencing difficulty in reaching a particular item on his professional growth plan--developing positive working relationships with his peers. Reports from both AEA colleagues and local school personnel suggest that Tim "does not know how to work with people"--he comes across as "the authority", does not listen to other people's ideas, will criticize other's work openly, and cannot explain the results of his work in terms that can be understood by parents and other lay people.

You will have fifteen minutes to plan for this conference. You will then have fifteen minutes to conduct a mock conference. Select one member of your team to be the interviewer, one person to be the interviewee, and the third member of your team to be the process observer who will complete the structured feedback instrument, "Post Observation Conference Analysis".

Guided Practice No. 1
"The Secretary"

You're responsible for evaluating a secretary by the name of Jan Dobbs. She is 32, attractive and well-groomed and well-intentioned. Her husband is a medical student at a nearby university. They use a babysitter for their infant but their two older children look after themselves after school.

Mrs. Dobbs' annual performance review is scheduled in two weeks. You have held quarterly reviews as the year progressed and you have had several coaching and feedback sessions. She has worked for the organization for three years in three different assignments.

As you prepare for the performance review conference, you are concerned about the following behaviors:

1. She is on the telephone for non-business reasons a lot. Sometimes it's long chats with friends and family, often it's from 3:30-5:00 p.m. to check on the kids.

2. Jan loves to "play" with her computer programs, always trying something new. Unfortunately, she loses things in the process. Files go astray. Letters are incomplete when printed.

3. Her telephone manners leave much to be desired—yet she must act as receptionist for three professionals in your office.

4. She likes to gossip over the telephone and in person. When she calls other secretaries she rambles a lot, making small talk before getting to the point. She often embarrasses the professionals she serves by blurting out to callers "I don't know where she is?" or "It's 9:30 a.m. but I haven't seen him come in yet!".

Prepare an outline of how you would conduct the (1) introduction, (2) body and (3) close of the interview.
APPENDIX T: VIDEO TAPE SCRIPT OUTLINES
A. Setting the Stage
1. Evaluator extends evaluatee welcome to his/her office for summative evaluation conference (small-talk; icebreaker)
2. Evaluator and evaluatee are seated beside each other rather than across from each other
3. Evaluator states purpose of the conference; checks for understanding
4. Evaluator reviews steps in evaluation process leading up to summative conference
   a. Self-evaluation (set goals, review criteria, discuss procedures, agree upon timelines, review due process, discuss agency goals)
   b. Observations (formal and informal)
   c. Feedback conferences
   d. Supporting data and input

B. Summative Report
1. Evaluator explains "levels of performance"
2. Evaluator explains comment sections (both evaluator and evaluatee) with reference to generic and job specific responsibilities and descriptors
3. Evaluator identifies evaluatee's strengths (in given position--state specific example of a position in Educational Services)
4. Evaluator relates strengths to evaluatee's self-evaluation (Professional Development Plan)
5. Evaluator identifies evaluatee's area(s) in need of improvement (provide supporting data/examples)
6. Evaluator compares areas in need of improvement to evaluatee's self-evaluation (Professional Development Plan)
7. Evaluator checks for evaluatee's understanding

C. Professional Development Plan
1. Evaluator and evaluatee determine criterion from Summative Evaluation Report on which Professional Development Plan is based
2. Identify general goal
3. Specify measurable behavior
4. List procedures and timeline
5. Specify documentation/appraisal method for final accomplishment
6. Evaluator explains rebuttal procedure

D. Closure
1. Summarize strengths, goals - Professional Development Plan
2. Check for agreement
3. Questions
4. Thank-yous
A. Setting the Stage
1. Evaluator extends evaluatee welcome to his/her office for summative evaluation conference (small-talk; icebreaker)
2. Evaluator and evaluatee are seated beside each other rather than across from each other
3. Evaluator states purpose of the conference; checks for understanding
4. Evaluator reviews steps in evaluation process leading up to summative conference
   a. Self-evaluation (set goals, review criteria, discuss procedures, agree upon timelines, review due process, discuss agency goals)
   b. Observations (formal and informal)
   c. Feedback conferences
   d. Supporting data and input

B. Summative Report
1. Evaluator explains "levels of performance"
2. Evaluator explains comment sections (both evaluator and evaluatee) with reference to generic and job specific responsibilities and descriptors
3. Evaluator identifies evaluatee's strengths (in given position—state specific example of a position in Special Education Services)
4. Evaluator relates strengths to evaluatee's self-evaluation (Professional Development Plan)
5. Evaluator identifies evaluatee's area(s) in need of improvement (provide supporting data/examples)
6. Evaluator compares areas in need of improvement to evaluatee's self-evaluation (Professional Development Plan)
7. Evaluator checks for evaluatee's understanding

C. Professional Development Plan
1. Evaluator and evaluatee determine criterion from Summative Evaluation Report on which Professional Development Plan is based
2. Identify general goal
3. Specify measurable behavior
4. List procedures and timeline
5. Specify documentation/appraisal method for final accomplishment
6. Evaluator explains rebuttal procedure

D. Closure
1. Summarize strengths, goals - Professional Development Plan
2. Check for agreement
3. Questions
4. Thank-yous
A. Setting the Stage
1. Evaluator extends evaluatee welcome to his/her office for summative evaluation conference (small-talk; icebreaker)
2. Evaluator and evaluatee are seated beside each other rather than across from each other
3. Evaluator states purpose of the conference; checks for understanding
4. Evaluator reviews steps in evaluation process leading up to summative conference
   a. Self-evaluation (set goals, review criteria, discuss procedures, agree upon timelines, review due process, discuss agency goals)
   b. Observations (formal and informal)
   c. Feedback conferences
   d. Supporting data and input

B. Summative Report
1. Evaluator explains "levels of performance"
2. Evaluator explains comment sections (both evaluator and evaluatee) with reference to generic and job specific responsibilities and descriptors
3. Evaluator identifies evaluatee's strengths (in given position--state specific example of a position in Media Services)
4. Evaluator relates strengths to evaluatee's self-evaluation (Professional Development Plan)
5. Evaluator identifies evaluatee's area(s) in need of improvement (provide supporting data/examples)
6. Evaluator compares areas in need of improvement to evaluatee's self-evaluation (Professional Development Plan)
7. Evaluator checks for evaluatee's understanding

C. Professional Development Plan
1. Evaluator and evaluatee determine criterion from Summative Evaluation Report on which Professional Development Plan is based
2. Identify general goal
3. Specify measurable behavior
4. List procedures and timeline
5. Specify documentation/appraisal method for final accomplishment
6. Evaluator explains rebuttal procedure

D. Closure
1. Summarize strengths, goals - Professional Development Plan
2. Check for agreement
3. Questions
4. Thank-yous
A. Setting the Stage
   1. Evaluator extends evaluatee welcome to his/her office for formative evaluation conference. Note: could be done at Secretary's desk if privacy is maintained.
   2. Evaluator and evaluatee are seated beside each other rather than across from each other.
   3. Evaluator states purpose of the conference. This is a progress check, a time for mid-course corrections, and opportunity for coaching.

B. Formative Discussion
   In this vignette, the secretary is working on prioritizing, i.e., working on first things, first.
   1. The evaluator checks to see how the effort is going. Asks some probing question and gives some feedback.
   2. The secretary is to appear positive and willing but a bit doubtful that things can be prioritized in "such a busy office".
   3. Evaluator indicates that progress is being made, is encouraging but is very firm—work is not always on time, yet. Quality is good but it's often just after the intended deadline.

C. Closure
   1. Evaluator offers to be available for more questions, more coaching and to give tips on prioritizing when work is assigned.
   2. Check for agreement.
   3. Set date(s) for next progress check and summative evaluation conference.
A. Setting the Stage
1. Evaluator extends evaluatee welcome to his/her office for summative evaluation conference (small talk; icebreaker)
2. Evaluator and evaluatee are seated beside each other rather than across from each other
3. Evaluator states purpose of the conference; checks for understanding
4. Evaluator reviews steps in evaluation process leading up to summative conference
   a. Self-evaluation (set goals, review criteria, discuss procedures, agree upon timelines, review due process, discuss agency goals)
   b. Observations (formal and informal)
   c. Feedback conferences
   d. Supporting data and input

B. Summative Report
1. Evaluator explains "levels of performance"
2. Evaluator explains comment sections (both evaluator and evaluatee) with reference to generic and job specific responsibilities and descriptors
3. Evaluator identifies evaluatee's strengths (in given position--state specific example of a secretarial position in Administrative Services)
4. Evaluator relates strengths to evaluatee's self-evaluation (Professional Development Plan)
5. Evaluator identifies evaluatee's area(s) in need of improvement (provide supporting data/examples)
6. Evaluator compares areas in need of improvement to evaluatee's self-evaluation (Professional Development Plan)
7. Evaluator checks for evaluatee's understanding

C. Professional Development Plan
1. Evaluator and evaluatee determine criterion from Summative Evaluation Report on which Professional Development Plan is based
2. Identify general goal
3. Specify measurable behavior
4. List procedures and timeline
5. Specify documentation/appraisal method for final accomplishment
6. Evaluator explains rebuttal procedure

D. Closure
1. Summarize strengths, goals - Professional Development Plan
2. Check for agreement
3. Questions
4. Thank-yous
APPENDIX U: INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT
1. The test-and-try of your newly developed performance evaluation system was completed last spring. Were you involved in that process? Yes _____. No _____.

2. If yes, did you participate as an evaluator _____, or as an evaluatee _____?

3. Which of the following procedures were implemented? (Please comment on the usefulness of each component of the system.)

   a. Planning Conference

   b. Self-evaluation

   c. Formative Components:
      - Scheduled Observations (How many? ____)
      - Non-scheduled Observations (How many? ____)
      - Feedback Conferences (How many? ____)
      - Supporting data and input, i.e. work samples, feedback from peers
      - Other

   d. Summative Components:
      - Report
      - Conference
      - Professional Development Plan

   e. Other (please specify)_____

4. Is the Performance Evaluation System manageable and practical? Yes _____. No _____. If no, please explain. ____
5. Are the procedures and instruments adequate for collecting the data needed for evaluation performance? Yes ___, No ___. If no, please explain. __________________________

6. Do your job specific responsibilities adequately and fairly represent your role in the Agency? Yes ___, No ___. If no, what changes do you recommend? __________________________

7. Other comments/suggestions:

Thank-you for your assistance!
APPENDIX V: "FEEDBACK FROM THE CABINET"
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION HANDBOOK
WESTERN HILLS
AREA EDUCATION AGENCY
SIOUX CITY, IOWA

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION HANDBOOK
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR

(Feedback from the Cabinet)

DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY BY THE WESTERN HILLS AREA EDUCATION AGENCY STAKEHOLDERS' COMMITTEE AND THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT MODEL TEAM AT IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY.

NOVEMBER 16, 1992
Performance evaluation of the chief administrator is an integral and integrated part of the well-established management system based on objectives and plans-of-action that is utilized by the Western Hills Area Education Agency. The chief administrator evaluation is a subcomponent of the management system which enhances it. At the same time, it parallels the performance evaluation system for Agency personnel.

Following is a suggested time schedule that incorporates the chief administrator performance evaluation into the existing management program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>In Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All year</td>
<td>Systematic input from</td>
<td>Designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendents’ Advisory</td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - January</td>
<td>Refining input</td>
<td>Agency Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - February</td>
<td>Input received</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Feedback from Cabinet</td>
<td>Cabinet Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January - March</td>
<td>Agency goals approved</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Management contract developed</td>
<td>Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Board goals developed</td>
<td>Chief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR
WESTERN HILLS AREA EDUCATION AGENCY
SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT
Sioux City, Iowa

POSITION: Chief Administrator

**General Instructions**

Each Cabinet Member is to complete the following "feedback survey" and return it to the Chief Administrator's secretary for tabulations.
CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR       WESTERN HILLS AREA EDUCATION AGENCY  
SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT     Sioux City, Iowa  

APPRAISAL SCALE

Use the following numerical scale to indicate your appraisal of the individual’s performance in meeting his Principal Accountabilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
<th>EXPECTATION</th>
<th>EXPECTATIONS</th>
<th>EXPECTATION</th>
<th>OUTSTANDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Unsatisfactory: Performance is clearly below acceptable level. Does Not Meet Standards.

2. Meets Minimum Expectations: Performance comes close to being acceptable but the need for further development is recognizable. Needs Improvement.

3. Meets Expectations: Performance is acceptable, satisfactory, sufficient.

4. Exceeds Expectations: Performance is noticeably better than "acceptable".

5. Outstanding: Outstanding performance is clearly obvious to all. (A special category to recognize exemplary Agency performance.)
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SECTION A. GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

1. UNSATISFACTORY: Does Not Meet Agency Standards
2. MEETS MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS: Needs Improvement
3. MEETS EXPECTATIONS: Meets Agency Standards
4. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations
5. OUTSTANDING: Exemplary Performance

Chief Administrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides leadership.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manages responsibilities.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establishes systematic procedures for accomplishing goals and objectives.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Promotes the programs of the Agency.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Practices effective participatory management techniques.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Demonstrates human relations skills.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Engages in professional growth activities.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communicates a system of norms, values, and understandings which support inter-agency cooperation and maximizes teamwork.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Functions effectively in complex roles and situations.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provides symbolic leadership in which the Agency’s communications provide impetus to the Agency’s programs. Provides verbal and written communications which is consistent with the Agency’s expectations being clear, concise, and positive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION A. GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

1. **UNSATISFACTORY:** Does Not Meet Agency Standards  
2. **MEETS MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS:** Needs Improvement  
3. **MEETS EXPECTATIONS:** Meets Agency Standards  
4. **EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS:** Noticeably Exceeds Expectations  
5. **OUTSTANDING:** Exemplary Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief Administrator</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Provides leadership, vision, and direction in working with the Agency’s Board and Administrative Staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Promotes staff development activities appropriate to meet the goals of the Agency and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Effectively implements and monitors the performance evaluation system for all staff members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Provides opportunities for professional growth to all staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Recruits, employees, and assigns highly competent staff based on a clear statement of Agency needs (job descriptions, Agency culture, and other performance related criteria.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Assigns Agency responsibilities to administrative staff based on their competencies and ability to perform the assigned task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Demonstrates positive professional relationship with Agency personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION A. GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

1. UNSATISFACTORY: Does Not Meet Agency Standards
2. MEETS MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS: Needs Improvement
3. MEETS EXPECTATIONS: Meets Agency Standards
4. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations
5. OUTSTANDING: Exemplary Performance

Chief Administrator

18. Works with the division directors, Board members and management team negotiations to assure that salary settlements and negotiated language are consistent with the welfare of the Agency.

19. Provides leadership in assuring that the Agency’s involvement with the Superintendents’ Advisory Council, local area boards, and state level agencies is consistent with the Agency’s program needs.

20. Actively participates in AEA programs which address the Agency’s funding, legislative, and inter-agency roles.

21. Gains respect and support of the community on the conduct of the Agency’s operations.

22. Solicits and gives attention to problems and opinions of all groups and individuals.

23. Demonstrates a commitment to significant current issues in education, strives to stay informed and actively strives to provide leadership in and towards a meaningful education agenda.
SECTION A. GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

1. UNSATISFACTORY: Does Not Meet Agency Standards
2. MEETS MINIMUM EXPECTATIONS: Needs Improvement
3. MEETS EXPECTATIONS: Meets Agency Standards
4. EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS: Noticeably Exceeds Expectations
5. OUTSTANDING: Exemplary Performance

Chief Administrator

24. Maintains high standards of ethics, honesty, and integrity in all personal and professional matters. 1 2 3 4 5

25. Participates in professional growth activities. 1 2 3 4 5

Section A - Average Score
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