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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

U.S. businesses have been involved in "cultural change" since the 1980s in an effort to improve their working environment and their "bottom line." Organizational change depends on everyone in the organization having a common understanding of the organization's purpose, the organization's direction, and the organization's values. The paradigm shift from manager to leader, from dependency to self-responsibility, and from traditional hierarchy to culture-focused organizational change results in the need for the organization to give its employees the information they need to guide their own development. The use of $360^\circ$ Feedback is a natural outgrowth of this paradigm shift (Jones & Bearley, 1996).

The concept of $360^\circ$ Feedback refers to the practice of gathering and processing multi-rater assessments on employees and feeding back the results to the participants. Generally, ratings are produced by self, boss, peers, and subordinates. Business organizations are rapidly adopting $360^\circ$ Feedback systems. Based on a recent survey, 90 percent of Fortune 1000 companies use some form of multi-source assessment. Innovators of the multi-source assessment include the U.S. Department of Energy, Disney, Arizona State University, Monsanto, Florida Power & Light, DuPont, Westinghouse, Motorola, Federal Express, Kino Hospital, Fidelity Bank, and McDonnell-Douglas (Edwards & Ewen, 1996c).

Seven hundred fifty companies who use the $360^\circ$ Feedback system found that communication was improved with supervisors and that there was greater improvement in performance than when the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system was used (Bohl, 1996).

$360^\circ$ Feedback is a registered trademark of Teams, Inc.
Improved leadership/manager behavior and an increased understanding of how one is viewed by others is also a result of multiple-source feedback (Atwater, Roush, & Fischthal, 1995).

In the business literature, one major question hovers over the use of 360° Feedback. Should the feedback be used strictly by the individual as a means to improve his or her own performance or should the feedback be used by the managers to make personnel decisions? If the information is to be used by the individual to improve performance, then only that individual should have access to the information. There is less concern about dishonest or padded responses when the data are used solely by the individual. However, when the supervisor has access to the results, it is no longer simply developmental (Edwards & Ewen, 1996b). Feedback that is to be used by the managers must be in response to criteria that are an adequate representation of the work (Lepsinger & Lucia, 1997; Gebelein, 1996).

The business literature also identifies the characteristics of the organizational culture that will support 360° Feedback. Learning organizations which seek to improve the collective learning of all the employees support open and honest feedback. Clear and agreed-on performance measures and behaviors are found in such organizations. Employees are also willing to invest the time to make the 360° Feedback system work; they are willing to complete survey information for multiple employees and to invest the time in analyzing the feedback. Organizational cultures which enable speaking openly without fear of punishment, which stress listening to others, which expect respect and understanding of differences, which encourage reflection on and the challenging of one’s own thinking and actions, and which recognize equality of ideas are appropriate cultures for 360° Feedback (Lepsinger & Lucia, 1997).

The management level is an appropriate level to begin the implementation of 360° Feedback. Managers, at times, have a difficult time obtaining honest input from subordinates because of the fear of a negative evaluation in a supervisor-only evaluation system (Kennedy,
In fact, most authors writing on the use of 360° Feedback recommend that the system be started with the management level. Starting with the top managers engaging in multi-source feedback sets a good example for the other employees as the system shifts to include others in 360° Feedback system.

School systems, like businesses, also are seeking continuous improvement. Because public funds are spent on public education, continuous verification of teaching effectiveness is needed (Andrews & Knight, 1987). The majority of school districts look to teacher evaluation as a means of improving teaching performance (Manatt, 1987; Stiggins & Duke, 1988). In fact, in an effort to improve teaching, many states have adopted mandated state-wide evaluation systems. This effort to improve teacher performance as tied to evaluation techniques is a century-long effort (George, 1987).

Standards have been developed by which to gauge effective educator evaluation systems. Guiding assumptions include the purpose for evaluation is to provide effective services to students and to society, personnel evaluation has a demoralizing characteristic, personnel evaluations are vital for planning professional development, the discussion about characteristics of good teacher and good administration is needed, and personnel evaluations vary in complexity and importance. Recommended in the standards is that feedback encourages evaluatee acceptance and the use of findings to improve performance (Stufflebeam, 1988).

Traditional educational employee performance evaluation systems fall short of meeting the standards. Traditional evaluation systems are based on a clinical supervision model. A preobservation conference is held to mutually establish goals followed by multiple classroom observations. A postobservation conference then is held to plan for improvement. However, in most schools, the needed frequent observation and discussion about goals and improvement do not
occur (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). In search for improvement, districts must relate effective teaching research to evaluation criteria (Buttram & Wilson, 1987).

There are other problems which plague single-source evaluations. The tendency to favor employees who are like the evaluator, to show favoritism, and to refuse to confront marginal performance does not support improvement. The resulting lack of data and varying degrees of rigor in the evaluations creates poor information on which to base improvement plans (Manatt & Benway, 1998). Evaluations performed only by superiors, who may be removed from the "doing" level, provide limited relevant information.

In the effort to provide information to improve performance, many educators urge the use of assessment methods that provide more adequate and objective data about classroom interaction and the use of multiple evaluation procedures to provide a more comprehensive picture of a teacher’s performance (O’Hanlon & Morensen, 1977). Evaluations by peers and subordinates provide insight because of the different perspective they bring to the evaluation (National Study of School Evaluation, 1984). The use of multiple data sources as the foundation for teacher growth plans also is recommended by Richard Stiggins (Fontana, 1994).

A total systems approach, which utilizes multi-source feedback, in the evaluation of teachers and administrators is in use in Lincoln County School District No. 1 in Diamondville, Wyoming. The School Improvement Model, from Iowa State University, has worked with the school to develop surveys to be completed by students, teachers, and parents. The information is shared with the evaluatee and can be compared to national norms. Therefore, the one being evaluated can determine areas of strength and weakness to be improved (Manatt & Kemis, 1997).

Multiple data sources in the evaluation of school personnel enable the evaluatee to observe congruence between perceptions documented by the sources who provided feedback (Harris, 1987). A single source evaluation system, whether it be classroom observation, parent feedback,
student feedback, student performance, or artifact collection, does not provide a broad look at the teacher's work. The use of multiple sources provides a more encompassing reference point (McGreal, 1982).

Using multi-source feedback is appropriate for administrator as well as for teachers. Evaluation systems must help administrators do their job better (Bolton, 1980). The use of a two-pronged system could allow for multi-source feedback in the development of professional growth plans and for the single-source supervisor's evaluation in district accountability measures (Fontana, 1994).

The surest way to improve a K–12 evaluation system is to improve the evaluation system for administrators (Manatt, 1996). Starting with administrators develops a foundation for the system and allows the administrators to model the new evaluation system (Thorson, Miller, & Bellon, 1997).

Feedback provided by the faculty, the parents, and by the immediate supervisor gives valid information on which to base job performance. The administrator is in the position to benefit from feedback provided by those who directly receive the service (Manatt, 1987; Thomas, 1987; Education USA, 1987).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this investigation is to develop, implement, and test a procedure to utilize 360° Feedback collected from various job titles for central office and building administrators in a K–12 school district. Surveys were developed and used which reflect the critical criteria for successful job performance. Data were aggregated and shared in a feedback conference with administrators being evaluated. Based on the feedback, a self-improvement plan was developed. Ultimately, during this study, training materials were developed to allow the process to be used
by other districts. Administrators in the district who have used 360° Feedback completed a survey comparing the traditional evaluation system to the multi-rater system. Administrators in the same district who had not used the 360° Feedback rated their perceptions of the traditional evaluation system.

Schools are complex organizations which must meet the needs of the students. In complex organizations, single-source evaluations provide, at best, a limited perspective on which to base improvement. Multi-source feedback is a way to improve the performance of administrators in the district.

**Purpose of the Study**

At the conclusion of the study, multi-source feedback procedures are available for use in improving the performance of central office and building administrators in K–12 school districts. These materials were combined into a video-based learning album to assist those charged with the establishment of a 360° Feedback system. Sample instruments were also provided.

**Objectives of the Study**

1. Determine the functions of the performance evaluation system for the administrators in a K–12 school system.
2. Identify job titles for all central office and building administrators in the K–12 school system.
3. Incorporate generic criteria and job-specific responsibilities into job descriptions for all administrative position in a K–12 school system.
4. Identify the number and position of feedback sources for each administrator.
5. Design a survey instrument consistent with the job description and the district’s administrative philosophy for each administrative position in a K–12 system.

6. Pilot a multi-source feedback system with administrators in a K–12 school district.

7. Aggregate and disaggregate the data to share with the participants in a meaningful way.

8. Conduct planning conferences with each participating administrator.

9. Identify a control set of building administrators and an experimental set of building administrators to survey for their perceptions on 360° Feedback and on traditional supervisor-only feedback.

10. Design and use a survey to compare 360° Feedback to traditional supervisor-only feedback.

11. Survey the subjects for their satisfaction with the multi-source feedback.

12. Revise the multi-source feedback system of a K–12 school district based on the feedback of the employees.

13. Develop a script/notebook that would subsequently be incorporated into a video-based instructional package for use by administrators installing a multi-source feedback system.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for this investigation include:

1. Is it possible to develop a multi-source feedback system that will meet the needs of the board and the administration of a K–12 school district?

2. Is it possible to develop a multi-source implementation procedure that will meet the needs of the supervisors and of the administrators receiving the feedback?
3. Is it possible to develop a survey instrument for each identified administrative position that can be used with each administrator of a K–12 school that will include district generic criteria as well as job-specific criteria for each position?

4. Is it possible to aggregate and disaggregate the feedback results to share in a meaningful way with the administrator being evaluated?

5. Is it possible to develop plans for improvement based on the feedback?

6. Is it possible to identify job-specific criteria for each central office and building administrative position that will meet the needs of each employee working in that position?

   Criteria used to determine if feedback methods meet the needs of the employee include:
   
   • the promotion of sound education principles
   • information provided by knowledgeable personnel
   • useful reports/feedback
   • enhanced information.

7. Is it possible to develop a script for training video complete with user’s manual, sample surveys, and recommended feedback practices?

Basic Assumptions

The basic assumptions of this study included the following:

1. The development of a multi-source feedback system was supported by the administrators in the district.

2. Job-specific criteria are representative of administrators in similar positions in other K–12 schools.
3. All representative groups selected to provide feedback during the test-and-try participate as requested.

4. All employees who had suggestions for revisions prior to finalizing the multi-source feedback system responded on the designated survey.

5. The school district studied is reasonably representative of other K–12 schools.

**Delimitations**

1. The multi-source feedback procedures were developed for the Waterloo, Iowa School District.

2. The initial groundwork for the development and for the implementation of a multi-source feedback system was begun during the 1997–98 school year by Professor Richard Manatt and the School Improvement Model (SIM) team from Iowa State University.

3. Only administrators were involved—no other employees received 360° Feedback.

**Outline of Procedure**

1. Determine the functions of multi-source feedback system for the administrators in a K–12 school system.

2. Identify job titles for all administrators in the K–12 school system.

3. Identify the administrators involved in the 360° Feedback and those not involved in the 360° Feedback.


5. Incorporate generic criteria and job-specific responsibilities into job descriptions for all administrative positions in a K–12 school systems.
6. Design a survey instrument consistent with the job description for each administrative position in a K-12 system.

7. Identify the number and position of feedback sources for each administrator.

8. Develop a feedback conference procedure which results in a self-identified improvement plan for each administrator.

9. Implement a multi-source feedback system with administrators in a K-12 school district.

10. Survey the administrators of a K-12 school for their satisfaction with the multi-source feedback system.

11. Revise the multi-source feedback system of a K-12 school based on the feedback of the employees.

12. Develop a videotape script and support materials that would be subsequently incorporated into a video-based instructional package for use by administrators.

**Definitions**

**Critical criteria**: Descriptors of expectations of skills and of behaviors necessary for successful execution of the job.

**Feedback**: Information given to improve performance.

**Feedback sources**: People who can provide information about job performance based on knowledge of the critical criteria for the position.

**Multi-source feedback**: More than one person responding to job specific criteria to provide information about job performance.

**360° Feedback**: Feedback provided by representatives from all levels of the organization with whom one has direct contact.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Multi-rater feedback, or 360° Feedback, has been used in the business community for a number of years. In an attempt to improve performance appraisals, feedback has been sought from peers, from subordinates, and from self. Education is also seeking ways to improve the evaluation systems, and using the 360° Feedback model from business is one way to consider. For this study of implementation of multi-rater feedback for school administrators, reviewing literature focusing on 360° Feedback, administrator feedback and evaluation, manager feedback, teacher evaluation, and performance appraisal was necessary.

The review began by searching the Internet for the keywords of 360° Feedback, multi-rater feedback, evaluation, and feedback. The SCHOLAR Program at the Iowa State University Library was also a valuable source. The abstracts available through ERIC and the Dissertation Abstract Service were used. Once materials were located on the topic, the bibliographies were used to locate more information on feedback and evaluation systems. The information found is presented here beginning with the specifics concerning 360° Feedback, followed by the specifics concerning school administrator and teacher evaluation, and concluding with the general information concerning performance evaluation systems.

360° Feedback

Multi-source feedback can extend traditional performance appraisal by collecting information from subordinates, peers, supervisors, and customers. By receiving the normative data of the peer, subordinate, and supervisor feedback in addition to self-rating, a fuller view of performance can be obtained (London & Smither, 1995). Feedback from subordinates is sometimes referred to as "upward feedback," whereas, feedback from peers is referred to as
"lateral feedback." The concept of 360° Feedback implies that representatives of the "total circle" of those who one works with provide feedback.

Without specific feedback from multiple sources, people do not accurately know how others view them. The determination of how others view them is based on their own self-perceptions rather than on specific information. There was greater understanding about how one generally is viewed rather than by specific individuals (Kenny & DePaulo, 1993).

**Process for 360° Feedback**

Commitment from the management is needed before beginning the system (Roebuck, 1996). Organizations which value open and honest communication are effective systems to use 360° Feedback. Involvement of recipients in the planning of the process, in the surveys to be used, and in the feedback conference procedures strengthens the commitment to the process and decisions to be made (Lepsinger & Lucia, 1997). The process for using 360° Feedback begins with the identification of the organization's strategies and goals. The strategies and goals are the basis for the feedback surveys—the skills that are needed among the employees to meet the organization's goals. The scope of the multi-rater process must be defined. The identification of who will receive feedback and who will provide the feedback is needed. Consideration must be given for the purpose of the feedback (development and/or appraisal) (London, Wohlers, & Gallagher, 1990). For managers, data from self, subordinates, and peers are valuable. Some organizations also include the supervisor in the feedback loop. For non-managers, information can be collected from self and from peers (Pollack & Pollack, 1996).
Feedback for appraisal

If the information is to be used for appraisal, the method for integrating the information with other performance information should be established (London, 1997). The next step is to plan the process. Considerations include which employees will be assessed first, the design of the instrument, and the frequency of the collection of the feedback information. Some companies use a consultant for the design of the instrument and its administration. Confidentiality of the respondent must be maintained (London, 1997; Edwards & Ewen, 1996).

Data should be reported by four or more respondents. Fewer than four responses does not allow for a spread of responses. All subordinates should have the opportunity to complete the survey and up to five peers should be asked for lateral feedback. London and Smither (1995) suggest that three to five raters per source be used. Those not directly involved with the employee might also be asked, but the relevance of their responses might be less valid because they do not have as much contact with the employee as a direct supervisor, subordinate, or peer (London, 1997; Lepsinger & Lucia, 1997). The survey items can be created by a committee based on the goals of the organization. Surveys should be kept to 60 items or less. Open-ended responses make it difficult to protect the respondents' anonymity. A six-point scale provides more exact information than a four-point scale (London, 1997). Statistical procedures can also be used that trim the mean to reduce or eliminate the impact of invalid respondent strategies (Edwards & Ewen, 1996c; Lepsinger & Lucia, 1997). Data can be collected via on-line computer to ease in the time needed to collect and organize the information (London, 1997; Meyer, 1998).

The difference in the perception of the accuracy of single-source and multi-source feedback was found by Robert McDonald (1997) to not be significant. However, employees who received multi-source feedback that was not averaged from all the participants indicted they were more likely to use the feedback than those who received averaged information. There was not a
difference between those who received single or multi-source feedback in their intention to use the information.

A note of caution has been raised about the convergence between the self and peer ratings. One study indicated that managers who are extroverted have greater agreement between their self-evaluation and peer evaluation (McElhenie, 1998).

**Multi-rater feedback instruments**

Because of the publication of various multi-rater feedback instruments, a checklist has been created to guide managers as they select the instrument to be used. Recommendations include the following: surveying what is available, comparing the purpose of the instrument with the characteristics of the instrument, technical considerations such as the consistency of the scores and the face validity, and the presentation of rater responses and the feedback display (Van Velsor & Brittain, 1991).

The multi-rater process might be linked to the competencies expected of the employees needed to meet the organization's goals. Implementation of the 360° Feedback system involves educating those who will be involved with it and the determination of the feedback strategy. Normative data, so that employees can see how they compare to others, are helpful. Normative data can also be used to determine if the norm is high enough within the organization to be considered acceptable. Time series collection is also helpful to provide information over a period of time. Data should be collected at a minimum of once a year (London, 1997).

**Delivery of information**

The method for the delivery of the feedback information is a decision the organization must make. Feedback conferences are recommended. Recommendations include a training of managers
and team leaders to coach and develop employees based on the feedback received (Gebelein, 1996). Survey results can be presented as normative data for all categories or by groups of items (London, 1997). The feedback conference must be planned to include action planning based on the information delivered (Roe, 1996; Edwards & Ewen, 1996). Focusing on the average rating in relation to the norm and self-rating gives the employee an opportunity to identify discrepancies on which to base improvement plans. Extremely negative results could be presented in a private meeting with a counselor or consultant present (London, 1997). The process must be evaluated and adjusted to work for the organization (Gebelein, 1996). Evaluation of change over time is one way to evaluate the effectiveness of the feedback, and ways to enhance the process should be identified (London, 1997).

The process recommendations for 360° Feedback can be found in Table 1. Many authors provide suggestions for the process and procedures that can be effectively used for the implementation of 360° Feedback. The table summarizes the recommendations.

**Use of 360° Feedback—Development or Evaluation**

Feedback from multiple sources provides information about job performance from multiple perspectives. However, there is disagreement about the ultimate use of the information. Some researchers feel that the purpose of the data collection should drive its usage.

**Developmental purpose**

Information to be used for developmental purposes would be different than information collected for appraisal decisions (Meyer, Kay, & French, n.d.; Pollack & Pollack, 1996). The attitude toward peer feedback appeared to be more favorable when the information would be used for developmental purposes rather than for performance decisions (McEvoy & Buller, 1987). In
Table 1. Summary of process recommendations for 360° Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher and year</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lepsinger &amp; Lucia (1997)</td>
<td>Involvement of participants in planning strengthens commitment to process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollack &amp; Pollack (1996)</td>
<td>For managers, include self, subordinates, and peers. For nonmanagers, include self and peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepsinger (1997)</td>
<td>Training the raters strengthens feedback system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (1997)</td>
<td>For appraisal, determine how feedback will be used with other information. Six-point scale proved more exact information than four-point scale. Data should be collected at least once a year. Survey items presented as normative for all categories or by groups of items. Evaluate effectiveness of process by considering change over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards &amp; Ewen (1996c)</td>
<td>Statistical procedures can reduce or eliminate the impact of invalid respondent strategies. Feedback conference needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer (1998)</td>
<td>Data can be collected on-line to ease time factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElhenie (1998)</td>
<td>Extroverted managers have greater agreement between self-evaluation and peer evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebelein (1996)</td>
<td>Recommended training managers and team leaders to coach and develop employees based on feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fact, subordinates appeared to respond less honestly when the information collected would be used to evaluate performance. Thirty-four percent of the subordinates surveyed indicated they would respond more favorably about the supervisor if the information were to be used for performance appraisal (Dalton; London & Wohlers, 1991). "When used for development, the ongoing coaching and feedback continued to improve skills rather than resulting in a one-time evaluation conference" (Hazucha & Hezlett). In surveying companies using 360° Feedback, 65 percent surveyed believed upward feedback should be used for development only (London & Wohlers, 1991). This is the way that the feedback information is used at General Electric (Carew, 1989). Other writers suggest that using the feedback information for evaluative purposes undermines the ability to use the information for improvement because it undermines the psychological safety of the employee which is necessary to work to one's best (Brotherton, 1996; Filipczak, Hequet, Lee, Picard, & Stamps, 1996; Yukl & Lepsinger, 1995).

**Appraisal purposes**

Other researchers and writers support the use of 360° Feedback for appraisal decisions such as pay increases and promotions. Many companies which are using the multi-source feedback use the information for performance decisions. Bohl (1996) found that 90 percent of the companies surveyed use the information for performance decisions while London and Smither found that 50 percent of the companies in their survey used the feedback for appraisal decisions. Some writers see the feedback as a way to improve the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system (Crainer, 1997; Edwards & Ewen, 1996; Lepsinger & Lucia, 1997). Using the system for two years as a means to improve performance prior to using it as criteria for compensations tests the legal soundness of the multi-source feedback (Gebelein, 1996). If the organization is to move from
using the feedback information for development only to using the information for pay and for appraisal, ten guidelines to consider are the following:

- User support from the satisfaction surveys should exceed 75 percent.
- Users' individual ratings will be confidential.
- The spread of scores should differentiate between high, medium, and low performance.
- Responses from those who provide feedback should be above 75 percent.
- Time required for respondents and for process administration must be minimized and reasonable.
- Respondents must be accountable for honest ratings; invalid responses—those 40 percent different from the consensus of others—should be below 5 percent.
- Respondents do not systemically discriminate against protected status groups, and members of such groups should receive performance scores similar to others.
- Users should be trained in both providing and receiving behavior feedback.
- Safeguards to process fairness, such as intelligent scoring which minimizes unknown sources of bias, are understood and supported (Edwards & Ewen, 1996).

The recommendations for the use of 360° Feedback, to be used for development or appraisal purposes, are summarized in Table 2. Some writers suggest that multi-source feedback be used solely for the personal development of the employee. Others, however, suggest that the feedback can be used for performance evaluation.

**Self, Peer, and Subordinate Feedback**

Information about performance is collected from many sources for 360° Feedback. Feedback is provided by peers, subordinates, and supervisors. Self-evaluation also provides a lens for the viewing of job performance.
Table 2. Summary of recommendations for the use of 360° Feedback to be used for development or appraisal purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McEvoy &amp; Buller: Attitude more favorable for peer appraisal when used for development.</td>
<td>London &amp; Smither: Fifty-percent of companies using 360° Feedback use administrative decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazucha &amp; Hezlett: On-going coaching and feedback support the continued improvement of skills.</td>
<td>Crainer: It is robust, rigorous, and takes feedback to unprecedented levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London &amp; Wohlers: Sixty-five percent surveyed believed upward feedback should be used for development only. Thirty-four percent indicated they would respond differently for supervisor if used for performance appraisal.</td>
<td>Bohl: Ninety percent of the companies who use 360° Feedback use the results for personnel decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherton: Most effective when used for development purposes.</td>
<td>Edwards &amp; Ewen: Information can be used for personnel decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollack &amp; Pollack: Data collection and feedback processes most effective and efficient when used for developmental rather than evaluation purposes.</td>
<td>Gebelein: For two years use as development to test legal soundness before using for compensation systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carew: At General Electric, results don’t go to the supervisor; it is not a part of the formal performance system. It is developmental.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipczak: Use of 360° Feedback for appraisal violates basic condition for change—psychological safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton: Raters aren’t honest if it will be used for performance appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukl: Feedback information is more valuable for development than for evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-assessment

Self-assessment is a component of 360° Feedback systems. The discrepancy score may be compared to the feedback provided by peers, subordinates, and supervisors. One reason for discrepancy could be the different perspective on the same job or role (Yammarino & Atwater, 1977). Self-assessment endorses the role of self in feedback. It is also a critical part in the self-regulation process. Self-regulation affects the identification of goals and the evaluation of behavior toward the achievement of the goals. The quick changing of organizations requires that employees be able to sort out supervisory and peer preferences and evaluative criteria in order to survive, and self-assessments give the individual the option of when to obtain feedback and from whom (Ashford, 1989). Self-appraisals, however, were characterized by more leniency, less variability, and less discriminate validity than appraisals by supervisors, peers, and subordinates (Thornton, 1980).

The accuracy of self-appraisals is questioned at times, and a number of studies have resulted to identify the correlation among various feedback sources. The correlation was relatively high between peer and supervisor rating, and only moderate between self-appraisal and supervisor appraisal. There was also a moderate correlation between self-appraisal and peer appraisal (Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988). Self-evaluations were found to be more accurate for employees whose achievement was high, who were intelligent, and who exhibited a strong internal locus of control. The validity of the self-assessment improved when the following occurred:

- The employee knew that the self-evaluation would be compared to criterion measures.
- The employee had previous experience with self-evaluation.
- There were instructions guaranteeing anonymity of the self-evaluation.
- The self-evaluation instructions emphasized that the results would enable the comparison with other employees (Mabe & West, 1982).
The correlations between subordinate and self-ratings also improved when the subordinates' ratings were aggregated prior to the comparison with the self-rating. Interestingly, the correlation between self-ratings and the average subordinates' ratings was higher for female than for male managers.

Utilizing self-appraisals in the evaluation conference involves the manager in a different role than the traditional supervisor-only documentation evaluation conference. Working from a self-appraisal in the feedback conference allows the manager to function in the role of counselor rather than as a judge. The self-appraisal is more productive and satisfying to the employee than the traditional supervisor-only evaluation, especially in the identification of overall progress, identification of a problem area, identification of opportunities to improve, long-range planning, and the setting of goals and plans for the next year (Meyer, 1991).

The individual's tenure in the job influences the need for and the usefulness of self-evaluation. Information and feedback can cause anxiety and can threaten self-esteem. Those employees who are new to the job or who have a high need for achievement greatly value feedback. Feedback is an organizational resource. "People seek to reduce their uncertainty about their job performance, to signal the priorities of the job performance needed, and to create feelings of competence" (Ashford & Cummings, 1983). Those employees who have been on the job a number of years and who have lower self-esteem tend to avoid feedback. It is for the latter that self-evaluation is the least accurate (Ashford, 1989).

Table 3 summarizes the findings which focus on self and subordinate feedback. Both self and subordinate feedback play a role in multi-source systems. A self-reflection can be cast against perceptions of one's subordinates.
Table 3. Summary of findings which focus on self and subordinate feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton (1980)</td>
<td>More lenient, less variable, and less discriminate than assessments by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabe &amp; West (1982)</td>
<td>Validity improved when self-evaluation compared to criterion measures, previous experience with self-evaluation, anonymity guaranteed, and comparison to others emphasized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris &amp; Schaubroeck (1988)</td>
<td>Relatively high correlation between peer and supervisor ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford (1989)</td>
<td>Give option of when to obtain feedback and from whom. Least accurate for employees who have been on the job a number of years and have low self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yammarino &amp; Atwater (1997)</td>
<td>Discrepancy due to different perspective on role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subordinate feedback:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawler (1967)</td>
<td>Discovering discrepancies can lead to greater understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wohlers, Hall, &amp; London (1993)</td>
<td>Supervisors over the age of 55 rated themselves more positively than did the subordinates. Supervisors and employees of same race showed more agreement in evaluation. Gender had no significant bearing. Use in career planning served for greater agreement between supervisor and subordinate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of raters

Managers may control impressions others have of them, and in that way, managers protect their self-concepts. Few people are able to see their own total job performance. For that reason, different perspectives may be provided by the use of peer, subordinate, supervisor, and self-assessments (Wohlers & London, 1989). Because there is a wide variance of perspectives, managers may seek to minimize the discrepancy. Training those involved in the appraisal system is one way to lessen the discrepancy. Characteristics of competence as an appraiser such as knowledge of the job, education, experience, etc., could be identified. Raters could then be selected from within that pool. Raters from within the organization as opposed to those outside of the organization are perceived to be more fair and to produce appraisals that are more satisfying to the ratee (Barclay & Harland, 1995). Managers also benefit from feedback which provides normative information based on how other managers evaluate. Leniency was reduced by information (Davis & Mount, 1984).

Subordinate feedback

The use of feedback from subordinates (upward feedback) does improve supervisors’ behavior, which is the goal for a performance system (Hegarty, 1974). The perspective provided by peers is different than the perspective of the supervisors. Discovering the discrepancies between the ratings by peers, by supervisor, and by self can lead to greater understanding of the rating and the performance (Lawler, 1967). The type of organization, the race, the gender, and the use of the upward feedback were examined for agreement between self and subordinate input. In government organizations which are non-military, there was lower self/subordinate agreement than there was in a military organization or business organization. Supervisors over the age of 55 rated themselves more favorably than did their subordinates, and supervisors and subordinates of
the same race showed more agreement than when the supervisor and subordinate were of a
different race. Gender did not influence the agreement of the rating, and for those supervisors
who use the feedback in career planning, there was a greater agreement as well (Wohlers, Hall,

Feedback Conference

Once the information has been gathered from the various respondents, it must be shared
with the one being evaluated. Stanley Angriest (1973) defined feedback as the "information
enabling adjustment for the future based on past performance." Feedback is essential to the
improvement of one's work (Ashford, 1989; Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgen, 1984; Schmidt & Finnigan,
1993). Information about one's work enables the employee to accelerate progress and to increase
the rate of learning in an effort to improve job performance (Blake & Mouton, 1991).

Information and feedback can expand the information known to the employee and can
provide a stronger basis for improvement. Providing information known to others but not known
to self enables one a broader picture of oneself.

The Jahari Window, as shown in Figure 1, is a depiction that graphically illustrates the
areas that are blind to one. The fourth quadrant is an area where one is not able to discern
information about oneself without assistance from others.

"Effective feedback is relevant, understandable, descriptive, verifiable, limited, impactable,
also adds that the effective feedback is frequent, confidential, and accompanied by an explanation
so one knows how to use the information (Pascale & Athos, 1981).
Some information is known to self and to others, while other information is unknown to self, but is known to others. (Rasch, 1984, p. 226)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known to self</th>
<th>Not known to self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known to others</td>
<td>I. Area of free activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(knowledge/awareness gap)</td>
<td>II. Blind area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known to others</td>
<td>III. Area of yet undisclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. Area of activity or confidential matters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Possible avoided matters—to private self)

| Closed mouth                     | Unknown                              |

Figure 1. The Jahari Window

Who delivers the feedback

Who delivers the information is a question for the management team to determine. The use of a consultant increases the confidentiality of the information that may increase the acceptance of the information. The consultant may analyze the data and develop the feedback reports. However, if a consultant is not used, the human resources department can fulfill the function (Pollack & Pollack, 1996).

A feedback conference is scheduled for the review of the information, the identification of strengths and weaknesses, and the plan for improvement (Pollack & Pollack, 1996; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Rasch, 1984). The raw data should be given to the employee collected under headings tied to the survey document (Singleton, 1981; Wilson, 1981). The actual documents provided by the respondent were more helpful than paraphrasing (Singleton, 1981; Rausch, 1985).
When specific information is given in a calm, nonjudgmental manner, the employee is more likely to respond positively and improve job performance. A delivery by someone who is willing to listen, who chooses words carefully, and reflects information back to the employee enables the avoidance of conflict and enables resolution (Rausch, 1985; Nadler, 1977). Ambiguous and nebulous language should be avoided (Longenecker & Gioia, 1988; Hazucha, Hezlett, & Schneider, 1993).

Acceptance of feedback

The acceptance of the feedback was also influenced by the perceived accuracy of the information (Nadler, 1977; Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgen, 1984). The expertise of the rater affects whether the employee deems the information as accurate or not; a rater with a high level of expertise was regarded by the employee as one who delivers accurate information. Whether the information is negative or positive, it is perceived as more accurate if the rater is deemed to hold expertise in the field. However, if the rater is not acknowledged to hold expertise in the area, the feedback, either positive or negative, is disregarded as inaccurate.

For those employees with a high internal locus of control, feedback which was delivered with thepositives first then followed by the negatives was perceived as more accurate than feedback presented with the negatives first. However, for the employee with a high locus of external control, the order of the information had no effect on its perceived accuracy (Stone, Gueutal, & McIntosh, 1984). When delivering feedback, acknowledging personal causes for positive performance and obtaining information about what may be causing low performance improved performance. In the case of low performance, the recognition of the constraints which may be contributing to the poor performance allowed the supervisor to assist in the removal of the factors in an effort to improve performance (Bannister & Balking, 1990). Stating the standards
used to judge performance and to establish benchmark performance was helpful in improving performance. "Employees should be encouraged to check their performance against levels of performance" (Taylor, Fisher, & Ilgen, 1984).

At times, employees must consider negative feedback. Supervisors tended to provide direct positive feedback more frequently than the needed negative feedback. Without direct feedback, employees must depend more on observational cues which are less accurate than direct feedback (Ashford, 1989; Larson, 1986). However, the feedback for negative performance was more specific than the feedback provided for the positive performance (Larson, 1986).

If the feedback were delivered at a face-to-face conference, there was a tendency for the manager to cushion the negative information. Managers allowed the employee to explain away the deficiencies. As a result, negative performance feedback was frequently buffered which resulted in rating inflation (Waung & Highhouse, 1997). Supervisors also tended to reduce interaction time with those who have been negatively evaluated which once again forced employees to rely more heavily on speculative cues (Ashford, 1989). Recommendations for delivering negative feedback during a conference include "being specific, setting objectives for improvement, and refusing to be distracted" (London, 1997).

The solicitation of the feedback plays a role in the perceived accuracy as well. Managers who are willing to seek negative feedback received more accurate information than managers who just sought positive feedback. In fact, the seeking of positive information decreased employees' opinions of the manager's effectiveness (Ashford & Tsui, 1991). Employees who solicited feedback also tended to receive less negative feedback. By paying attention to timing and by giving reasons that were beyond the employee's control for undesirable performance, employees lessened the negativity of the performance feedback (Larson, 1989).
Data which compare the employees to others at the same work level are helpful. Recipients also compare to their self-assessment (Brotherton, 1996). The comparative data and the individual data then are used for the development of performance goals (Zander, 1971).

Goal setting

The setting of goals based on the feedback information should be used to improve performance (Meyer, Kay, & French, n.d.; Nadler, 1977; Brotherton, 1996; Greller, 1978; Pollack & Pollack, 1996). Joint goal setting based on the jointly identified strengths and weaknesses was consistently associated with the satisfaction of the employee (Greller, 1978). Joint planning also increased the probable extent of the change and improvement (French & Bell, n.d.). However, new workers and those not performing to an acceptable level may respond better to supervisor-developed goals (Eder & Fedord, 1989). Employees are advised to be able to discuss weaknesses and to present ideas on how to improve (Murray, n.d.).

The action plans which are developed based on the goals should be implemented as quickly as possible. In an effort not to overwhelm, three to five areas should be identified for focus at one time (Pollack & Pollack, 1996; Meyer, Kay, & French, n.d.). Goal areas should match the employee’s abilities. If the goal is too easy or too difficult, the resulting work is deficient. Providing a rationale for the needed goal also improves the likelihood that the goal will be met (Huber, Latham, & Locke, 1989; Locke, Cartledge, & Koeppel, 1968). A recommended action plan identifies the objective (targeted strength), the strategy/resources (how to achieve objective and what will be needed), the target date (when will the objective be achieved), and the observable/measurable results (how will one know the objectives are met) (Edwards & Ewen, 1996).
The feedback conference is an essential part of the multi-rater process. Many authors provide specific recommendations about how the information should be presented during the conference. The acceptance of the feedback is also a consideration of the writers. Table 4 summarizes the findings.

Another part of the feedback conference is goal-setting. Table 5 summarizes the recommendations on the setting of goals. Joint planning is suggested by some authors.

**Benefits for Managers**

All managers can benefit from feedback; a focus on the feedback for management is needed. "Managers seem to have little knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses" (London, Wohlers, & Gallagher, 1990). Managers know themselves differently than how others see them. Managers must define themselves before they can create conditions that will result in positive energy for the organization (Kilmann et al., 1994). Collecting feedback from a variety of sources provides more information on which to base job improvement; multiple rater systems have higher predictive validities for predicting supervisory success than single supervisor rating systems (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). Multi-rater systems also have been strongly supported in litigation (Bernardin & Cascio, 1984). However, in a survey of 140 organizations, only ten involved subordinates in the formal appraisal of their managers (Bernardin & Klatt, 1985).

Because of the difficulty in acquiring feedback for managers in the traditional evaluation system, the management should be involved in the multi-rater feedback. Constructive feedback leads to higher performance and commitment. For continued improvement to occur, management must cultivate an open culture that facilitates feedback from all segments of the working company (Roebuck, 1996). In closed systems where managers forget or ignore feedback, subordinates do
Table 4. Summary of findings of feedback conference and acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback conference:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford, Taylor, Fisher, &amp; Ilgen</td>
<td>Feedback essential to improving work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt &amp; Finnigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake &amp; McCanse</td>
<td>Enables acceleration of progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Effective feedback is frequent, confidential, accompanied by explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longenecker &amp; Gioia</td>
<td>Avoid ambiguous and nebulous language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazucha, Hezlett, &amp; Schneider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollack &amp; Pollack, Bernardin</td>
<td>Identifies strengths and weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatty, Rasch</td>
<td>Plan for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raasch</td>
<td>Provides information not known to self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton, Rausch</td>
<td>Include actual comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannister &amp; Balkin</td>
<td>Improved performance if acknowledgment of what may be causing low performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, Gueutal, McIntosh</td>
<td>Higher if the one delivering it is perceived to be an expert. Employee with high internal locus of control, deliver positives first. Employee with low internal locus of control, it doesn't matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Fisher, &amp; Ilgen</td>
<td>Stating standards improves performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative feedback:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>Supervisors spent less time with employees evaluated negatively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford, Larson</td>
<td>Need direct feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford &amp; Tsui</td>
<td>Seeking feedback lessened its negativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>Negative feedback more specific. Employees who give reasons for poor performance received less negative evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Be specific, set objectives, refuse to be distracted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waung &amp; Highhouse</td>
<td>Negative feedback delivered face-to-face was cushioned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Summary of findings of recommendations on goal setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eder &amp; Fedor</td>
<td>New employees may respond better to supervisor-set goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards &amp; Ewen</td>
<td>Identify objective, strategy, what will be needed, target date, results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &amp; Bell</td>
<td>Joint planning increased probable extent of change and improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greller</td>
<td>Employee more satisfied if goals are set jointly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, Kay &amp; French, Nadler,</td>
<td>Should be used to improve performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherton, Greller, Pollack &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollack</td>
<td>Three to five areas should be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollack &amp; Pollack, Meyer,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay &amp; French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

not provide the feedback that would improve the performance of the managers. Support staff frequently are averse to offering feedback as opposed to the managerial staff or professional staff. Managers should participate at the onset of the 360° Feedback system implementation. Others can participate on a voluntary basis (London, Wohlers, & Gallagher, 1990).

Effects on manager behavior

Managers benefit from 360° Feedback. With the establishment of standards which are communicated to the employees, data can be collected. The resulting data can be compared to the expected standards (Sussman, Herden, Kuzmits, n.d.). Clear, precise information is more valuable than ambiguous feedback (Morrison, McCall, & DeVries, 1978). In a study of the impact of 360° Feedback on management skill development, the identified skill areas were
improved following the feedback sessions. Another benefit for the managers was in the second year of the multi-rater feedback system, the manager's self-perception more closely aligned with the perceptions of the employees, and those who had participated in the multi-rater feedback were more likely to be promoted (Hazucha, Hezlett, & Schneider, 1993).

Leaders who received feedback from their subordinates used the information to improve their performance and to reevaluate their own performance. Leaders who received negative feedback rated themselves on self-evaluations lower at the next rating. For the leaders who had received positive feedback, the self-evaluations were higher at the next rating. Subordinates noted improved performance behaviors for those leaders who received negative feedback, while for those leaders who received positive feedback, no change was noted (Atwater, Roush, & Fischthal, 1995).

The research on the use of multi-source feedback by managers can be found in Table 6. The authors suggest that managers, in particular, can benefit from feedback from many different people.

**School Administrator Evaluation**

Managers of schools can also benefit from multi-rater feedback. For instance, principal evaluation can also involve input from people other than direct supervisors. The traditional model for principal evaluation did not include multiple sources of information. In a study completed in 1971, of 154 school districts, 84 evaluated administrators. However, none of the districts solicited input from anyone other than from the direct supervisor (evaluating administrative/supervisory performance). A later document, based on the public's concern for accountability, indicated that districts across the country were revising procedures to solicit input from parents and staff about supervisors' performance (Nygaard, 1994).
Table 6. Summary of findings on the use of multi-source feedback by managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London, Wohlers, &amp; Gallagher</td>
<td>Managers have little knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilmann</td>
<td>Managers must define themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardin &amp; Beatty</td>
<td>Multi-rater systems provide more information on which to base improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardin &amp; Cascio</td>
<td>Multi-rater systems supported in litigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardin &amp; Klatt</td>
<td>Only 10 out of 140 organizations surveyed included subordinates in appraisal of managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roebuck</td>
<td>Need information from all segments of the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London &amp; Wohlers</td>
<td>Managers must participate in 360° Feedback; others are voluntary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwater, Rousch, &amp; Fischthal</td>
<td>After receiving feedback, self-evaluations were higher. After receiving negative feedback, improvement was noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caution is raised because of the relatively untested area of multiple-source assessments for use by school personnel. Knowing what the clients think has value; however, the perceptions may not provide a valid view of the effectiveness of the educator's work (Stronge & Ostrander, 1997, p. 156). Problems and issues to be resolved were also identified by Dale L. Bolton (1980, p. 115). His concerns include the reality of the design based on the needs of the district and of the personnel. The purpose for the evaluation and the criteria for the job performance must be understood. Collection of data in a way that is functional is also identified. The evaluation system can be judged based on if it helps the administrators do their job better, if the evaluation functions
throughout the whole system, if sufficient time is available to make it work, if the system has purpose, and if the evaluation is cyclical and self-correcting.

Faculty-based needs assessment

A faculty-based needs assessment can be used to provide feedback to a principal about his or her competency (Thomas, 1987). Focus on three domains of the work of principals (organizational direction, organizational linkage, and organizational procedures) can be evaluated by teachers to be used by supervisors to improve their performance (Valentine & Bowman, 1986). Multiple evaluators for principals is encouraged by Jean Fontana (1994). Fontana suggests, "Principals receive feedback from a self-selected mentor, a coach to lend recommendations and support, and an external evaluation from a university."

Principals can be critiqued based on the improved effectiveness of their schools. Such criteria may include the setting of personal goals and the regular assessing of personal achievements, nurturing creativity in others, self-management, physical and emotional well-being, time management skills, interest in professional growth, adherence to the highest standards of moral, ethical, and professional conduct, and the dedication to enhancing the self-esteem of staff members and students by demonstrating belief in their abilities and acknowledging their successes and accomplishments (Fredericks & Brown, 1993).

The role of any school administrator must be considered as the evaluation system is developed. To effectively lead schools into the twenty-first century, school leaders must "lead rather than boss" and work with staff members to learn to disagree agreeably. Leaders should teach others to make decisions rather than making decisions solely in a vacuum (Schlechty, 1990, p.8; Lambert, 1998, p. 205). Such recommendations must be considered in the development of
administrative performance systems, the identification of what needs to be evaluated, what should be recorded, what should be accomplished is recommended by George Rentsch (1976).

Existing multi-source feedback systems

The School Improvement Model System at Iowa State University has assisted in the establishment of a multi-source feedback system in three school districts: Cave Creek (AZ); Unified School District, Lincoln County School District in Kemmerer (WY); and Mesa Public Schools (AZ). Information is sought from students, from peers, from supervisors, and from parents and is combined with self-evaluation, student achievement documentation, and professional growth goals (Manatt, 1997; Manatt & Kemis, 1997; Education Daily, 1997; Education USA, 1997). The School Improvement Model (SIM) research team at Iowa State University discovered that multiple data sets helped overcome persistent problems. The problems include: 1) self serving "like-me-ness" expectations, 2) favoritism, 3) scant data, 4) evaluators who refuse to confront marginal performance, and 5) varying degrees of rigor in making evaluation ratings (Manatt & Benway, 1998).

Table 7 summarizes the research on school administrator evaluation. The authors recommend information being provided by multiple sources. Focus areas can be used as the foundation for information.

Teacher Evaluation

The preponderance of research on educational personnel evaluation has focused on the evaluation of teachers. The purposes for and the methodologies to be used in the evaluation of teachers has been definitively undefined for decades even though the majority districts look to
Table 7. Summary of findings on school administrator evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher and year</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Administrative Performance (1971)</td>
<td>Out of 154 school districts, none solicited information from other than supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nygaard (1974)</td>
<td>Policies revised to include input from parents and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas (1987)</td>
<td>Needs assessment from faculty can be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine (1986)</td>
<td>Focus on three domains: Direction, linkage, procedures evaluated by principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana (1994)</td>
<td>Recommends multiple evaluators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three purposes were identified by Gary Natriello:

- to influence the performance of individuals who will remain in the same positions,
- to guide decisions about the movement of individuals into and out of positions,
- to legitimize the control attempts of the school organizations. (Natriello, 1990, p. 636).

As increased student achievement is sought, there is an emphasis on the evaluation of and improvement of the teaching staff (Darling-Hammond, 1992, p. 8; McGreal, 1986; Duke & Stiggins, 1990, p. 117). Numerous authors have identified characteristics of effective systems for the evaluation of teachers. Systems in which the primary goal is the accountability of teachers for student learning are viewed more negatively than those which have as their primary goal the improvement of teaching staff. Districts which have a match between the expressed purpose of the evaluation system and the procedures that are used create a trust between the supervisor and the
teacher. A separation between administrative and supervisory behavior enables administrators to coach teachers in a manner that will improve instruction throughout the year.

Goal setting between the teacher and supervisor allows a focus for instruction, and that narrowed focus enables the teacher to focus improvements. Narrowing the range of what one is observing increases the reliability of the classroom observation. The use of multiple sources of data also increases the reliability of the information that is gained about a teacher's performance. Developing different requirements for tenured and nontenured teachers is recommended: New teachers should have goals established for them while experienced teachers should work cooperatively with the supervisor to set goals. Staff development should be coupled with the findings of the evaluation system (McGreal, 1982).

Effective teacher evaluation

Another list of characteristics of effective teacher evaluation includes:

- All the participants accept the relationship between what is observed and the results of the observation—the values, goals, and culture of the school and community must support the criteria used in the evaluation system.
- Participants should understand the mechanics of the system—the timelines, the filing, the conferences.
- All the participants should know that the performance criteria have a clear, consistent rationale.
- Involvement of stakeholders in the identification and development of performance criteria generally results in more commitment to the system.
- Evaluators should be trained in the procedural and substantive use of the system.
• There should be a distinguishing between the teachers who need improvement and those who need remediation.

• A distinction between formation and summative evaluation components should also be evident.

• A variety of evaluation methods are used in effective systems which may include clinical supervision, staff development, self-directed development, and administrative monitoring.

• A commitment by the district to evaluation through the time designated for conferencing, for training, for connecting with the district goals evidence a strong system (Conley, 1987; Wise & Darling-Hammond, McLauling, Bernstein, 1984; Dornbusch & Scott, 1975, p. 134; Stiggins & Duke, 1988, p. 89).

An emphasis on the validity, reliability, and job relatedness of the teacher evaluation system can be seen in the system used by Florida in the 1980s (Smith, Peterson, & Micceri, 1987). Linda Darling-Hammond (1988) concurs that there is a need for valid and reliable scoring systems if the information is to be used for high stakes decision-making. Standardized tasks and a careful process of standard setting lends to the credibility of the system (Shinkfield, 1995, p. 302; Holdzkom, 1987; Elliott, 1989, p. 190).

In an effort to improve teacher evaluation, the Supportive Supervision Model has been developed and piloted. The relationship between the evaluator and the teacher becomes one of coach rather than evaluator. The research study focusing on the system discovered that the administrators perceived little or no inconsistency between their behavior and the role they were in as part of the Supportive Supervision Model; however, the teachers perceived that administrators were sending contradictory messages about teachers’ roles within the organization (Poole, 1996).
Personnel evaluation standards

Personnel evaluation standards were developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. They provide guidance for the evaluation systems which are appropriate for the people involved, for the purposes of the system, and for the implementation in the system.

Personnel Evaluation Standards include the following:

- Propriety Standards (to protect those involved in the evaluation system)
- Utility Standards (to guide evaluations so they will be informative, timely, and influential)
- Feasibility Standards (to ensure efficiency, ease of use, adequate funding, and political viability)
- Accuracy Standards (to require that the information is technically defensible and conclusions are logical) (The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation [Stufflebeam, 1988]).

The Standards can be used as a starting point for discussion about the expectations for educator performance. A stakeholders group can use the document to begin the listing of strengths and weaknesses in the current evaluation system (Sanders, 1997, p. 101).

However, the Evaluation Standards have critics. Those who favor postmodernism challenge the standards in their ability to deliver useful answers to evaluation questions. Stufflebeam (1998) finds many similarities between the postmodernist view and the Joint Committee's position: Role of value and bias, social context, political context, mixed methods, and the need for improvement.

The supervisory evaluation of a teacher involves both qualitative and quantitative documentation and decision making. An awareness of the types of information given to students influences the ability of the student to complete the task. Systems which simply quantify the
amount of teacher talk and the amount of student response can miss the information which distinguishes effective teaching from ineffective (Herrmann, 1987; Burgess, 1989, p. 26).

**Development**

Many authors distinguish between the functions of evaluation for skill development and evaluation for employment decisions. The trend toward the distinction and development was identified by Joan Buttram and Bruce Wilson (1987). Attention to a reflective teaching orientation or to specific behaviors thought to represent "effective teaching" are related to the evaluation policy of school staff members. "Is the purpose of the evaluation system to help teachers reflect about their work or to show specific behaviors related to effectiveness?" (Darling-Hammond, 1992, p. 15; Wragg, 1987, p. 3).

The data are simply data unless they are delivered as meaningful feedback. Characteristics that are correlated to the perceived quality and impact of teacher evaluation include the quality of the ideas for improvement, the depth of information, the specificity of information, and account of information, the extent to which the information was descriptive rather than judgmental, the timing of the feedback to promote attention to the message, the extent to which feedback was linked to standards, the frequency of formal feedback, and the frequency of informal feedback (Duke & Stiggins, 1990, p. 117; Stiggins and Duke, 1988, p. 89).

A strong staff-development model is emphasized as an adjunct to teacher evaluation (Tesch, Nyland, & Kernutt, 1987; Brandt, 1987; Thorson, Miller, & Bellon, 1987; Duke & Stiggins, 1990, p. 117). The feedback given the teachers is also necessarily different for those whose skills are being developed as opposed to those whose employment will be determined (Glatthorn & Holler, 1987). A balance between accountability systems and growth systems is recommended by Richard Stiggins (1986). The agreement between the supervisor and the teacher on the
improvement goals which tie to the district goals can allow for staff development and for teacher accountability (George, 1987; Erlandson & Bifano, 1987; Maeroff, 1988, p. 82). Mentoring programs can help teachers improve their performance (Holdzkom, 1987).

Reliance on principal as sole evaluator

Until very recently in the education field, the immediate supervisor was the primary if not the sole evaluator. Relying on the principal as the sole source of information restricts the kind and amount of information that can help create the picture of teacher effectiveness. Teachers who were uncomfortable with their supervisor did not allow them access to help the teacher improve their work. The gatekeeping status of the teacher could undercut the ability of the principal to support the teacher in improvement (Blumberg & Jonas, 1987). Principals are frequently removed from the teaching level (National Study of School Evaluation, 1984).

An empirical study also indicated the fallacy of relying on the principal's sole judgment. Medley and Coker (1987) found a low level of accuracy of the principal's judgment of the performance of the teachers that are supervised. The performance was based on the gains of students on achievement tests. There was no significant difference found in the ability of the principals to identify teacher effectiveness. The least effective predictor for the career ladder placement of teachers in Cave Creek, Arizona was the principal's rating (Manatt & Price, 1991).

A recognition that teachers should be viewed as active constructors of their own knowledge about learning and teaching and that general methods of teaching in addition to content-specific skills should be involved in the evaluation process should result in supervisory processes that are more group-orientated and that involve the supervisor as a coach (Nolan & Francis, 1992).

The effectiveness of the performance evaluation can be enhanced by the teacher delving into the reasons behind behaviors and choices exhibited. The principal should orchestrate the
conference so that the teacher is the primary "talker" rather than the administrator. A search for
the "why" and "how" of the performance must be explored rather than the "what" (Helm, 1997).

The effect of supervision on teacher behavior was also a question Robert Anderson (1988)
pondered. Based on information about how people prefer to work, Anderson proposed that a
coaching team could more realistically help teachers improve their performance. Most adults
prefer to work and learn in a social context, helping work groups function well is an effective,
cost efficient use of manager time, and work cultures are healthy when members value the goals
and work of the organization.

System-wide development of the evaluation procedure with teacher involvement allows the
school goals and individual responsibilities to be merged. Clearly stated goals and system-wide
resources that can be channeled into the evaluation system improve evaluation systems (Stronge,
1997).

Peer review

An evaluation system which matches the concept of education as a profession includes
acknowledgement of team planning, sharing, evaluating work, and learning which may involve
peer review of practice (Darling-Hammond, 1992, p. 15). Peer review is supported by the
acceptance of teaching as a profession. Other professionals use peer review systems to monitor
their membership (Strike, 1990, p. 357; National Study of School Evaluation, 1984). Peers have
an inherent credibility because of the roles they assume. An assessment panel composed of the
teacher, a peer nominated by the teacher, and the principal could provide information to be used
by the teacher for the improvement of job performance (Shinkfield, 1995, p. 302).

A distinction is made between peer review and peer feedback. Peer feedback provides
additional information while peer review provides potential evaluatory information. Concerns
raised about the use of peer feedback include the possibility of a conflict of interests created by providing information about another staff member. A second concern is teaching peers may have little direct knowledge of their colleagues' work. Guidelines to guard against the misuse of the peer information are as follows: Use only factual data, repeated use of surveys will build the reliability, confidentiality must be guarded, and sample procedures should be used to ensure adequate information (Strong & Ostrander, p. 153–154).

A system of peer review was a plank in the proposal to join the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. Both organizations viewed peer review as "Far superior to 'dipstick' evaluations conducted by harried principals" (Grossman, 1998). Peer review allows other teachers to observe classroom teachers and make recommendations for improvement (Bradley, 1998).

However, peer review is viewed as a bad idea by Myron Liberman (1999). Liberman contends that peer review undermines the role of the principal as an informer and motivator of teachers. He also views the role of teachers potentially "counseling out" other teachers as being awkward.

On the Iowa State University campus, post-tenure peer review met with opposition as being too time consuming and unnecessary. A dissenter on the faculty senate believed the concept of peer review to be for the benefit of the administration rather than for the benefit of the professors (Cain, 1999). However, the peer review was adopted by the faculty senate during the 1998–99 school term (Poston, 1999).

Peer coaching has been accepted for use in the San Diego school system. The peer coaching is an effort to involve teachers in assisting other teachers to improve instruction. However, the union is concerned that the teachers "would be viewed as evaluators and critics." The board approved the peer coaching plan in a 3–2 vote (Keller, 1999).
Student input

Student input into the evaluation of teachers has been considered by various researchers. One study indicated that student feedback led to positive change from the staff member, whereas supervisor feedback led to negative or no change (Tuckman & Oliver, 1967). As students understand the content of the class, they can become able to perceive differences between teachers. Students are more reliable evaluators of teachers when they understand the content (Shepherd & Trank, 1989). The multidimensional student evaluations of university students were more consistent for general characteristics of effectiveness than for diagnostic information to be used for improvement. The recommendation was that student information be used for formative rather than for summative evaluation (Marsh & Bailey, 1993). Extremely young children also could reliably respond to an instrument to measure teacher effectiveness. However, the preschool children were more negative about their teacher than were the kindergarten and first grade students (Driscoll, Peterson, Browning, & Stevens, 1990). Surveys can be designed for teachers to gain information from students to be used in the improvement of instruction (Bailey, 1983, p. 6).

Students are accurate in their assessment of the teachers' effectiveness. There is a high positive correlation between student evaluation of teacher performance and student achievement in reading, mathematics, and language arts. In fact, in a comparison study by Wilkerson, the best predictor of student achievement was the student ratings of teacher effectiveness rather than the principal's evaluation or the teacher's self-ratings (Wilkerson, 1997).

Another study found that multiple evaluations and consultations with students improved the ratings the students gave the teachers. It appeared that the individual conferencing enabled the students to gain better comprehension of the course concepts (Griffin & Pool, 1998).
Further work by Strasser (1999) examined the variability to students who were able to rate teacher effectiveness as related to student achievement. Gender did not affect the ratings, nor did the inclusion of special education students in the rating system. There was not a significant difference based on the honor roll students enrollment nor those from low socioeconomic homes. Attendance also did not affect the accuracy of the student ratings.

Student achievement is being considered in Dallas as a way to identify teachers who need staff development. Students who had the most effective teachers scored the highest on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Teacher Magazine, 1998). One recommendation is that teachers decide if the student ratings are shared with their supervisors. The information could be used solely by the teacher as a means to identify strengths and weaknesses (Stronge & Ostrander, pp. 145–149).

Self-evaluations

Self-evaluations and supervisor evaluations were studied in Mississippi. Teachers rated themselves higher on teaching plans and materials, but there was no difference between the self-ratings and the supervisor ratings for the interpersonal skills and position skills (teaching attributes). Black teachers were rated lower than were the white teachers, and they rated themselves only slightly lower than did the white teachers. Females rated higher on both self-evaluations and supervisor evaluations than did males, and teachers in grades K–3 and 9–12 rated themselves higher than did their supervisors (Tisdale, 1996).

Multiple data sets

Multiple data sets (self-evaluation, student ratings, peer ratings, student achievement, and supervisor ratings) are recommended in the evaluation of teachers (Furtwengler, 1987; Stiggins, 1986; Harris, 1987; Stiggins & Duke, 1988, p. 7). In Cave Creek, Arizona, the best predictor of
career ladder placement was the student ratings, followed by peer ratings, student achievement, and growth plan accomplishment (Manatt & Price, 1994). Feedback from students was more likely to bring about lasting change if it was accompanied by feedback from other sources (Seyfarth & Nowinski, 1987). A blend of assessment methods which may include written examinations of knowledge and reasoning, performance assessments, observations of teaching, reflective portfolios which include documentation of student work, and other artifacts is recommended by Lee Shulman (1988) and James Nolan and Pam Francis (1992, p. 50).

An appraisal project which includes feedback for teachers from students, for principals from teachers, for superintendents from principals has been used in school systems in Iowa and Minnesota (Manatt, 1987). When multiple data sources are used, William Mehrens (1990) suggests that if the purpose is for development of job skills, the data should be presented from each source as raw data. In the event that the data are to be used for evaluation decisions, they will need to be combined in some fashion.

Multiple data sets can be individualized for each teacher to meet the information needs of the individual. Variable data sets have been found to be technically defensible (Peterson, Stevens, & Ponzio, 1998).

However, the use of multiple information sources is challenged by Andrews and Knight (1987) because they believe the student, peer, or self-evaluation cannot be used to make the firing decisions needed to stimulate staff improvement. Simply having more data does not always result in better decisions. If the information gathered is redundant or not delivered to the employee in a manner to influence behavior, it may simply be an added expense (Mehrens, 1990).

Multiple data sets or 360° Feedback can also be used in teacher evaluations. The broadening of data collection sources emphasizes validity, reliability, and discrimination (National Education Policy Network, 1997).
Findings on the evaluation of teachers are summarized in Table 8. Many authors have written about the evaluation of teachers. Information for the sake of growth and for performance appraisal are two reasons cited for teacher evaluation.

**Performance Appraisal**

Performance appraisal systems are the foundation on which 360° Feedback has been based. The performance appraisal system was the focus of improvement during the 1980s. Attention to the process dominated the research literature. The process view of performance appraisal has created a heightened awareness of the importance of observation and the need to ensure a systematic sampling of information. Another discovery is that the rater did not just report what was observed, but evaluation did occur. Based on what was considered as positive or negative, the observation was viewed through definite lenses and what was reported was colored by the viewpoint. There is also a need to use past performance appraisals very judiciously. Past appraisals were created with specific criteria as the standard, and the relevance to the criteria which may be currently used is limited (Ilgen, Barnes-Farrell, & McKellin, 1993).

Performance appraisals were typically done by the supervisor with the information shared with the employee. As companies have sought to improve, many have begun to seek information from customers. Total Quality concepts have been implemented of which teamwork is a major component. Supervisor-only performance appraisals have been criticized for the following: Undermining teamwork, for seeking only personal gain or improvement, for increasing the variability in the system, for using a measurement system that is unreliable and inconsistent, for not encouraging a problem-solving approach, for not establishing safe goals, for creating losers, and is inadequate to accomplish determination of pay, promotion, feedback, and goal-setting (Scholtes, 1993).
Table 8. Summary of the findings on teacher evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher evaluation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiggins &amp; Duke</td>
<td>Majority of districts look to teacher evaluation to improve teaching performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGreal</td>
<td>Staff development is sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesch, Nyland, &amp; Kernutt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorson, Miller, &amp; Bellon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke &amp; Stiggins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Darling-Hammond</td>
<td>Need valid and reliable scoring systems if used for high stakes decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinkfield, Holdzkom, Elliott</td>
<td>Standardized tasks and standard setting lends credibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrmann, Burgess</td>
<td>Measuring only teacher and student talk misses important information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glatthom &amp; Holler</td>
<td>Feedback different for development than for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiggins</td>
<td>Need balance between information for growth and for evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdzkom</td>
<td>Mentoring can help teachers improve performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal-only evaluation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumberg &amp; Jonas</td>
<td>Teachers are gatekeepers of what principal sees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medley &amp; Coker</td>
<td>Low level of accuracy of principal judgment of teacher performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatt &amp; Benway</td>
<td>Least effective predictor for career ladder placement was principal.  Adam  西</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuckman &amp; Oliver</td>
<td>Supervisor feedback resulted in negative or no change; student feedback resulted in positive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd &amp; Trank</td>
<td>As students understand content, they are more reliable predictors of effective teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh &amp; Bailey</td>
<td>Student input should be used for formative rather than summative evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driscoll, Peterson, Browning, &amp; Stevens</td>
<td>Preschool children more negative about teachers than kindergarten and first grade students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance appraisals are intended to produce an accurate, unbiased, and reliable appraisal of individual behavior and performance in organizations. Performance appraisal documents developed through careful analysis of job traits are legally defensible (Feild & Holley, 1982). As companies develop performance appraisal systems, certain factors are upheld in the court systems. These elements include: Appraisal of job performance must be based on the analysis of job requirements which are reflected in performance standards. Performance standards need to be communicated with and understood by the employees. Clearly defined individual components should be rated rather than global measures of job performance, and the performance should be behaviorally based so observable evidence can be documented. Abstract trait names, such as loyalty and honest, would be avoided unless they can be defined in observable behaviors. "Rating scale anchors should be brief and local, and when used for employment decisions, the system must be validated, psychometrically sound, and raters must be reliable" (Cascio & Bernardin, 1981). The system should also provide a mechanism for appeal if the employee disagrees with the supervisor's appraisal (Rausch, 1985, p. 233).

Surveys taken at General Electric indicated that performance appraisals should help managers know where they stand and what can be done to improve their performance. However, few examples exist at General Electric where significant improvement could be connected to performance appraisal interviews with a supervisor. Recommendations to improve the performance appraisal system included that coaching should be a day-to-day, not a once-a-year activity because employees are given less information at a time and are better able to use the information; goal setting, not criticism, should be used to improve performance; and separate appraisals should be held for different purposes. A supervisor coaching for improvement should be involved in a different appraisal than the evaluation appraisal for salary action. The comprehensive annual performance appraisals as were in existence at General Electric were of
questionable value because they did not lead to job performance improvement (Meyer, Kay, & French, n.d.).

Process for performance appraisal

Focusing on the process of performance appraisal, Daniel Ilgen and Jack Feldman (1983) found similar results. Separation of feedback and rewards is recommended because the advice seems faulty when rewards are being considered. Accuracy is needed for effective appraisal, and with the reliance on one evaluator, central tendency, leniency, and the halo effect were concerns. A separation of description of behaviors and of evaluation helps create the accuracy of the appraisal. Once a supervisor had been involved in an evaluation, it was difficult to create unbiased descriptions of behavior. Improvements of the performance appraisal system would include the design of the appraisal instrument and procedures for its use to accurately reflect what is being evaluated and to reduce bias, training of appraisers to create more equity in the evaluation, and the engineering of work settings to enhance the possibilities for accurate appraisals.

Effectively providing feedback from multiple sources should enable the employee to improve job performance. Table 9 summarizes the research about performance appraisals. Performance appraisals are the basis for the current work on multi-source feedback.

Video-based Instruction Album

The delivery system for the 360° Feedback instruction is a video-based album. The intent is that the materials can be viewed and read, and that the procedure can be replicated in a K-12 school district. The videotape is an effective means by which to demonstrate an action; however, supplemental materials must accompany it (Romiszowski, 1986, p. 162). The package reaches the
Table 9. Summary of findings on performance appraisals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilgen, Barnes-Farrell, &amp; McKellin</td>
<td>Past appraisals have little relevance to current criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholtes</td>
<td>Current supervisor-only appraisal criticized for undermining teamwork, seeking only personal gain, increasing variability in system, being unreliable and inconsistent, not encouraging problem solving, not establishing safe goals, creating losers, and inadequate to determine pay, promotion, feedback, and goal-setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascio &amp; Bernardin</td>
<td>Rating scale anchors should be brief, psychometrically sound, and raters reliable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rausch</td>
<td>Must have an appeal mechanism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
instruction, and conventional lecture and questioning for nonformal adult groups (Hamilton, 1986, p. 59).

Summary

Multi-rater systems provide more data than traditional supervisor-only evaluation systems on which to base performance improvement. The use of information provided by various groups would allow the school administrator a clearer picture of their job performance and allow improvement based on the information.
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

During the 1998–99 school year, Dr. Arlis Swartzendruber, Superintendent for Waterloo School District in Waterloo, Iowa, contacted Professor Richard Manatt and the School Improvement Model (SIM) team from Iowa State University regarding the development of a 360° Feedback performance appraisal system.

Development of a Multi-source Feedback System

The following research questions provided direction for this study:

1. Is it possible to develop a multi-source feedback system that will meet the needs of the board and the administration of a K–12 school district?

After agreeing to procedures, timelines, and financial obligations for the project, the Board of Directors of the Waterloo School District issued a contract to Professor Manatt and the SIM team for their professional assistance with the development and implementation of a 360° Feedback performance appraisal system. The procedures and data became the basis for this dissertation. They are detailed in a later portion of the chapter.

2. Is it possible to develop a multi-source implementation procedure that will meet the needs of the supervisors and of the administrators receiving the feedback?

The project consisted of three phases. Feedback instruments were developed, and the results were shared with the board and the superintendent. During the second phase, the model was replicated with the central office and building administrators, and shared with the participants. During the third phase, it is planned that the 360° Feedback system will be used at all levels of the organization. The plan can be seen in Table 10.
## Table 10. Schedule of events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of days</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Topic/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Feb. 1998</td>
<td>Administration Evaluation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation for central office building administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Feb. 1998</td>
<td>Develop 3-phase proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>March 1998</td>
<td>Draft feedback instrument for superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>March/April 1998</td>
<td>Feedback input from participants (superintendent and self-selected central office administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>May 1998</td>
<td>Meet with board and superintendent (feedback results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>May/August 1998</td>
<td>Progress report and planning meeting, Administration Evaluation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>May/August 1998</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Sept./Oct./Nov. 1998</td>
<td>Inservice (central and building administration, self-selected teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>Prepare all feedback materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Jan./Feb. 1999</td>
<td>Facilitate feedback process (all participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Jan./Feb. 1999</td>
<td>Prepare feedback reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>March/April 1999</td>
<td>Meetings with all levels (feedback results)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>May 1999</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Topic/Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>May/August 1999</td>
<td>Prepare handbooks and instruments for district operation of system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Sept./Oct. 1999</td>
<td>Training of 360° Cadre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Jan./Feb. 2000</td>
<td>Feedback process with district leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Feb./March 2000</td>
<td>Prepare reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>March/April 2000</td>
<td>Facilitate use of reports (feedback to all levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>May 2000</td>
<td>Final report to board and administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating administrators identified the number of persons and at which position they wished to survey. The central staff sent the correct number of surveys in manila envelopes with a cover letter. The envelopes were addressed with a mailing label to be returned to the associate superintendent. The participating administrators then sent the survey envelopes to the staff members to complete. Table 11 indicates the number for each position that was designated to receive a survey.

3. Is it possible to develop a survey instrument for each identified administrative position that can be used with each administrator of a K-12 school district that will include district generic criteria as well as job-specific criteria for each position?

Year one, 1998–99

Phase I began with an orientation meeting provided by Professor Richard P. Manatt and a research associate. The district employees involved in the project met with Professor Manatt and determined the items to be included in the feedback surveys. Involved during this phase were the superintendent, the associate superintendent for educational services, the director of operational services, the director of board and community relations, the director of volunteer services, and a secondary principal. Surveys were distributed to constituents selected by the administrators and were returned to the SIM office for tabulating. Table 12 contains a list of those who participated in the project.

4. Is it possible to aggregate and disaggregate the feedback results to share in a meaningful way with the administrator being evaluated?

The surveys were aggregated for each participant and each position. The results for all the secondary principals and elementary principals were tallied and reported as a composite. For each participating administrator, the results were tallied based on the reporting group. A range, a
Table 11. 360° Feedback distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Supt.</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Building principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Support staff</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Parent/ community</th>
<th>Special needs</th>
<th>Service staff</th>
<th>Non-des.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Supt.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of School Community Relations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Operations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Volunteers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Needs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Financial Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Supt. for Human Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Serv.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Serv.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Prin.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Prin.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Prin.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Participation in 360° Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1998–99</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Superintendent for Educational Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Operational Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Board and Community Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Volunteer Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of Financial Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Superintendent for Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean, and the standard deviation for each survey question were reported. The tabulated results were shared by Professor Manatt during individual conferences with each administrator during the spring of 1999.

5. Is it possible to develop plans for improvement based on the feedback?

Each administrator identified areas of strength and developed an action plan for professional growth. The action plan included specific goals for improvement which developed from answering the following questions:

- What can help him or her to improve?
- How can his or her strengths be used?
- Who will hold him or her responsible?
- How will progress be measured?
- When will the plan be completed?
Year two, 1998–99

The original group of administrators once again received feedback on their work via surveys, and the procedure was refined. The results of the surveys were aggregated and disaggregated by job type. The following were used to disaggregate the information: Principals, parents, and supervisor. The feedback was shared in print with the participating administrator and with the administrator's supervisor.

A second group of employees was added to the 360° Feedback performance appraisal project. The associate superintendent for human services, the executive director of financial services, the director of staff services, the director of student services, the director of special education programming, the director of curriculum, a high school principal, and an elementary teacher were involved. They too met with Professor Manatt to determine items for the feedback survey (see Appendix A for feedback survey). It was distributed by the central office to the selected constituents, and the results were compiled by the SIM office. In June 1999 Dr. Manatt met with each participating staff member and shared the disaggregated results of the feedback surveys. Each staff member was coached through the selection of and development of a performance skill to be improved.

Process Surveys

6. Is it possible to identify survey criteria that will meet the needs of the administrators?

During year two this researcher joined the project. Surveys to document the perception of the participants concerning traditional evaluation systems and the multi-source feedback system were developed and distributed to the Waterloo personnel who had been involved in the 360° Feedback performance appraisal project. Criteria included the promotion of sound education principles, information provided by knowledgeable personnel, useful reports/feedback, and
enhanced information. Personnel who had experienced the feedback conference provided their perceptions of the effectiveness of the 360° Feedback in addition to the traditional supervisor-only evaluation. Those who had not been involved in the feedback conference up to that point provided perceptual information about the effectiveness of the supervisor-only evaluation.

The survey was based conceptually on the Personnel Evaluation Standards developed by the National Study of School Evaluation (1984). Members of the dissertation seminar course also provided input into the survey.

Survey categories included promotion of sound education principles, information provided by knowledgeable personnel, useful reports/feedback, and comments.

Data Treatment

The surveys were coded so that a comparison could be made between the subject's perception of the district's traditional evaluation system and the 360° Feedback system. Frequencies were run on the data for each stem to determine the number of times respondents indicated "disagree" or "agree." A paired t-test was then used to determine difference, significance, mean, standard deviation, and standard error of the mean. Such descriptive statistics are mathematical techniques for organizing and summarizing a set of numerical data. The frequency accounts for the number of responses for each individual item. The mean is a measure of central tendency which is arrived at by adding all the scores for the response and dividing by the total number. In this case, there were four choices with the "strongly agree" valued as a 4; the "agree" valued as a 3; the "disagree" valued as a 2; and the "strongly disagree" valued as a 1. "No opinion" was valued as a 0. The standard deviation indicates the extent to which the scores deviate from the mean (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).
A Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was used to determine a z score and significance level for each response. The test is commonly used in designs that involve matched pairs of subjects or pre-posttests. It is a nonparametric analog of two-sample case with dependent samples for ordinal data (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1994, p. 567). The test statistic is computed as follows:

- Determine the difference between the pretest and the posttest.
- Rank the absolute differences. If the pretest is larger than the posttest score the sign is positive.
- Sum the ranks with the less frequent sign.

**Video-based Learning Album**

7. Is it possible to develop a script for a training video complete with user's manual, sample surveys, and recommended feedback practice?

The video-based learning album was created based on information related to the researcher by those involved in the development of the 360° performance appraisal systems with the SIM office. Materials developed by school districts through work with the SIM office became sample materials for the support of the instruction. Included are samples of surveys to provide feedback to teachers from teachers, to teachers from parents, to principals, to district administrations, to building administrators, to secretaries, to bus drivers, to instructional aides, to associate superintendents, and to superintendents. There are also surveys to be used as self feedback to teachers, letters to respondents, School Improvement Inventory scan form, and a news release. The documents were developed and used by the following school districts: West Des Moines (IA); Waterloo (IA); Camp Verde (AZ); and Riverhead (NY). Permission was granted by the
districts for the materials to be included in the learning album. Personal observations of the researcher during the feedback conference were also used.

The videotape production was done by Iowa State University students and the roleplays were performed by doctoral candidates in the Educational Leadership and Policy Development program.

Summary

A 360° Feedback system was developed and implemented by the administrators of the Waterloo (IA) School District. Surveys were designed, respondents selected and surveyed, and the results compiled. The data were aggregated by the position of the participant and disaggregated by the positions of the respondents. Feedback conferences were held with each participating administrator. At the conclusion, the administrators provided suggestions for improving the 360° Feedback system.

Perceptual data were collected from each of the participants to determine their reactions to both the traditional supervisor-only feedback system and the multi-source feedback system. The data were studied as descriptives, as a paired-t test, and as a Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test.

A video-based learning album was developed and reviewed by the administrators in the Waterloo School District.
CHAPTER IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS

A 360° Feedback system for use by administrators in a K-12 school district was developed, implemented, and tested. A video-based training album was also developed as a result of this project involving Waterloo Community Schools.

The two problems of this study were to develop, implement, test, and improve a procedure for 360° Feedback to be used by central office and building administrators and to develop a video-based learning album which would allow districts to replicate the procedure.

Development of Multi-source Feedback System

Is it possible to develop a multi-source feedback system that will meet the needs of the board and the administration of a K-12 school district?

Objective 1

_Determine the functions of the performance evaluation system for the administrators in a K-12 school system._

Members of the SIM office met with Dr. Arlis Swartzendruber, superintendent of the Waterloo School District, and identified project outcomes for the 360° Feedback Project.

The following Project Outcomes were identified for the Waterloo School District feedback process:

1. Valid, reliable, and legally discriminating performance evaluation. Employees will know that their evaluations are truthful, fair, and have the power to sort out superior performance from average to subpar.
2. Accurate information will be generated for promotion, tenure, transfer, and termination decisions.

3. Accountability will be improved. Development of the new system will follow the strategic goals of the district.

4. Decision-making skills will be enhanced for board members, administrators, and staff.

5. A more accurate data base will be provided for planning, compensation, and staff development.

6. The personnel evaluation system will meet the requirements of the Iowa State Law.

The system which was developed meets the objectives and is in use in the Waterloo, Iowa School District.

Objective 2

*Identify job titles for all central office and building administrators in the K-12 system.*

Job titles were identified for 11 administrators who participated in the study. The titles were assigned codes which were used on the survey documents:

- (01) Superintendent Council
- (02) Education Service Center Non-administrative Staff
- (03) Building Principal
- (04) Teacher
- (05) Support Staff
- (06) Student
- (07) Parent/Community Member
- (08) Special Needs Advisory Council
- (09) Service Area Staff (maintenance, food service, transportation)

Objective 3

*Incorporate generic criteria and job-specific responsibilities into job descriptions for all administrative positions in a K-12 school system.*
All administrative personnel in Waterloo Community School District were asked to time-log one month of their contract year. Time-logging is a systems-analysis technique pioneered by the School Improvement Model Project Office at ISU's College of Education. During the months selected, all job-related activities performed by each administrator were logged using 20-minute intervals. A "starter" list of possible activities was provided by the SIM consultants so that several participants with the same job title would provide comparable data.

After all time-logging was completed and data were analyzed and tabled, each participant was interviewed by a SIM team member. The interviewer sought clarification of activities identified by time-logging, identification of critical work activities performed during the 11 months not included in the time-logging, and suggestions for updating the job descriptions.

Using this information, the SIM consultants created a custom-tailored evaluation instrument for each administrative position and each administrative employee.

The job-specific behaviors were written as criteria and added to the generic criteria for all administrative employees. Generic criteria had been drafted by the Stakeholders Committee (Design Team). Examples of generic criteria include:

Criterion #1: Acts in accordance with district policy/procedures and state/federal regulations.

Criterion #2: Discharges responsibility for selection, orientation, transfer, retention or dismissal of district employees.

Criterion #3: Develops and administers budget in area of responsibility.

Criterion #4: Maintains and submits accurate and timely records and reports.

Criterion #5: Establishes and implements district, building, and/or program goals.

Criterion #6: Evaluates the programs for which he/she is responsible.
Criterion #7: Evaluates and conducts performance improvement activities for all personnel for whom he/she has responsibility.

Criterion #8: Promotes the programs of the district by encouraging a free flow of comments and effectively communicating with staff, students, parents, and community.

Generic criteria typically provide good sources for feedback items to be included in the 360° survey instrument. Each survey instrument also included some items that are unique to the job, e.g., principal, director, deputy superintendent.

Is it possible to develop a multi-source implementation procedure that will meet the needs of the supervisors and of the administrators receiving the feedback?

Objective 4

Identify the number and position of feedback sources for each administrator.

The School Improvement Model (SIM) office identified the number and position of feedback sources. SIM distributed the surveys, tabulated the data, aggregated the data, and disaggregated the data. The participants indicated which positions they wished to receive feedback from during the survey. Table 13 represents the number of survey responses received by each participant from each position code.

Position of Survey Responses Received

Is it possible to develop a survey instrument for each identified administrative position that can be used with each administrator of a K–12 school district that will include district generic criteria as well as job-specific criteria for each position?
Table 13. Position and number of survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Supt. Council</th>
<th>Education Service Center</th>
<th>Non-admin. staff</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Support staff</th>
<th>Parent community member</th>
<th>Special Needs Advisory Council</th>
<th>Service area staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Supt.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Board and Comm. Relations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Operational Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Volunteer Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Director of Financial Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Supt. of Human Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 5

*Design a survey instrument consistent with the job description and the district's administrative philosophy for each in a K-12 school system.*

The School Improvement Model (SIM) office designed the instruments for each participant based on the information provided during interviews. The instruments had 11–22 questions depending upon the position. The respondents indicated the following responses about the work matching the criteria of each participant: "always", "to a great extent," "to some extent," "not at all," and "do not know/not applicable." (See Appendix C for the survey instruments.)

Pilot Test of Multi-source Feedback System

Is it possible to aggregate and disaggregate the feedback results to share in a meaningful way with the administrator being evaluated?

Objective 6

*Pilot a multi-source feedback system with administrators in a K-12 school district.*

The multi-source feedback system was piloted with administrators in the Waterloo Community School District. The pilot occurred over a three-year period. The first year the feedback data were shared only with the participant. The second year the feedback data were shared with the participant and their immediate supervisor.

Is it possible to develop plans for improvement based on the feedback?
Objective 7

*Aggregate and disaggregate the data for feedback to the participants.*

The SIM office tabulated the results of the feedback surveys. The data were aggregated for all employees in the identified position. It was disaggregated by the position of employee who responded to the survey.

Objective 8

*Conference with each participating administrator.*

Professor Manatt shared with each participating administrator the results of the survey. In individual conferences, the administrator reviewed the aggregate score of the position and the disaggregate scores of responses of personnel by their employment code. Each participant identified areas of strength and areas of weaknesses. An improvement goal was then specified.

Meeting the Needs of the Employees

Is it possible to identify job-specific criteria for each central office and building administrative position that will meet the needs of each employee working in that position?

Objective 9

*Identify a set of building administrators who have not used 360° Feedback and a set of building administrators who have used 360° Feedback.*

Five administrators, group A, participated in the 360° Feedback pilot during the 1998–99 school year. They initially served as the experimental group. The seven administrators who had not participated in the multi-source feedback, group B, served as the control group and provided perceptions of the traditional evaluation system. After they experienced the 360° Feedback
process, the second group responded with their perceptions of the 360° Feedback as well. Table 14 identifies the groupings of administrators.

Objective 10

*Design and use a survey to evaluate 360° Feedback to traditional supervisor-only feedback.*

The survey consisted of 17 questions positioned under four headings:

- Promotion of sound education principles
- Information provided by knowledgeable personnel
- Useful reports/feedback
- Enhanced information.

The survey allowed four responses: 4 = strongly agree, 3 = agree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. (See Appendix C for the survey instruments.)

Fifteen participants completed both instruments. Group A completed the survey in February 1999. Group B completed the survey about traditional supervisor-only evaluation in February 1999 and completed the section about 360° Feedback during June 1999. The mean of each of the questions on "traditional evaluation promoting sound education principles" ranged from 2.57-2.73. For the administrators who completed the survey, the response was between "disagree" and "agree." Table 15 details the results of the surveys on the traditional supervisor-only evaluation promotion of sound education principles.

The survey results for the 360° Feedback criterion of the "promotion of sound education principles" were more positive. The response range is from "agree" to "strongly agree" or 3.21 to 3.66 on a 4.0 scale. Therefore, one can conclude that the 360° Feedback is perceived to promote sound educational principles better than the traditional supervisor-only evaluation feedback. Table 16 presents the frequency distribution, the mean, and the standard deviation for the 360° data.
Table 14. Administrator groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlis Swartzendruber, Superintendent</td>
<td>Peggy Wainwright, Curriculum Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Van Pelt, Associate Superintendent</td>
<td>Patrick Clancy, Director of Special Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Fitzgerald, Director of Operational Services</td>
<td>Greg Schmitz, Executive Director of Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Miller, Director of Board and Community Services</td>
<td>Mary Meir, Secondary Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Temeyer, Director of Volunteer Services</td>
<td>Sharon Droste, Director of Staff Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Moon, Secondary Principal</td>
<td>Bernard Cooper, Director of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bev Smith, Associate Superintendent of Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. Frequency distribution of traditional evaluation perceptions: Promotion of sound education principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The traditional evaluation system provides:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Feedback on the fulfillment of the institutional mission</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Frequency distribution of 360° Feedback perceptions: Promotion of sound education principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The 360° Feedback system provides:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Feedback on the fulfillment of the institutional mission</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the 360° Feedback, the responses ranged from 3.21-3.66. This indicates that participants "agreed" to "strongly agreed" that the feedback from 360° Feedback promoted strong education principles. For both the traditional evaluation and the 360° Feedback, the lowest score was on the "promotion of sound educational principles," the median score was on the "fulfillment of educational mission," and the highest score was for "feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities."

The second section of the survey focused on "information being provided by knowledgeable personnel" through the evaluation/feedback system. Table 17 identifies the frequencies, the mean, and the standard deviation for the perceptions concerning traditional supervisor-only evaluation meeting the criteria of delivery by knowledgeable personnel. The responses are "disagree" or "agree." Once again, for the traditional feedback system, no respondent indicated that she or he "strongly agreed" that the information was provided by people knowledgeable with the work.

The range was between 2.73 and 2.66 which indicates that the respondents perceived the traditional feedback between "disagree" and "agree" that the information is provided by knowledgeable personnel.

Table 18 presents the information for the multi-source feedback. The responses range from 3.30-3.33 which indicates that the participants "agreed" to "strongly agreed" that the 360° Feedback was delivered by knowledgeable personnel. Respondents perceived that feedback was provided by knowledgeable personnel during the 360° system. Once again, the traditional supervisor-only evaluation feedback produced responses of "disagree" and "agree" as compared to the responses produced by the 360° Feedback which was denoted as "agree" to "strongly agree."
Table 17. Frequency distribution of traditional evaluation perceptions: Information provided by knowledgeable personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Feedback is provided by personnel with the:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Knowledge to identify strengths and concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Feedback is provided on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Frequency distribution of 360° Feedback perceptions: Information provided by knowledgeable personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Feedback is provided by personnel with the:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Feedback is provided on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another criterion that both systems were gauged on is the ability to provide useful reports. Tables 19 and 20 show the results for the traditional system and for the 360° Feedback system. For the traditional supervisor-only evaluation criterion, "reports are practical," one person responded with "strongly disagree." The same response is also seen for the item "strengths and weaknesses are identified." However, no such negative perception is recorded for the 360° Feedback. The 360° Feedback is perceived by the survey respondents to provide practical reports while the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system does not.

Inspection of Table 20 indicates that participants perceive the 360° Feedback to provide useful reports, to identify strengths as well as weaknesses, and to match the job responsibilities. For the criterion of "practice," two people selected "disagree." On each of the other criterions, respondents selected "agree" or "strongly disagree." Once again, the 360° Feedback was perceived to provide more useful reports than the traditional supervisor-only evaluation feedback.

**Summary Results of Perception Surveys**

The perceptions of the traditional supervisor-only evaluation feedback indicate that some of the personnel perceive that the system does not meet the stated criteria. For each of the eight items, "disagree" or "strongly disagree" was selected by respondents. However, for the 360° Feedback, only one of the eight items had a response of "disagree" with the criteria. Based on the results, the 360° Feedback was perceived to better meet the stated criteria. The multi-source feedback was also perceived to enhance the traditional system.

**T-test Results**

Based on the t-test, the supervisor-only evaluation and the 360° Feedback were positively related on only one criterion: "fulfill mission." The predictability of the response concerning
Table 19. Frequency distribution of traditional evaluation perceptions: Useful reports/feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. With the traditional evaluation system:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reports are practical for the improvement of job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strengths as well as weaknesses are identified</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20. Frequency distribution of 360° Feedback perceptions: Useful reports/feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Reports are practical for the improvement of job performance</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strengths as well as weaknesses are identified</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the 360° Feedback from the supervisor-only evaluation was only true with the "fulfillment of mission" criterion. On the other seven criteria, a relationship which showed differentiation between the two systems was noted. The difference was significant for each of the items. Four criteria were significant to the .01 level, and two were significant to the .05 level. Table 21 presents the difference and significance of each of the questions.

**Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test**

The Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test also indicated results which are greater than would occur by chance. The 360° Feedback was perceived to be significant to the .05 level for each criterion with the exception of the practicality of the reports. The Wilcoxin Test identified the difference between the perceptions of the 360° Feedback as compared to the traditional supervisor-only evaluation feedback.

The difference in each of the ranks is negative which indicates that the posttest score, or in this case the 360° Feedback, is ranked higher than the supervisor-only feedback for each survey item.

Each test is significant to the .05 level. In other words, the results are not just due to chance at that level. One can infer that the 360° Feedback is ranked higher for each of the criteria than the traditional supervisor-only evaluation feedback.

The rankings from greatest to least for the difference between 360° Feedback and the Traditional Supervisor-only Feedback are as follows:

1. Strengths and weaknesses are identified.
2. Feedback on effective job responsibilities.
3. Instrument matches responsibilities.
Table 21. T-test for paired samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>2-tail significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feedback on promotion of sound educational principles</td>
<td>-.693</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feedback on fulfillment of educational mission</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feedback delivered by knowledgeable personnel</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feedback by knowledgeable personnel about job performance</td>
<td>-.400</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reports are practical</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strengths and weaknesses are identified</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instrument matches responsibilities</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.
4. Feedback delivered by knowledgeable personnel and fulfillment of educational mission.

5. Knowledgeable personnel provided information on job performance.

6. Feedback provided on promotion of sound education principles.

7. Reports are practical.

Table 22 shows the results of the Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test.

Objective 11

*Survey the subjects for their satisfaction with the multi-source feedback.*

The survey collected the perceptions of the 360° Feedback and the perceptions of the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system. The final survey question required respondents to provide their perception of the 360° Feedback as an enhancement to the traditional supervisor-only evaluation feedback. Ten of the respondents "strongly agreed," and five of the respondents "agreed." The participants perceived that the 360° Feedback enhanced the evaluation system.

Table 23 shows the number of responses.

Objective 12

Revise the multi-source feedback system of a K-12 school district based on the feedback of the employees.

The administrators involved in the project made the following recommendations to improve the process: 1) combine the surveys for the elementary and secondary principals so that only one survey is used for both positions and 2) clarify the procedures for returning the surveys. A design team met on Monday, November 29, 1999. Based on the surveys previously used to gather information, three areas were identified as subheadings: personal attributes, curriculum/instruction, leadership of the school organization. The group brainstormed items that could be used under each heading.
Table 22. Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean rank (traditional/360°)</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Feedback on promotion of sound educational principles</td>
<td>.00 / 3.00</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Feedback of fulfillment of institutional mission</td>
<td>.00 / 4.50</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities</td>
<td>5.50 / 7.13</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feedback delivered by knowledgeable personnel</td>
<td>.00 / 4.50</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Knowledgeable personnel provided information on job performance</td>
<td>.00 / 4.00</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reports are practical</td>
<td>5.50 / 6.11</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strengths and weaknesses are identified</td>
<td>.00 / 6.50</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instrument matches responsibilities</td>
<td>.00 / 5.00</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 23. Frequency distribution for perceptions of enhancement of the traditional supervisor-only evaluation feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In small groups, specific items were generated to complete the survey. The survey which will be used to gather feedback for the elementary and secondary principals will be shared with the design team and with the remaining principals for approval before distribution in January.

The distribution system also will be different during the third phase of the project. Many survey packets were returned unopened to the associate superintendent. During the next phase, a label attached to the envelope will state "After completing survey, return to (secretary's name)." The label will be affixed in the right corner rather than in the center of the envelope. The associate superintendent for instruction plans to meet with the principal group to explain the procedure and the importance of distributing and completing the surveys. In turn, the principals will share with their constituents the importance of returning the surveys.

**Video-based Learning Album**

Is it possible to develop a script for training video complete with user's manual, sample surveys, and recommended feedback practices?

**Objective 13**

*Develop a script/notebook that would subsequently be incorporated into a video-based instructional package for use by administrators installing a multi-source feedback system.*

The script has been developed into a draft-version videotape, and the materials are collected into a learning album to accompany the video package. The script underwent many versions as members of the dissertation seminar provided input and editing.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Multi-source feedback, 360° Feedback, is a successful practice in the business world. Traditionally, in education, feedback has been a function of the supervisor-only evaluation systems. Broadening the feedback to include various constituencies strengthens the feedback which is provided for administrators in K–12 school systems.

Summary

Development of multi-source feedback system

The following italicized questions are the research questions which guided the study.

Is it possible to develop a multi-source feedback system that will meet the needs of the board and the administration of a K–12 school district?

Fourteen administrators and one teacher in the Waterloo, Iowa School District participated in a 360° Feedback project. The administrators responded that the multi-source feedback enhanced the current supervisor-only evaluation system.

Feedback instruments were developed and used to collect information for five administrators. The aggregated and disaggregated data were shared with the board and the superintendent. During the second phase of the project, feedback instruments were developed for six more administrative positions. The central office distributed the surveys to the respondents identified by each participating administrator. Surveys were returned to the central office and mailed to the School Improvement Model Office to be compiled. The results were aggregated by question and were disaggregated by the position of the respondents.

A feedback conference was held with each participant. Working with Professor Manatt, each administrator identified areas of strength and of weakness, then developed goals to guide
professional improvement. All the administrators who participated in the 360° Feedback project responded to a survey comparing the multiple source feedback to the feedback produced during the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system.

A video-based learning album was created based on the procedures used by the Waterloo School District in the development of the 360° Feedback system. A script was developed and reviewed by members of Professor Manatt’s dissertation seminar. The video describes a design team working to develop feedback surveys, feedback conferences with a superintendent and with a principal, and provides general information about the development and implementation of a 360° Feedback system. Members of the dissertation seminar acted in the video production. Administrators in the Davenport, Iowa public school system viewed the videotape and provided recommendations for its improvement.

Is it possible to develop a multi-source implementation procedure that will meet the needs of the supervisors and of the administrators receiving feedback?

A feedback system was developed that allowed the participating administrators to gather information from various groups of people. Depending upon the position of the administrator, feedback was sought from members of the superintendent’s council, the education center non-administrative staff, principals, teachers, support staff, special needs advisory council, and service area staff.

Is it possible to develop a survey instrument for each identified administrative position that can be used with each administrator of a K-12 school district that will include district generic criteria as well as job-specific criteria for each position?

The administrators met with Professor Manatt and designed the survey instruments for their positions. The surveys contained from 15 to 22 questions which focused on the work of an administrator. The scale allowed respondents to indicate if they strongly agreed with a statement,
if they agreed with a statement, if they disagreed with a statement, and if they strongly disagreed with a statement.

*Is it possible to aggregate and disaggregate the feedback results to share in a meaningful way with the administrator being evaluated?*

The feedback was aggregated for all of the like positions. The feedback was disaggregated by the positions of the respondents. All comments were shared with the administrators who were seeking the feedback.

**Feedback conference**

*Is it possible to develop plans for improvement based on the feedback?*

Each participating administrator received the feedback during a conference with Professor Manatt. During the conference, each one identified strengths and areas of concern. Based on the strengths and concerns, the administrator specified goals for improvement for the next year. The administrators also identified who they would share the information with, who they would want to help hold them accountable for meeting the identified goal.

*Is it possible to identify job-specific criteria for each central office and building administrative position that will meet the needs of each employee working in that position?*

**Criteria considered include:** promotion of sound education principles, information provided by knowledgeable personnel, useful reports/feedback, and enhanced information.

The administrators perceived that the 360° Feedback did meet their need for feedback. In fact, it met the identified criteria better than did the traditional supervisor-only feedback.
Video-based learning album

Is it possible to develop a script for a training video complete with user’s manual, sample surveys, and recommended feedback practices?

Based on the processes used and the experiences of the administrators in the Waterloo School District, a video-based learning album was developed to assist administrators in other school districts who wish to be involved in a 360° Feedback system. The album includes sample surveys which have been used in the Waterloo, Iowa; Camp Verde, Arizona; West Des Moines, Iowa; and Riverhead, New York school districts.

Conclusions

Development of procedure

Surveys can be developed, which match the job descriptions of the participants, and distributed to staff members with whom the administrator works. The returned survey data can be aggregated and disaggregated and successfully shared with those participating.

Plans for improvement

Individuals can create plans for improving their work by including the data gained through the 360° Feedback sought. Receiving feedback from a range of constituents broadens the perspective of the administrator. According to respondents in the Waterloo, Iowa project, a truer picture of one’s work is gained and can be used to determine areas which can be improved.

Meeting needs for each employee

The criteria of promoting sound educational principles, information provided by knowledgeable personnel, and useful reports and feedback were indeed met by the 360°
Feedback. In fact, according to respondents, the multi-source feedback better met the identified criteria than did the supervisor-only feedback. Each participant concluded that the 360° Feedback enhanced the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system.

The surveys of the administrators who were involved in the project indicate that 360° Feedback provides better feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles, on the fulfillment of the institutional mission, and on the effective performance of job responsibilities than does the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system. The administrators also perceived that the 360° Feedback involved the personnel with the knowledge to identify strengths and concerns and to provide input on the effective performance of job responsibilities. The multi-source feedback also was perceived to provide better reports than the traditional-supervisor-only evaluation system. In short, the administrators perceived that the multi-source feedback enhanced the traditional system.

The 360° Feedback system was acknowledged by the participants as providing better identification of strengths and weaknesses, of providing better feedback on the effective job responsibilities, on the match between the feedback system and the instrument, on the delivery of information by knowledgeable personnel, on the provision by personnel knowledgeable with the work, on the promotion of sound education principles, and having reports that are practical.

The addition of the 360° Feedback enhances the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system currently used in K-12 school districts. More information is provided by more knowledgeable personnel.

**Video-based learning album**

The video-based learning album does provide a beginning point for a district which wishes to pilot a 360° Feedback system. The videotape provides information on the development of the
survey instrument to be used, on the positions to be surveyed, and on preparing the data to share. Narration provides basic information on the development and implementation of the 360° Feedback system. During the first scene, a consultant works with a design team of administrators to develop a survey to be used to gather feedback for principals. The second scene depicts the consultant providing feedback via a conference with a superintendent. A goal-setting conference with a principal is the basis of the third scene. The script for the videotape is included in Appendix B. Materials are available to be used in the development of surveys, and procedures are presented for the formation of a multi-source feedback system (see Appendix C). Administrators in the Waterloo Community School District critiqued the videotape (see Appendix D).

The respondents evaluated the video presentation on a five-point scale and made the following observations. They agreed that the videotape does provide a clear overview of the 360° Feedback procedures and that the information presented is helpful in deciding if one should consider the development and implementation of a 360° Feedback system. The reviewing administrators also responded that the viewer could not facilitate a survey development design team. Based on this feedback, more information should be provided to enable design teams to create a survey instrument. However, a K-12 district could use the materials to begin work toward the addition of a 360° Feedback system to its current evaluation system.

Limitations

The study is limited by the small number of participants from one district in the sample. Fifteen administrators were involved and completed the perception survey. At this point in the study, the information was used solely for the development of the individual administrator rather than for the evaluation of the administrator. The criteria which were used for gathering feedback did not include some of the factors which have been found to most greatly influence student
achievement (i.e., tutoring, early childhood programs, behavioral classroom techniques, parental involvement, classroom management skills, time on task [Cawelti, 1988]).

The study was limited in the timeline which was used. The feedback loop has been in place for only two years at the conclusion of this study. Only a K–12 school district has been involved in the implementation of the multi-source feedback system. The study was also limited in the number of districts which reviewed the video-based learning album. One district reviewed the album and provided input. Another limitation was that a school district has not yet replicated the process based on the learning album which was produced. The learning album was also limited because a professional script-writer and actors were not employed in its production.

Discussion

Administrators benefit from 360° Feedback systems. The administrators in this study found the feedback more beneficial to them than the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system. This finding is collaborated by the work of Hazucha, Hezlett, and Schneider (1993). The information was shared with the administrators to be used for their own development rather than for evaluation purposes based on the work of Hazucha and Hezlett. The administrators in the study selected people from many different positions to provide feedback on their work. Depending upon the position, the number of subgroups surveyed ranged from four to seven. Those who dealt with a broad range of people surveyed more positions for feedback. Those varied perspectives are valued by Wohlers & London (1989). In business circles, four to six respondents for each of the positions represented is recommended. The concept of a judgment sample of respondents one supervisory level above and those who directly report to the participant complete the feedback circle is expected in the business world. However, in public schools, administrators appear anxious to include many more people in the respondent circle. The difficulty is getting the surveys
returned from all those who were identified as respondents. A small judgment sample selected by
the participant with a definite return provides more feedback than a large sample with few
returns. Feedback enables the administrator to better see one’s work rather than through one’s
own self-bias. Feedback delivered by a knowledgeable person enabled the administrators to see
themselves better, as Raasch (1984) predicted.

The 360° Feedback system was effective for the Waterloo School District administrators
because of the support of the superintendent and of the board of education. A top-level
administrator was assigned the oversight of the project. Timelines were maintained, data
collected, and conferences held as specified. The next step for the Waterloo district is to link
feedback back to the evaluation system and broaden the number of personnel who receive the
multi-source feedback as a way to improve their job performance. Private industry limits the
number of individuals who respond with feedback. The officials in the school district study
attempted to collect feedback from many people. However, the great numbers of surveys
distributed did not result in a corresponding number of responses. Industrial models also include
only those personnel who are one step above and one step below the person seeking feedback.
The respondents in the Waterloo study broadened the respondent pool beyond those with whom
they have direct contact. Although Waterloo Community School District is a very racially and
culturally diverse district, nothing was mentioned about the need to survey respondents for
information concerning equitable treatment. This can possibly be attributed to the maturity of the
district that diversity is not considered an issue at the present time.

The video-based learning album was effective because the "learner cues" were included and
supplemental materials accompanied the videotape. Adults are able to learn through electronic
means if specific materials are provided (Romiszowski, 1984; Braden, 1982; Hamilton, 1986).
Members of Ed Adm 654 responded to a questionnaire about the effectiveness of the videotape.
The citations in the bibliography depend heavily on references from the 1980s business literature. This is because that is the time period when much was being written about multi-source feedback in the business world. The concept of 360° Feedback is a new one for the field of education, thus the education references are more recent.

**Recommendations for Practice**

Recommendations for practice by educators include the following:

1. Public school districts should use 360° Feedback to supplement the traditional supervisor-only evaluation system.

2. Use the video-based learning album to develop a 360° Feedback system in other K–12 school districts.

3. Use feedback surveys from various constituents to augment the evaluation process for K–12 administrators.

4. Provide the participant with aggregated data for his/her job position and disaggregated by position data for his/her use.

5. Develop professional job goals based on feedback provided by constituents in various positions.

**Recommendations for Research**

Recommendations for further research include the following:

1. Broaden the number of districts and administrators who pilot the 360° Feedback system. A multiple-district sample would provide more feedback to use to improve the multi-source system as well as document its effectiveness as compared to the traditional
supervisor-only feedback systems. A larger sample would allow a check on the reliability of the study.

2. Broaden the use of 360° Feedback to include other positions in a school district beyond the administrative staff, i.e., teachers, custodians, secretaries, bus drivers. Testing the generalizability of the project to all levels of the school organization would strengthen the study.

3. Expand the use of 360° Feedback systems to independent schools and parochial schools. The system could also be used by intermediate educational units and by universities.

4. Focus the survey items on practices found to be effective in the improvement of student achievement (Caweiti, 1998). Feedback and student achievement could be correlated. Effective educational practices should be reflected in feedback and in evaluation.

5. Develop a procedure to use multi-source feedback for evaluation purposes rather than solely for feedback purposes. The differences which result from the different purpose could be identified, and the effectiveness of multi-source information could be identified for evaluation systems.

6. Longitudinal data could be kept and analyzed on the improvement of participants who have used 360° Feedback over a period of years. Does it indeed improve job performance at a higher rate than the traditional supervisor-only feedback?

7. The multi-source feedback procedure could be used by non-K–12 systems. The concept could be piloted by college departments as well as by K–12 school districts. Once again, the generalizability of the study would be verified.
8. Involve several districts in the viewing and the usage of the video-based learning album. Feedback from many districts could be used to improve the learning album. A broader base of feedback would provide more reliable results.

9. Study the replication of the 360° Feedback System procedures and process. As other school districts use the process, identify the effectiveness of the procedures. The perceptions of the users could also be documented.

10. Produce a professional videotape and learning album for nationwide distribution. When K-12 school districts view the materials, the reaction could be different when professional-quality work is viewed.

The benefits of 360° Feedback for the improvement of job performance merits further research, development, piloting, and implementation. A system improves through listening to and taking action based on its constituencies.
APPENDIX A. FEEDBACK SURVEY
In an effort to compare the traditional evaluation system with input solely by the supervisor, to the 360° Feedback system, please indicate your reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

360° FEEDBACK
Promotion of sound education principles
1. The 360° evaluation system provides:
   a. feedback on the promotion of sound education: 5 4 3 2 1
   b. feedback on the fulfillment of the institutional n
   c. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities.

Information provided by knowledgeable personnel
2. With the 360° evaluation system, feedback is provided:
   a. by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns.
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. on the effective performance of job responsibilities.
      5 4 3 2 1

Useful reports/feedback
3. With the 360° evaluation system:
   a. reports are practical for the improvement of job performance.
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. strengths as well as weaknesses are identified
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. the instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated.
      5 4 3 2 1

Enhanced information
4. The 360° Feedback enhances the traditional system.
   5 4 3 2 1

Please return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by June 18.

Comments:
APPENDIX B. VIDEO SCRIPT
Setting: A conference room with a desk and the narrator seated in a chair. Books that create the image of an intellectual environment should be visible in the background.

(Camera does long shot of speaker)

Narrator, looking into the camera: Multi-rater feedback, or 360° Feedback, has been used in the business community for a number of years. In an attempt to improve performance appraisals, feedback has been sought from peers, from subordinates, and from self. Education is also seeking ways to improve performance evaluation systems and using the 360° Feedback model from business is one way to consider.

(Close up of speaker)

The term 360° Feedback, also called multi-source assessment, is a registered trademark of TEAMS, Inc. Information is gathered about job performance from those who work closely with the employee: supervisor, colleagues, and subordinates. Many times a self-assessment is also included. The terminology indicates that feedback is gathered from the total circle of those with whom one works; thus, the concept of the 360° circle. Gathering information from more sources than just the supervisor allows a more complete picture of one’s job performance.

Using this video training module, you and your school district will gain the information needed to create and implement a multi-source assessment system for administrators. Administrators are the logical place to begin an improved evaluation system. Educational leaders frequently have difficulty getting good, valid feedback on their work. Supervisors often do not have access to the work a principal performs on a daily basis, and the perspectives of a supervisor may not match the perspective of a subordinate. An improved evaluation system based on a wide range of feedback for administrators would certainly support improved schools. Working first
with administrators on a multi-source feedback system also allows for the district administration to
demonstrate to the other employees their willingness to take risks and to use feedback from many
sources other than just the supervisor's one-stop evaluation.

During the course of the video, you will learn to develop surveys to be used to gather
information about an administrator's job performance, to select the pool of people to provide
feedback, to hold a feedback conference, and to plan for improvement.

(Slide or line on a chart Survey development)

Survey Development

Early in the process, it is necessary to select an administrator to assume responsibility for
the development and implementation of the 360° Feedback work. The administrator-in-charge
will be responsible for the development of the surveys, the distribution and collection of the
surveys, the analysis of the data collected, the feedback conferences resulting from the
information collected, the follow-up to the evaluation, and the evaluation of the process.

The first step in survey development is to identify the job specific and generic criteria for
each administrative position. A design team, representative of the positions for whom the 360°
Feedback will be used, meets to review the process and to develop the surveys. Administrators
review the job descriptions for the positions and suggest other attributes on which they wish to
receive feedback. Criteria relating to the stated mission of the school district are helpful for those
receiving feedback. Typically, criteria fall into groupings because more than one attribute is
considered under the heading. (Poster) You may wish to use groupings such as "integrity,"
"results," "teamwork/supervision/conflict resolution," "empowerment," "vision," "self-
confidence," "development," and "communications." Individual administrators may wish to
include project-specific criteria. For instance, if the administrator is seeking to improve
communication channels within the building, he or she may suggest a specific question pertaining
to the specific issue.

(Close-up)

Care should be taken to keep the survey to 20 items or less. In fact, the survey should be
able to be completed in 10 minutes or less. When it takes longer than 10 minutes to respond to the
survey, the respondents may get frustrated and provide less accurate information. Open-ended
questions should be avoided, instead a comment area should be provided at the bottom of the
survey form. In the instructional packet are surveys developed by school districts which will
provide examples for you. Open the instructional packet to pages 34–35 for a sample survey used
to provide feedback to the Director of Curriculum.

(Example of survey with scale)

(Poster) The surveys are designed with a rating scale. Common practice is to use a
Likert-type Scale where a 1 represents "not at all," a 2 represents "to some extent," a 3 represents
"to a great extent," a 4 represents "always," and a 5 represents "do not know/not applicable."

(Close-up of speaker)

Let's look at a design team working on the development of a survey instrument.
Represented on the team are assistant superintendents, principals, and vice principals.

(Cut to design team developing survey. There are three administrators and one
consultant involved. They are seated at a round table in a conference room. A facilitator is
seated near a piece of chart paper where ideas are recorded as they are given. Eye contact is
established with each member of the team.)
Development of Survey

Consultant: You have your current job descriptions, evaluation instruments, and time logs for critical work activities in front of you. I've also included some sample of surveys developed by administrators in other districts. Based on those documents and on what you know about the job, what do you see as the critical attributes of your work?

Principal: Well, as a middle school principal, I need to be honest and open in my working relationships with staff, students, and parents. I also know that it’s important that all students and their parents are treated with respect. In our district, we are expected to involve the staff in developing a school improvement plan and in the decision making process.

This survey includes a focus on student achievement. And I think that should be included in my feedback survey as well. Focusing on student achievement is a critical element of my position—working with staff to identify ways to make our system work better for the achievement of the students. And of course, as a building-level administrator, I must manage the schedules, the facilities, and the logistical business of "doing school."

Consultant: Would you say that those five areas: open communication, working relationships, staff involvement, student achievement, and building management, are the critical attributes of your job?

Principal: Yes, they seem to be.

Consultant: Alright, so the next step is to identify indicators of success for each of the five critical attributes. For instance, for open communication, it is necessary for you as a building principal to
listen effectively and seek to understand. It is also necessary to share knowledge, information, and expertise with others.

Principal: That’s certainly true. I expect for each of the critical attributes, I could identify two or three more specific indicators of success.

Consultant: Good, that’s exactly what we’re after. You can brainstorm some survey statements that the response would let you know how well you are meeting the critical attribute. Take a look at the samples in the handbook—there might be some ideas there that would help you. Pages 17 and 44 focus specifically on feedback surveys for building administrators. Keep in mind, the respondent will answer for each, "always," "to a great extent," "to some extent," or "not at all." They also have the option of not marking the instrument which can be interpreted as "do you know or not applicable."

Principal: Okay, so how about under “working relationships with staff” (pause) "seeks accomplishment through teams and works cooperatively with others”?

Consultant: That will work. All of you who are principals need to generate some possible survey items, and I’ll write them on the chart paper.

(Camera focuses on the chart paper)

The group generates numerous responses

demonstrates high standards of honesty and integrity
effectively manages building resources
seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others
provides timely responses to staff/parents/students
promotes understanding and cooperation
encourages and supports creative thinking and innovation

(Back to facilitator)

Consultant: Now let's group them into the critical attribute categories. Are there any that do not fit the response mode? Can they be answered by "always," "to a great extent," "to some extent," or "not at all"? Are there any that should be struck for other reasons?

Principal: It looks fine.

Consultant: Now the ultimate question—will this provide you with information that will be helpful and that you do not already have through your traditional, supervisor-only evaluation system?

Principal: I think they are good additions to our traditional system. Partly because they will be answered by different people coming from different perspectives. It will be helpful to know how parents respond to the items and how teachers respond. Student input is always interesting and valuable.

Consultant: Okay, so now we'll get it typed and give it a try.

(Conference with superintendent. Setting continues to be in the conference room.)

Consultant: What we need to do today, Bill, is to review the job description for the superintendent, and the current evaluation instrument to identify critical job attributes. I've also brought samples of surveys used by other superintendents. You can see some samples on pages 26
and 73 of the instructional material. For the moment, look at page 73. What do you see as the
critical aspects for success in your job?

(The consultant takes notes as the superintendent speaks.)

Superintendent: (Looking at sample) It seems to me that critical attributes for all central office
positions are "integrity," "results," and "teamwork/supervision/conflict resolution." Others that
are mentioned here that I agree with are "empowerment," "self-confidence," "development.
"communication," and "vision."

Consultant: Okay, now what are some indicators of success that could go with each. What does
integrity look like?

Superintendent: Under "integrity," it is important that actions are consistent with words.

Consultant: That could certainly be an item to respond to.

Superintendent: Under "results," it is necessary to manage district resources well. These
resources could be human, physical, or financial. Of course, one needs to seek accomplishments
through teams and work cooperatively on teams. And it is important to accomplish established
goals and objectives.

Consultant: Sure, those items will work nicely.

Superintendent: These samples are helpful. But I want to be sure that the survey instrument I use
fits our district. I like the format of this survey, and I think these questions fit our system. Is there
any way I can know if the questions are clear and represent our needs before we actually collect
the data?

Consultant: I would encourage you to share the survey with a few people for their input before
you distribute it for feedback. Share it with a couple of board members, a central office
administrator, and a building principal. Ask them if the questions represent your district and your
position. Ask them if the questions are clear. It's a good idea to actually fill out the form in a
practice evaluation of yourself. Then you can make adjustments before you use the survey to
collect the feedback.

Superintendent: Do you think surveying one time is enough to begin to make changes in the way I
conduct business in the district?

Consultant: Well, Bill, some people are using the first two years as benchmarking years. You can
use the survey for two years, aggregate and disaggregate the data, and then determine the areas
that you need to concentrate on for the third year. In that way you will have more information on
which to base your efforts.

Superintendent: I'm interested in doing this. It's hard to know how others see me and my work.
I'll share the survey with a few other people then get back to you with the changes. I'm looking
forward to getting this information and using it to improve my work in the district.
Respondents

Narrator, looking into the camera: The true beauty of a 360° Feedback System is the information provided by multiple sources. Traditionally, only the supervisor provided feedback to the employee. One person can only provide one person’s perception. By collecting information from many people who know the employee in different ways, a more balanced vision of the job performance can be obtained. Soliciting feedback from subordinates, from peers, and from supervisors provides a broader base on which to base job improvement.

Team feedback requires identification of the kinds of respondents from whom you want feedback. In actuality, a “judgment panel” is used of people identified by the one being evaluated. Feedback should be gathered from at least four respondents, and some authors suggest that three to five raters per category of respondents be used. The employee should indicate which subordinates, peers, and clients should be involved. In the case of a superintendent, three board members might respond to the survey, three principals, and three community members. In the case of a principal, the superintendent, three teachers, three parents, and three students might be asked to respond to the survey.

Anonymity is critical. The surveys should be returned to a designated central office employee who codes the returns so the results can be disaggregated, but who protects the identity of the respondents.

At times, an outside consultant receives the surveys, aggregates the information, and meets with the staff members. At other times, the surveys are shared directly with the employee. And in some situations, the supervisor also receives the information.
Most sources recommend that the feedback information be used, at least initially, as information on which an individual can improve his or her own job performance. If the district seeks to consider the feedback for evaluation purposes, it would be wise to pilot the feedback system for the first year with the information being given only to the employee. In subsequent years the information can also be given to the supervisor.

When the feedback is considered as another facet of performance data, the district must consider what role the information will play. The action plan developed could become a job target.

It is also helpful, and adds another perspective, if the administrator completed a self-evaluation using the same survey instrument. Differences in perception can become part of the conferencing.

Examples of surveys are included in the manual accompanying this video package. These are presently used in the districts indicated on each form.

(Feedback conference—on slide or written on chart paper)

Once the data have been compiled for each individual and for total position groups, a conference is held with each individual administrator. The data are shared for the individual administrator and in aggregate for all those in the same level of positions. If you would like to look at an example of the aggregated data, it is included in the learning album on page 74. For instance, a building principal would be able to view the averaged ratings for each criterion on his or her survey as well as the averaged ratings for all building principals in the district for each criterion. At this point, the self-evaluation would be used as a basis for comparison. The administrator might examine the averaged ratings to his or her own self-evaluation. Discrepancies can then be identified on which to base improvement plans.
The facilitator should coach the administrator through the development of a 360° Action Plan. Based on the information collected, each administrator should identify a goal to improve his or her own performance during the next year. Sample forms are included in the manual which accompanies this video.

The employee will be asked to identify the three top-rated items. These are sources of confidence for the administrator. Next, the three lowest items are identified.

At that point, the employee selects one area to be used for job improvement for the next year. The administrator may look for the largest differences across raters, the lowest score, and the lowest score with the highest degree of agreement. Or he or she may select the items that are the most central to his or her professional or personal life, the items that are the easiest to change, or the items that are the most fun to develop.

Next, the goal must be stated very specifically. For instance, an administrator who received low marks for organizational skills might select the following as a goal, "I will write down the things that I need to do each day. They will be prioritized, and I will check them off as I accomplish them." Notice the personalizing of the goal by the statement, "I will...."

It's helpful to think about the possible reasons why the area is a problem. Is it because the administrator does not like what she or he is expected to do? Is it because he or she doesn't understand how to do what is expected? Or is it because she or he doesn't have the resources that are needed?

The areas of responsibility where the skill will be applied must also be identified. The specificity of the action plan helps insure its success in improving the performance of the administrator.
In conclusion, the administrator will identify the following:

- What can help him or her to improve
- How his or her strengths can be used
- Who will hold him or her responsible
- How progress will be measured
- When the plan will be completed.

Such a conference and the creation of an action plan to improve performance are key to improved performance. Action plan forms are included in the manual accompanying this video package. A feedback conference and the development of an action plan are the focus of the following scene.

Feedback conference/action plan development

Consultant: I have the compiled data from the survey documents you had distributed. As you recall, we have information from your supervisor, colleagues, teachers, parents and students. To help you, the numbers are presented by each category that responded to the survey. That way you can consider the perceptual differences between respondents—parents may see things differently than the teachers you supervise.
Principal: That sounds fine. Will I be able to know how my scores compare to other principals in the district?

Consultant: Sure. We have the aggregated data to give you a feel for your performance as compared to other principals in the district. Before we look at the information provided by the 360° survey instrument, let's talk about your self-evaluation. What do you see as your strength and challenge areas?

Principal: I feel especially strong in the area of student achievement. We use our test data to identify areas of weakness and of strength. In those areas of weakness, we work as a staff to identify ways we can improve. Sometimes, it has meant staffing the instructional time period differently—focusing the Title I personnel during the math time, for instance. Our staff development focus has been tied directly to the area we need to improve our student achievement. An area I find challenging continues to be communication. I communicate in writing, with staff members in person, I encourage people to ask questions and make myself available in the hallways, and still it seems people are unclear.

Consultant: Well, those are two areas that we can see if others see as your work challenges and strengths. Let's take a look at the compiled information. I'd like you to record some information on this sheet as we analyze this. List the three top-rated items. (Pause while principal writes the items.) Now list the three lowest-rated items. (Pause again) Are you surprised?

Principal: Actually, my communication skills are rated higher than I thought they might be. But the involvement of staff in decision making is lower than I expected. I appreciate having the
comments from the people who responded to the survey. Are they paraphrased or just as they wrote them?

Consultant: We had them transcribed just as they were written on the survey documents.

Principal: That's helpful to know.

Consultant: All good improvement plans provide a focus area. Now there are several ways you can make the selection of the area on which to focus your improvement plan. You might use the items with the largest differences across raters—do you see which one that would be? The lowest score or the lowest score which the most raters agree on is another way to make a choice. Do you see which those would be?

Principal: I can identify those. But what if they are not as critical to my job as some other areas are?

Consultant: Another way to make your selection is to select the areas that are most central to your professional or personal life. You could select the areas that you know matter the most to you. Or you could choose the items that are easiest to change first, or you could choose those that would be fun and interesting for you to develop.

Principal: Actually, I think I'd rather select those areas that were rated the lowest by the greatest number of people. Okay, now what.... I've seen people make goals before, and they remained goals and were never accomplished.
Consultant: That's why I'm going to ask you to get more specific. Write down on your goal sheet the three areas you will seek to improve. I'd like you to consider why they are low areas for you—is it part of your job that you don't enjoy? Do you have questions about how it can be accomplished? Are there resources that you need?

Principal: Well, I just think I need some more suggestions on how to involve staff in decisions without losing the focus on student achievement. Won't staff just use the easy way out?

Consultant: Actually, I don't think so. But now you have identified an area for yourself that you can seek professional development. Using the form, identify the observable actions in your goal statement. For instance, you might state "I will involve staff in decisions that will improve the education of the students." The involvement of the staff is observable. Next, identify who will hold you responsible for doing this—is there a staff member you can ask? Can you ask your supervisor to review the meeting notes with you?

Are you motivated to improve in this area? Why? Think how you can use your areas of responsibility to work through this goal.

Principal: Okay. I know educational decision making is improved by involving everyone who has connection to the situation to help identify solutions. I also know that involvement helps people in the building feel needed and important. Collaborative decision making is the way to meet student needs.

Consultant: Take a look at the action plan form. Identify the goal, "I will...." Now list the areas of responsibility in which you can apply the skill.
The final part of the form helps you build some parameters around the action plan. "What can help you to improve?" "How can you use your strengths?" "Who will hold you accountable?" "How will you measure your progress?" "When will you complete the plan?"

Principal: I think attending a conference on collaborative decision making could improve my skills. My strength in communication and facilitation could certainly be an asset. I'd like for one of my staff members and for my supervisor to hold me accountable for this plan. Probably, the best indicator of my success will be to tell the staff members that I am working toward this goal, and to ask them at the middle of the year how I am progressing. I think I'd do a short survey to give them at the end of the first semester. Then I could use the same short survey instrument at the end of the year. I should have this plan accomplished by next May—at least be able to tell if I've made progress.

Consultant: That certainly sounds workable.

Principal: Now, who gets a copy of this plan?

Consultant: Well that depends on your district's plan. In some districts, the feedback remains solely yours. In other districts, during the first year the feedback remains for the eyes only of the participant, and then the second year, the supervisor may also have a copy. Today, it's basically up to you. However, if you wish to have your supervisor help hold you accountable, she will need a copy. It will also be helpful if she knows your goal area so she will make it possible for you to attend workshops or conferences with that focus. You also will have a copy for your files.
Principal: Actually, it sounds exciting to be able to focus on an area that will help me professionally. As an administrator, that is certainly the way I have worked with our building and with our staff members. Now, I will have a professional improvement focus as well. I know we have discussed this, but how does this feedback work with the other evaluation components that our district uses? I am evaluated formally by my supervisor every three years, and the results are reported as a summative evaluation.

Consultant: This first year, the information is given only to you. However, next year your district may elect to have the feedback results also given to your supervisor. The results will be just another measure to identify strength and concern areas. As you and your supervisor devise job performance goals, the feedback surveys will provide more data on which to base your decisions.

Principal: Actually, I think the additional perspectives will improve our evaluation system. Relying solely on one person's opinion gives a rather limited perspective. With the additional viewpoints, I will more clearly know how well I am doing my job.

Consultant: I certainly have enjoyed meeting with you today. (Standing and shaking hands) I hope you find the information helpful.

Principal: Thank you, I have found it very helpful.
Narrator: (Close up shot).

(Process evaluation—on slide or chart paper)

Once the 360° Feedback process has been compiled, employees involved in the process should be surveyed for their satisfaction with the procedure. Questions such as "Does the multi-rater feedback system better promote sound education principles?" "Is the information provided by knowledgeable personnel?" "Are the reports/feedback useful?" "Does the feedback improve the process?" Those who completed surveys should be questioned about the amount of time that was required to complete the surveys and if the language on the survey was clear and understandable.

A copy of such a process evaluation is enclosed in the appendix of the manual accompanying this video tape.

Conclusion

Yes, coming the complete circle in gathering information about one’s job performance certainly enables one to improve. The 360° Feedback System can extend beyond the administrators in a district. Teachers can receive feedback from teachers, from parents, and from students. Seeing oneself as others do provides a great opportunity to be the best educator one can be.
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In A Performance Appraisal Discussion

- Listen for framework

- If not clear, suggest a framework to discuss strengths, needs, and criteria

- Probe generalizations and inferences

- Summarize

- Discuss how to build on your strengths

- If appropriate, ask for follow-up discussion
Self Feedback to Teachers

Suggestions for Completing the Questionnaires

a. Your packet contains one questionnaire and a scan form. The scan form is pre-coded with your assigned 2-digit teacher ID and a code designating that a teacher completed the questionnaire.

b. Use a No. 2 pencil and do not fill in your name. Completing this questionnaire is voluntary.

c. Seal the scan form in the envelope provided and return it to the central office to be forwarded to Dick Manatt at Iowa State University.

d. If you have questions, call me at 515-294-5521.

Dick Manatt
K-2 STUDENT RATINGS
TEACHER VERSION

Rate your performance on the following items:

1. I make the school day interesting for my students.  
2. I give my students enough time to do their work.  
3. My students pay attention in class.  
4. Discussions in my class are about lessons being studied.  
5. The work in my class is too hard for students.  
6. I give my students homework.  
7. I come to class on time.  
8. I require that students follow the rules.  
9. My students often have to take a test in class.  
10. I care if a student wastes time in class.  
11. Even when I am not watching, my students work in this class.  
12. Students can get help from me when they need it.  
13. I give students new work to do when they are ready for it.  
14. I tell students where they can find more information to help them learn about the lesson.  
15. I am ready for class when it is time to begin.  
16. I make it clear what I want students to do.  
17. I give students interesting work if they finish their work before class is over.  
18. I teach hard lessons in small steps.  
19. I give students work back quickly.  
20. I tell my students what new things they can learn in each lesson.
GRADES 3-5 – STUDENT RATINGS
TEACHER VERSION

Rate your performance on the following items:

1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=sometimes, 4=usually, 5=almost always

1. I make work interesting for my students. 1 2 3 4 5
2. My students find the school day interesting. 1 2 3 4 5
3. We go back over each lesson when we finish it. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I give students work to do at home. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Our discussions are about the subject being studied. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I return students' work quickly. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I make my students feel good when they do good work. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Students can get help from me. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Students finish their work before class is over. 1 2 3 4 5
10. If my students finish their work before class is over, I give them interesting work. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I give new work without making the students wait a long time for it. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I explain lessons clearly. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I know my students well. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I will explain new things in a way that is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I have my students work at the right pace. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I tell students what new things they can learn in each lesson. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I will explain new things in a way that is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
18. I am available to help students during class time and other times during the school day. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I use a variety of classroom activities and resources. 1 2 3 4 5
20. I am well prepared. 1 2 3 4 5
### STUDENT FEEDBACK – GRADES 6-8
#### TEACHER VERSION

Rate your performance on the following items:

1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = sometimes, 4 = usually, 5 = almost always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I make class work interesting.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am fair with all students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I maintain discipline in the classroom.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am well prepared for my class.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I give assignments related to the subjects we are studying.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My students and I discuss and summarize each lesson just studied.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I ensure that our discussions focus on the topic of the lesson.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like it when students ask questions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My students have excessive time in which to complete their work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I begin lessons by explaining what we are going to do and why we are going to do it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I ask questions in class to see if my students understand what has been taught.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I explain new ideas in a way that is easy to understand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I monitor students' work, as they are doing it, to see if they understand the lesson.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am very knowledgeable about the subject I teach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have work prepared for students to do if they complete their assignment before class is over.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I often use teacher-made materials and worksheets for my students to use.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I give tests and quizzes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I return tests and assignments quickly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I use a variety of classroom activities and resources.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I give students enough time to do their work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRADES 9-12 - STUDENT RATINGS
TEACHER VERSION

Rate your performance on the following items:
1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=sometimes, 4=usually, 5=almost always

1. I make class work interesting. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I ask questions in class to see if the students understand what has been taught. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I give assignments related to the subject we are studying. 1 2 3 4 5
4. My students and I discuss and summarize each lesson just studied. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I tell students how they can use what they already have learned to learn new things. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I maintain discipline in my classroom. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I return tests and assignments quickly. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I give students feedback about their performance. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I am very knowledgeable about the subject(s) I teach. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I assign homework that helps students to learn the subject being taught. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I make materials and worksheets for students to use. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I use a variety of classroom activities and resources. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I use films or videotapes for students to watch that help them learn about the subject they are studying. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I tell the class about library/media materials that will help them learn about the subject they are studying, when appropriate. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I am well organized. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I like it when students ask questions. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I have students work in different groups depending upon the activity in which they are involved. 1 2 3 4 5
18. I encourage students to look at problems in new ways and to find new ways to solve problems. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I am available to help students during class time and other times during the day. 1 2 3 4 5
20. I monitor student work, as they are doing it, to see if they understand the lesson. 1 2 3 4 5
Teacher-to Teacher Feedback

**Rating Scale**
No mark=Do not know/not applicable; 1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develops and maintains positive relations with students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Willingly shares successful teaching techniques/materials.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Maintains confidentiality in sensitive matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Provides positive classroom environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Aligns carefully the functional classroom curriculum taught with the school organization's curriculum guide and the state course of study.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cooperates with parents in the best interest of the student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Maintains a positive attitude.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Develops and maintains positive relations with colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Willing to do more than what's contractually mandated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
# TEACHER-TO-TEACHER FEEDBACK

Name of teacher being rated: ________________________________

**Rating Scale:**

5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

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

1. Develops and maintains positive relations with students.  
2. Willingly shares successful teaching techniques/materials.  
3. Maintains confidentiality in sensitive matters.  
4. Provides positive classroom environment.  
5. Aligns carefully the functional classroom curriculum taught with the school organization’s curriculum guide and the state course of study.  
6. Cooperates with parents in the best interest of the student.

**COMMENTS:**

**SOURCE:** RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
TEACHER-TO-TEACHER FEEDBACK

Name of teacher being rated: 

---

**Rating Scale:**

5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develops and maintains positive relations with students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Willingly shares successful teaching techniques/materials.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Maintains confidentiality in sensitive matters.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cooperates with parents in the best interest of the student.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Provides positive classroom environment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Aligns carefully the functional classroom curriculum taught with the school organization's curriculum guide and the state course of study.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Maintains a positive attitude.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Develops and maintains positive relations with colleagues.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Willing to accept additional responsibilities.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Conducts self in professional manner.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STUDENT FEEDBACK TO TEACHERS

Students can provide reliable information about classroom instruction. Because of their unique perspective for observing teachers, they have the most extensive opportunities of all potential observers to view a teacher's performance and also see a variety of teachers and performance levels over time.

Student feedback is an important component of a total (360°) teacher performance evaluation system. The School Improvement Model (SIM) has developed student feedback instruments that have valid, reliable, and discriminating items. Suitable for use by elementary and secondary students, these student ratings can be used to provide feedback to teachers and to show differences in the quality of instruction.

Student feedback instruments are available for students at four levels: grades K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Each instrument has 20 items. (See a sample on back.) A Spanish version is available for levels K-2 and 3-5.

The student feedback instrument is easy to administer and takes about fifteen minutes for students to complete. The school is responsible for making copies of the instruments, distributing instruments and scannable response forms to teachers, and collecting them from teachers. Teachers are asked to code an identification number on all response forms prior to returning them for scoring.

Anonymity and confidentiality for students are guaranteed. The results are machine scored and are reported by teacher and grade level; no individual student responses are ever reported. Summary information by level and for the district is also provided. Up-to-date norm information by subject and grade level is available for making comparisons to a national sample.

The cost for conducting a student feedback study is $800, plus direct expenses such as scanning scoring forms, computer analysis, and printing reports. Although direct expenses vary according to the number of surveys returned, they are typically $300 to $400.

For more information, contact:

Mari Kemis
E005 Lagomarcino Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011
515-294-9452
STUDENT FEEDBACK TO TEACHERS
SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE (9-12)

NOTE TO STUDENTS: Please remember that completing this form is voluntary. You may keep this form if you decide not to participate.

Directions: The statements below are designed to find out more about your class and teacher. This is not a test. Do not put your name on this paper. Please answer all the statements. Students are not to ask any questions during the survey.

1=Never
2=Not often
3=Sometimes
4=Usually
5=Almost always

1. My teacher makes class work interesting. 1 2 3 4 5
2. My teacher asks questions to see if we understand what has been taught. 1 2 3 4 5
3. My teacher gives assignments related to the subject we are studying. 1 2 3 4 5
4. We discuss and summarize each lesson we have just studied. 1 2 3 4 5
5. My teacher tells us how we can use what we have already learned to learn new things. 1 2 3 4 5
6. My teacher maintains discipline in our classroom. 1 2 3 4 5
7. My teacher returns tests and assignments quickly. 1 2 3 4 5
8. My teacher gives me feedback about my performance. 1 2 3 4 5
9. My teacher knows a lot about this subject. 1 2 3 4 5
10. My homework helps me to learn the subject being taught. 1 2 3 4 5
11. My teacher makes materials and worksheets for us to use. 1 2 3 4 5
12. My teacher uses a variety of classroom activities and resources. 1 2 3 4 5
13. The films and videotapes we watch help us learn about the subject we are studying. 1 2 3 4 5
14. My teacher tells the class about library/media materials that will help us learn about the subject we are studying, when appropriate. 1 2 3 4 5
15. My teacher is well-organized. 1 2 3 4 5
16. My teacher likes it when we ask questions. 1 2 3 4 5
17. We work in different groups depending upon the activity in which we are involved. 1 2 3 4 5
18. My teacher encourages us to look at problems in new ways and find new ways to solve problems. 1 2 3 4 5
19. My teacher is available to help me during class time and other times during the school day. 1 2 3 4 5
20. My teacher looks at our work, as we are doing it, to see if we understand the lesson. 1 2 3 4 5
March 10, 1999

Dear Parent,

Our district is experimenting with an evaluation system known as 360-degree feedback. This is a way for the different people I interact with (students, parents, other teachers and administrators) to evaluate me. As a part of this evaluation system, the district is asking for parents to complete a survey about their child’s teacher. I will receive the feedback from both parents and students. The information from these surveys will be used to make me a better teacher. I appreciate you taking the time to answer the questions enclosed.

Permission to collect data for this study has been granted by the Board of Governors for Camp Verde USD #28. There are no foreseeable discomforts or risks involved with this study. Participation is voluntary! All participants may stop participation in this study at any time. All information provided would be kept confidential. You will not be identified in any manner. Number and grouping codes will be used so that information may be related to me by class. The time to complete the 25-item questionnaire is approximately 15-20 minutes.

Enclosed is a questionnaire and scanform (answer sheet). Please complete all of the items to the best of your knowledge. The scanforms should be returned in the envelope provided no later than May 3, 1999.

Thank you for your time and help in improving my teaching.

Sincerely,

Teacher

Enclosures: Scanforms
             Questionnaires
Parent Feedback to Teachers

District name ____________________________

Teacher name ____________________________ Grade _______ Date ______/____/____

Spring 1999

Directions: The statements below are designed to find out your feelings about your child's teacher. Please answer all of the statements.

1. The teacher is available to meet with me about my child. 1 = Never 2 = Not often 3 = Sometimes 4 = Usually 5 = Almost Always 6 = Do not know

2. The teacher communicates openly, honestly, and frankly with my child and me.

3. The teacher shares information with me in an understandable, friendly, non-threatening manner.

4. The teacher provides verbal communication, which is clear, concise, positive and easy to understand.

5. The teacher responds to my communications in a timely manner.

6. The teacher keeps me informed of classroom activities and student progress.

7. I am satisfied with the opportunities I have for input and involvement in classroom activities.

Comments:

Classroom Environment

8. Discipline and educational programs are administered fairly and consistently in the classroom.

9. The teacher creates a feeling of unity and enthusiasm in the classroom.

10. The teacher treats all students fairly regardless of gender, race and ethnicity.

11. The teacher is concerned about my child as an individual.

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Parent Feedback to Teachers, continued

**Classroom Environment, continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. The teacher encourages understanding and cooperation.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The teacher helps motivate my child to work to my child's potential.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My teachers' classroom is orderly and safe.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Curriculum and Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. The classroom curriculum is appropriate for my child.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The teacher holds a high expectation for my child's learning.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I know what is expected of my child.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My child is challenged.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My child likes to go to class.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Assessment and Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. I am satisfied with the extent the teacher evaluates my child's progress.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The teacher teaches my child in the manner in which my child best learns.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Homework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. My child should have homework.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My child is given an appropriate amount of homework to help my child succeed.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My child's homework is meaningful and helps him/her to succeed.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My child has ______ hours of homework each night.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**SOURCE:** CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Marzo 10 de 1999

Estimados Padres de Familia:

Nuestro Distrito se encuentra estudiando una evaluación de un sistema conocido como “Nutridor 360 grados”.

Esta es una forma para contactarme con las diferentes personas con quienes tengo relación permanente (estudiantes, padres, otros profesores y administradores) para evaluarme.

Como parte de este sistema de calificación el Distrito pide a los padres, por favor, completar el questionario acerca de la profesora de sus hijos. Yo recibiré las respuestas de ambos: padres y estudiantes. Esta información, recibida a través de los cuestionarios, la utilizare para mejorar como profesora.

Les agrdezco el tiempo que se sirvan dedicar para contestar las preguntas adjuntas.

Gracias a la Junta Directiva de Campo Verde USD328 que me ha permitido recopilar estos datos. No habrá ninguna prevenda ni riesgo en la realización de este estudio y su participación es voluntaria. Todos los participantes pueden retirarse de este estudio en cualquier momento. Toda la información recibida será confidencial. Usted no será identificado de ninguna manera. Usaremos código de grupo y un número para que la información llegue a mi salón de clase. El tiempo necesario para completar este cuestionario es aproximadamente de 15 a 20 minutos.

Adjunto encontrarán el cuestionario Scaneado (hoja de respuesta). Por favor, complete todas las preguntas en la mejor forma posible. El formulario deberá devolverse en el sobre que se le será enviado antes del 3 de Mayo de 1999.

Muchas gracias por su ayuda para colaborar en mi calificación como profesora.

Atentamente,

Firma de la Profesora

Se incluyen formularios scaneados
INFORMACION DE PADRES PARA LOS PROFESORES
DISTRITO: CAMPO VERDE - UNION DE ESCUELAS DISTRITO #28
CAMPO VERDE ARIZONA

NOMBRE DEL PROFESOR GRADO FECHA PRIMAVERA/99

INSTRUCCIONES: LOS DATOS A CONTINUACION HAN SIDO DISEÑADOS PARA ENCONTRAR SUS OPINIONES ACERCA DEL PROFESOR DE SU HIJO. POR FAVOR CONTESTE TODAS LAS PREGUNTAS.

1= NUNCA  2= POCO  3= POCAS VECES  4= USUALMENTE  5= CASI SIEMPRE  6= NO SE

COMUNICACION
1. EL PROFESOR ESTA DISPONIBLE PARA REUNIRSE CONMIGO, POR MI HIJO
2. EL PROFESOR COMPARTE INFORMACION CONMIGO DE UNA MANERA ABIERTA, HONESTA Y FRANCA, CON MI HIJO Y CONMIGO.
3. EL PROFESOR COMPARTE INFORMACION CONMIGO DE UNA FORMA COMPRENSIVA, AMIGABLE Y NO DISPLICENTE.
4. EL PROFESOR ME INFORMA VERBALMENTE, DE UNA FORMA CLARA, CONCISA, POSITIVA Y FACIL DE COMPRENDER.
5. EL PROFESOR RESPONDE A MI COMUNICACION DE UNA FORMA CRONOMETRICA.(CON EL TIEMPO CONTADO)
6. EL PROFESOR ME MANTIEN INFORMADO DE LAS ACTIVIDADES DE LA CLASE Y EL PROGRESO DEL ESTUDIANTE
7. ESTOY SATISFECHO POR LAS OPORTUNIDADES QUE TENGO PARA CONOCER EL DESENVOLVIMIENTO DE LA CLASE Y SUS ACTIVIDADES.

OBSERVACIONES:

AMBIENTE DEL SALON DE CLASE
8. PROGRAMAS SOBRE DISCIPLINA Y EDUCACION SUMINISTRADOS FRECUENTE Y CONSTANTEMENTE EN LA CLASE.
9. EL PROFESOR CREA UN SENTIMIENTO DE UNIDAO Y ENTUSIASMO EN LA CLASE.
10. EL PROFESOR TRATA A TODOS LOS ESTUDIANTES DE ACUERDO CON SU GENERO, RAZA Y GRUPO ETNICO.
11. EL PROFESOR ESTA PENDIENTE DE CADA NINO EN PARTICULAR
12. EL PROFESOR LOS ANIMA. LES DA CORAJE Y COOPERACION
13. EL PROFESOR AYUDA A MOTIVAR A MI HIJO EN EL TRABAJO PARA SU RENDIMIENTO
14. EL SALON DE MI PROFESOR ES ORDENADO Y SEGURO.

OBSERVACIONES

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT INVENTORY

The School Improvement Inventory is designed to gather information that can be used for school improvement. It consists of two sections that examine (1) the six major responsibilities of building administrators and (2) perceptions of school climate and leadership. This instrument is appropriate for teachers, administrators, central office personnel, and other school-based staff and has been used for planning and informed decision-making in schools across the nation.

The responsibilities of the building administrator examined include human resources management, instructional leadership, learning environment management, noninstructional management, pupil personnel, and school-community relations. Respondents are asked to rate both the relative importance of each responsibility as it promotes school effectiveness and how effective the building administrator is in carrying it out.

School climate measures and leadership behaviors are also examined through a series of questions. These include goal orientation, esprit, cohesiveness, teachers' expectations of students, administrator dedication and enthusiasm, student attitudes, administrator support of teachers, evaluation of pupil progress, coordination of instruction and the curriculum, emphasis placed on instruction and curriculum, and learning environment provision.

The School Improvement Inventory is easy to administer and takes about fifteen minutes to complete. Anonymity and confidentiality are guaranteed. The results are machine scored and reported by building and school level; no individual responses are ever reported. Up-to-date norm information is available for making comparisons to a national sample. The cost is $3.00 per instrument and includes scoring and reporting.

For more information, contact:

Mári Kemis
E005 Lagomarcino Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011
515-294-9452
## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT INVENTORY

Dr. Jim Swiney  
Iowa State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
<th>IMPORTANT DIRECTIONS FOR MARKING ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use black lead pencil only (No. 2 or softer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do NOT use ink or ballpoint pens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make no stray marks on the answer sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inventory is designed to gather information which can be used for school improvement. In completing this inventory, it is important that you respond as thoughtfully and candidly as possible. Please read the directions carefully and respond to each item as it currently applies to conditions in your school. Described below are six major functions which are the responsibility of your building administrator. You are being asked to rate the relative importance of each for promoting effectiveness in your school.

### HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
- Assists teachers to motivate, challenge, and create students to learn at the optimal level, and assists staff in assessing maximum use of their human potential for reaching personal and organizational goals.

### INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP
- Enhances student learning through updating curriculum and instructional materials, evaluating staff for the purpose of improvement, and evaluating educational program and student progress.

### LEARNING ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT
- Develops and maintains discipline standards which provide students with a clear understanding of expectations for behavior inside and outside the classroom and provides an educational atmosphere conducive to learning.

### NON-INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT
- Schedules all routine and special activities; supervises logistical matters and the school plant.

### PUPIL PERSONNEL
- Seeks with students individually and in groups to address their problems and concerns, and promotes student involvement in co-curricular and extra-curricular activities.

### SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS
- Communicates with parents and promotes the school through advisory committees, parent-teacher organization, needs assessment, and the media.

You have 20 points to distribute among the six functions (using the 1 to 5 scale provided). While you may think that all of the functions are very important, since you have only 20 points to work with, it will be necessary for you to make some decisions as to the relative importance of each function. You may assign the same rating to more than one function and must rate each of the six. Below is an example of how one respondent approached the task.

### EXAMPLE: Relative importance

In the example, the respondent decided that Human Resource Management and Learning Environment Management were both of "very high importance" thereby using 10 of the 20 points. The remaining 10 points were distributed among the other four functions. You could have given Instructional Leadership, Pupil Personnel, and School-Community Relations 5 points each and then distribute the remaining 5 points among the other 3 functions.

### IMPORTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-instructional Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relative importance**

Please indicate the relative importance of each of the six functions for promoting effectiveness in your school by rating each function from 1 to 5. (Keep in mind that the total must equal 20.)
-- NEWS RELEASE --

DISTRICT BEGINS NEW PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

After 12 months of preparation, Riverhead Central School District is trying a new evaluation system for all employees. In a marked departure from the traditional, top-down evaluation by supervisors, Riverhead school employees will be seeking 360° feedback. This means that students will give feedback to teachers, teachers will give feedback to each other, and teachers will give feedback to principals. Parents will be surveyed to obtain their satisfaction with schools and suggestions for improvement.

During the month of ____________, a sample of parents/guardians and teachers will receive questionnaires from schools. A second group of parents/guardians will be surveyed by the school bus drivers that serve their children.

Please answer the questions provided as honestly as you can. Instructions will vary depending on the survey; however, all forms should be returned in the envelopes provided. Comments are encouraged. All responses will be anonymous to assure confidentiality. Results will be combined and shared with the appropriate faculty. Remember, participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, simply return the form unmarked in the envelope. Thanks for your assistance in making Riverhead Schools even better.
Dear Parent or Guardian:

For two years, the Riverhead School District has been involved in a project to improve the performance evaluation of the district's employees. As a part of this evaluation, we would like to survey parents and guardians of the children who attend school in Riverhead. We are doing this because we are interested in your opinions and recommendations to improve the quality of the schools.

Your responses will help the administration, faculty, and staff of the designated building to improve the quality of the education that we deliver. Your candid assessment is requested. Please be honest. If you are not sure about an item, or believe it does not apply, you should mark that question "5" for Do Not Know/Not applicable.

On the back of each questionnaire is a predarkened code to identify the designated school building in question. There are no marks to identify who filled out the survey.

Please complete the survey and mail it back to the School Improvement Stakeholders' Committee office in the attached envelope within 10 days. If you choose not to participate, please return the unmarked questionnaire in the same manner. No one in the school district will see your individual responses because your responses, along with those of others, will be combined. Any written comments or examples placed at the end of each section will be 1) printed word for word without identifying you or your children and 2) included with other responses to the same questions.

Comments relating to individuals will be seen only by the individual and the supervisor. General survey questions regarding building, administration, teachers and staff will be combined and presented to the building personnel.

Your voluntary participation is greatly appreciated as it will assist us in making improvements in the quality of education in Riverhead.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

The Stakeholders' Committee
PART 1

Parent/Guardian Feedback

The administration, faculty and staff of the building described in the attached letter are participating in a 360 degree performance evaluation. To accomplish this type of evaluation, parent feedback is required. Your responses to this survey will help the administration, faculty and staff in the designated building improve school quality. We realize you may have students in more than one building, by PLEASE ANSWER FOR THE BUILDING DESIGNATED IN THE COVER LETTER.

Please read each statement carefully. Refer to the Response Scale below and circle the number that best describes your response to the statement. The "S" means that the statement is not applicable or that you do not have an opinion. If you have specific comments (positive or negative), please write them in the space provided at the end of each section.

Response Scale:

5=Do not know/Not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Board of Education
1. The Board of Education is an effective advocate for the educational needs of the students and the welfare of the community. 5 4 3 2 1
2. The Board of Education studies all aspects of an issue before rendering a decision. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Adequate advance notice of topics to be discussed at the meetings of the Board of Education or Community Councils is given. 5 4 3 2 1

District Administration
4. The district administration (Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents, Director of Special Education, Athletic Director, etc.) provides effective leadership. 5 4 3 2 1
5. The district administration consistently enforces school rules. 5 4 3 2 1
6. The district administration encourages parents, students, teachers, and community members to cooperate in planning and achieving the goals of the school. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

School Building: (Please Write in the Name of the School you are being asked to Evaluate)

7. The school administration, faculty and staff provide a clean, safe environment for learning. 5 4 3 2 1
8. The school provides sufficient opportunities for parent/guardian involvement. 5 4 3 2 1
9. I am informed about the school's policies, programs and operations. 5 4 3 2 1
10. The concerns of parents/guardians are reflected in decisions affecting the school. 5 4 3 2 1
11. I feel welcome in the school. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Parent/Guardian Feedback, continued

Response Scale:

5=Do not know/Not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Building, continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. My child has access to a variety of resources (technology, media centers, libraries, etc.) to help him/her succeed in learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The school facilities (workspaces, furnishings, etc.) are adequate to support the instructional program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The school’s programs meet the requirements of students with special needs (learning disabled, physically challenged, gifted and talented, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The transportation services to and from the school meet the needs of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The school’s grading policies and practices are administered fairly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sensitivity to issues of racial and ethnic fairness is demonstrated by students, teachers, and administrators at our school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sexual harassment is not a problem at our school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. There is not a problem with substance abuse (e.g., drug and/or alcohol problems) among the students in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Learning is a high priority in this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The school is preparing my child to enter the 21st Century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Cheating is not a problem in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

School Administration (Principal and Assistant Principals)

| 23. School administrators listen to parents’ comments and suggestions. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 24. School administrators respond to parents’ communications in a timely manner. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 25. School administrators administer discipline and educational programs fairly and consistently. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 26. School administrators communicate openly and honestly with parents. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 27. School administrators administer rules and policies with compassion. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 28. School administrators support teachers appropriately in a parent/teacher conflict. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 29. School administrators support parents appropriately in a parent/teacher conflict. | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| 30. School administrators are accessible to meet with me about my child. | 5 4 3 2 1 |

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Parent/Guardian Feedback, continued

Response Scale:
5 = Do not know/Not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

Teaching and Professional Staff

31. Teachers regularly communicate with the parent/guardian of their students. 5 4 3 2 1
32. Teachers provide instructional activities that involve students in their learning. 5 4 3 2 1
33. My child is given an appropriate amount of homework to help him/her succeed. 5 4 3 2 1
34. Teachers and counselors are concerned about my child as an individual. 5 4 3 2 1
35. Teachers hold high expectations for learning. 5 4 3 2 1
36. The teachers are available to give students the assistance they need with assignments. 5 4 3 2 1
37. The teachers help motivate my child to work to his/her potential. 5 4 3 2 1
38. When requested, teachers and professional staff readily make themselves available for appointments. 5 4 3 2 1
39. The school's counselors, advisors, and nurse give students the help they need. 5 4 3 2 1
40. The teachers are preparing my child to master the Riverhead curriculum. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

Support Staff (Office Staff, Custodians, Aides, Food Service)

41. The support staff treats my child in a manner that is acceptable to me. 5 4 3 2 1
42. The support staff presents a positive, helpful image to parents and school visitors. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Riverhead Central School District
Towns of Riverhead, Southampton & Brookhaven
700 Osborne Avenue
Riverhead, New York, 11901-2996
FAX No. (516) 369-6816

Dr. Robert J. Holmes
Superintendent
Tel. No. (516) 369-6717

D. Jean Lapinski
Assistant Superintendent
Tel. No. (516) 369-6714

David J. Carlson
School Finance Manager
Tel. No. (516) 369-6708

Date

Dear ____________________________:

__________________________ seeks your help in reviewing his/her job performance. The Riverhead Central School District performance evaluation system requires a review at this time. A component of this evaluation process includes seeking feedback from you regarding his/her job performance.

Enclosed is a survey and a return envelope. We greatly appreciate your help in filling out this survey.
FEEDBACK TO DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS

Please select the administrator being rated:

Assistant Superintendent
Director of Pupil Personnel Services/Special Education
Assistant Director of Pupil Personnel Services/Special Education
Director of Athletics, Physical Education, and Health

Rating Scale:

5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

INTEGRITY

1. Actions are consistent with words. 5 4 3 2 1

RESULTS

2. Accomplishes established goals and objectives. 5 4 3 2 1

3. Effectively manages district resources (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1

4. Provides timely responses to staff/parents/students and others. 5 4 3 2 1

5. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others. 5 4 3 2 1

TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION

6. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 5 4 3 2 1

7. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals. 5 4 3 2 1

8. Provides timely and germane staff supervision/evaluation. 5 4 3 2 1

EMPOWERMENT

9. Provides opportunities for ongoing professional development. 5 4 3 2 1

10. Encourages innovative and creative thinking and an environment of high expectations. 5 4 3 2 1

11. Facilitates an environment of high expectations. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to District Administrators, continued

5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=not at all

VISION

12. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions. 5 4 3 2 1
13. Keeps service to students as primary goal. 5 4 3 2 1
14. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan: Building a learning community for the 21st century. 5 4 3 2 1

SELF-CONFIDENCE

15. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 5 4 3 2 1

DEVELOPMENT

16. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMUNICATIONS

17. Communicates openly and honestly. 5 4 3 2 1
18. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Student Services

Rating Scale:

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/Not applicable

INTEGRITY
1. Actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

RESULTS
2. Accomplishes established goals and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Effectively manages district resources (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others. 1 2 3 4 5

VISION
5. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Keeps service to students as primary goal. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan: Building a learning community for the 21st century. 1 2 3 4 5

SELF-CONFIDENCE
8. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMUNICATION
9. Communicates openly and honestly. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 1 2 3 4 5

WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY
11. Establishes and maintains a community relations program through communication with both the general public and parents. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Establishes open communication with the news media through high visibility and regular meetings. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Presents a positive image of the school both within and outside the community. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Solicits parent and community input and commitment to district goals, policies, and programs. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Student Services, continued

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/Not applicable

WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY, CONTINUED

15. Maintains communication with other governmental agencies in the best interest of the district.

TEAMWORK/CONFLICT RESOLUTION

16. Works cooperatively with others in the district.

17. Tries to resolve conflicts directly with parties involved.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

18. Demonstrates positive leadership when directing, motivating and coordinating the activities of others.

19. Works effectively with the assistant superintendent, district-wide and building administrators, community members, and Board of Education to meet goals.

20. Demonstrates the ability to guide diverse teams to accomplish goals.

21. Provides adequate opportunities for staff development and for employee self-assessment.

22. Sets standards to improve the district and involves the community and employees.

23. Develops goals, prioritizes demands, manages resources to achieve objectives, and links plans with the district philosophy.

24. Completes multiple projects in a timely fashion.

25. Organizes and uses information collected from both internal and external sources.

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Student Services

Rating Scale:

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/Not applicable

INTEGRITY
1. Actions are consistent with words. 5 4 3 2 1

RESULTS
2. Accomplishes established goals and objectives. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Effectively manages district resources (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others. 5 4 3 2 1

VISION
5. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions. 5 4 3 2 1
6. Keeps service to students as primary goal. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan: 
   Building a learning community for the 21st Century. 5 4 3 2 1

SELF-CONFIDENCE
8. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMUNICATION
9. Communicates openly and honestly. 5 4 3 2 1
10. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 5 4 3 2 1

WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY
11. Establishes and maintains a community relations program through communication with both the general public and parents. 5 4 3 2 1
12. Establishes open communication with the news media through high visibility and regular meetings. 5 4 3 2 1
13. Presents a positive image of the school both within and outside the community. 5 4 3 2 1
14. Solicits parent and community input and commitment to district goals, policies, and programs. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Student Services, continued

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/Not applicable

**WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY, CONTINUED**

15. Maintains communication with other governmental agencies in the best interest of the district.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**TEAMWORK/CONFLICT RESOLUTION**

16. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

17. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

18. Solves problems in the best interest of the students and the district by finding common solutions or effective compromises.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS**

19. Demonstrates positive leadership when directing, motivating and coordinating the activities of others.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

20. Works effectively with the superintendent, district-wide and building administrators, community members, and Board of Education to meet goals.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

21. Demonstrates the ability to guide diverse teams to accomplish goals.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

22. Provides adequate opportunities for staff development and for employee self-assessment.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

23. Sets standards to improve the district and involves the community and employees.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

24. Develops goals, prioritizes demands, manages resources to achieve objectives, and links plans with the district philosophy.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

25. Completes multiple projects in a timely fashion.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

26. Organizes and uses information collected from both internal and external sources.  
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
**Associate Superintendent for Human Resources**

**Rating Scale:**

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INTEGRITY</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Behaves in ways which are consistent with espoused values.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RESULTS</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Effectively interprets contract language to bargaining unit employees, administrators and others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EMPOWERMENT</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Urges staff to use their judgement and discretion, and to exercise autonomy once responsibilities are assigned.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Encourages innovation and creative thinking and promotes an environment of high expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>VISION</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Keeps service to students as a primary goal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supports the implementation of the district's goals and objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**
Feedback to Associate Superintendent for Human Resources, continued

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

ENERGY/PASSION/INITIATIVE

10. Seeks opportunities for improvement and supports them. 1 2 3 4 5

11. Volunteers to do tasks that will help the organization and the community. 1 2 3 4 5

SELF-CONFIDENCE

12. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 1 2 3 4 5

DEVELOPMENT

13. Shares knowledge and expertise with others. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMUNICATION

14. Communicates openly and honestly. 1 2 3 4 5

15. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 1 2 3 4 5

16. Communicates effectively with staff, colleagues, students, and community members. 1 2 3 4 5

WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY

17. Presents a positive image of the school both within and outside the community. 1 2 3 4 5

18. Maintains communication with other governmental agencies and teacher preparation institutions in the best interest of the district. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Curriculum

Rating Scale:

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

INTEGRITY

1. Actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

RESULTS

2. Accomplishes established goals and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Effectively manages district resources.
   (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION

5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Provides timely and germane staff supervision/evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5

EMPOWERMENT

8. Provides opportunities for ongoing professional development. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Facilitates an environment of high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Provides opportunities to focus energy, passion, and initiatives toward improvement and supports them. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Curriculum, continued

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

EMPOWERMENT, CONTINUED

13. Keep service to students as primary goal. 1 2 3 4 5

14. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan:
   Building a learning community for the 21st century. 1 2 3 4 5

SELF-CONFIDENCE

15. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 1 2 3 4 5

DEVELOPMENT

16. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMUNICATION

17. Communicates openly and honestly. 1 2 3 4 5

18. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 1 2 3 4 5

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

19. Demonstrates positive leadership when directing, motivating, and coordinating the activities of others. 1 2 3 4 5

20. Demonstrates the ability to guide diverse teams to accomplish goals. 1 2 3 4 5

21. Determines when change is needed and effectively manage changes through communication and problem solving. 1 2 3 4 5

22. Completes multiple projects in timely fashion. 1 2 3 4 5

23. Organizes and uses information collected from both internal and external sources. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Operational Services

Rating Scale:
1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

INTEGRITY
1. Walks the talk; actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

RESULTS
2. Effectively manages district resources (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5
3. Provides timely and responsive customer services. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively on teams. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK/CONFLICT RESOLUTION
5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals. 1 2 3 4 5

EMPOWERMENT
7. Encourages innovation and creative thinking. 1 2 3 4 5

VISION
8. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Keeps service to students as primary goal. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan. 1 2 3 4 5

ENERGY/PASSION/INITIATIVE
11. Seeks opportunities for improvement and supports them. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Operational Services, continued

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

**SELF-CONFIDENCE**

12. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues.  

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**DEVELOPMENT**

13. Shares knowledge and expertise with others.  

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**COMMUNICATIONS**


| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

15. Seeks to provide necessary equipment related to carrying out service areas.  

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

*SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT*
Feedback to Executive Director of Financial Services

Rating Scale:
1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

RESULTS
1. Demonstrates sound judgement and effective decision making to achieve the district's goals and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Effectively manages resources to provide timely and relevant results. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

LEADERSHIP
4. Encourages innovative and creative thinking and an environment of high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Urges staff to use their judgement and discretion for problem solving and completing daily duties. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Considers global consequences in decision making and actions. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK
7. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and making improvements. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMUNICATION
10. Communicates effectively. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Presents a positive image of the district. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director for Students with Special Needs

Rating Scale:
1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Actions are consistent with words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Effectively manages district resources. (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Solves problems in the best interest of the students and the district by finding common solutions or effective compromises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPOWERMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Encourages innovative and creative thinking and an environment of high expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Facilitates an environment of high expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF-CONFIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Communicates openly and honestly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Listens effectively and seeks to understand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Keeps service to students as primary goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Staff Services

Rating Scale:

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

INTEGRITY

1. Actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

RESULTS

2. Effectively interprets contract language to bargaining unit employees, administrators and others. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Provides timely responses to staff and others. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION

5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Works cooperatively with others in the district. 1 2 3 4 5

EMPOWERMENT

8. Provides opportunities for ongoing professional development. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Makes commitments and meets them. 1 2 3 4 5

VISION

11. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Keeps service to students as primary goal. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Staff Services, continued

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/Not applicable

**VISION, CONTINUED**

13. Supports the implementation of the district's goals and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5

**SELF-CONFIDENCE**

14. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 1 2 3 4 5

**DEVELOPMENT**

15. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others. 1 2 3 4 5

**COMMUNICATION**

16. Communicates openly and honestly. 1 2 3 4 5

17. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 1 2 3 4 5

**WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY**

18. Presents a positive image of the school both within and outside the community. 1 2 3 4 5

19. Maintains communications with other governmental agencies in the best interest of the district. 1 2 3 4 5

**SOURCE:** WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Board and Community Relations

Rating Scale:

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

INTEGRITY
1. Walks the talk; actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

RESULTS
2. Effectively manages district resources. (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5
3. Provides timely and responsive customer services. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively on teams. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Accomplishes established goals and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK/CONFLICT RESOLUTION
6. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals. 1 2 3 4 5

EMPOWERMENT
8. Encourages innovation and creative thinking and promotes an environment of high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5

VISION
9. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Seeks community input and support to improve the District's service to students. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Supports the implementation of the district's goals and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERSLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Director of Board and Community Relations, continued

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

ENERGY/PASSION/INITIATIVE

12. Seeks opportunities for improvement and supports them. 1 2 3 4 5

SELF-CONFIDENCE

13. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 1 2 3 4 5

DEVELOPMENT

14. Shares knowledge and expertise with others. 1 2 3 4 5

15. Encourages all staff to be positive ambassadors for the District. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMUNICATIONS

16. Communicates openly and honestly. 1 2 3 4 5

17. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 1 2 3 4 5

18. Facilitates effective two-way communication between the District and members of the community. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
## Principal Feedback from Parents

Please rate the performance of ________ on the following behaviors.

0 = Do not know/not applicable; 1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent is the building principal supportive of teachers?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the principal evaluate pupil progress in your school?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the principal demonstrate dedication and enthusiasm?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the principal effectively coordinate curriculum and instruction?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent are you satisfied with the way the principal includes parents in making decisions about matters that affect you and your children?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the principal in your child’s school consistently enforce rules?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is it easy to make an appointment to see the principal?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is it easy to talk with the principal?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the principal deal with problems in a tactful manner?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are you satisfied with the extent to which the principal seems to be planning for the needs of the schools and its programs?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are you satisfied with the opportunities parents and community members have for the input into decisions made by the principal?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are you satisfied with the extent of principal support for school activities?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Overall, are you satisfied with the principal of your child’s school?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Are you satisfied with the way students are treated by the principal?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you believe that discipline policies are fair at your child’s school?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you believe there is racial and ethnic fairness at your child’s school?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do you believe the principal is committed to preparing your child to enter the 21st Century?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Elementary Principal Feedback from Parents

Please rate the performance of __________________________ on the following behaviors.

0=Do not know/not applicable; 1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always

1. To what extent is the building principal supportive of teachers? 0 1 2 3 4
2. Does the principal evaluate pupil progress in your school? 0 1 2 3 4
3. Does your principal demonstrate dedication and enthusiasm? 0 1 2 3 4
4. Does the principal effectively coordinate curriculum and instruction? 0 1 2 3 4
5. To what extent are you satisfied with the way the principal includes parents in making decisions about matters that affect you and your children? 0 1 2 3 4
6. Does the principal in your child's school consistently enforce rules? 0 1 2 3 4
7. Is it easy to make an appointment to see the principal? 0 1 2 3 4
8. Is it easy to talk with the principal? 0 1 2 3 4
9. Does the principal deal with problems in a tactful manner? 0 1 2 3 4
10. Are you satisfied with the general level of competence of the principal? 0 1 2 3 4
11. Are you satisfied with the extent to which the principal seems to be planning for the needs of the schools and its programs? 0 1 2 3 4
12. Are you satisfied with the opportunities parents and community members have for the input into decisions made by the principal? 0 1 2 3 4
13. Are you satisfied with the extent of principal support for school activities? 0 1 2 3 4
14. Overall, are you satisfied with the principal of your child's school? 0 1 2 3 4
15. Are you satisfied with the way students are treated by the principal? 0 1 2 3 4
16. Do you believe that discipline policies are fair at your child's school? 0 1 2 3 4
17. Do you believe there is racial and ethnic fairness at your child's school? 0 1 2 3 4

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Elementary Principals from Teachers

Please rate the performance of __________________________ on the following behaviors.

0=Do not know/not applicable; 1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always

<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>To what extent does the principal evaluate pupil progress in our school?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To what extent is your principal dedicated and enthusiastic?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To what extent does the principal facilitate curriculum and instruction in your school?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To what extent does the principal deal tactfully with your problems?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Are you satisfied with the amount of input you have in the principal's decision that affect you and your classroom?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To what extent are you satisfied, overall, with the principal?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To what extent does the principal supervise or control your work assignment?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does the principal communicate openly and frankly with both staff and students?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the principal effectively run meetings, with a clear agenda and discussion limited to relevant topics?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Is the principal &quot;highly visible&quot; throughout the school?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Does the principal provide support to teachers on student discipline?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>At the principal's initiative, do teachers work together to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Does the principal possess organizational skills to effectively manage programs?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Does the principal use a variety of communication skills?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does the principal maintain an awareness and knowledge or recent research about the learning process?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does the principal promote positive relationships with students?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does the principal promote good school/community relations?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Elementary Principals from Teachers/Staff

Please rate the performance of ______________________ on the following behaviors.

0 = Do not know/not applicable; 1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always

1. Evaluates pupil progress in our school. 0 1 2 3 4
2. Demonstrates dedication and enthusiasm. 0 1 2 3 4
3. Facilitates curriculum and instruction in your school. 0 1 2 3 4
4. Deals tactfully with your problems. 0 1 2 3 4
5. Seeks input in decisions that affect you and your classroom. 0 1 2 3 4
6. Overall satisfaction with the principal. 0 1 2 3 4
7. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations. 0 1 2 3 4
8. Communicates openly and honestly. 0 1 2 3 4
9. Runs meetings effectively, with a clear agenda and discussion limited to relevant topics. 0 1 2 3 4
10. Is "highly visible" throughout the school. 0 1 2 3 4
11. Provides support to teachers on student discipline. 0 1 2 3 4
12. Initiates working together in teams to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades. 0 1 2 3 4
13. Possesses organizational skills to effectively manage programs. 0 1 2 3 4
14. Uses a variety of communication skills. 0 1 2 3 4
15. Maintains an awareness and knowledge on recent research about the learning process. 0 1 2 3 4
16. Promotes positive relationships with students. 0 1 2 3 4
17. Promotes good parent/community relations. 0 1 2 3 4

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
18. Supports the teacher. | 0 1 2 3 4
19. Supports the parents. | 0 1 2 3 4
20. Demonstrates high standards of honesty and integrity. | 0 1 2 3 4
21. Effectively manages building resources. | 0 1 2 3 4
22. Provides timely responses to staff. | 0 1 2 3 4
23. Provides timely information to parents. | 0 1 2 3 4
24. Provides timely information to staff. | 0 1 2 3 4
25. Considers global consequence in decision making and actions. | 0 1 2 3 4
26. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations. | 0 1 2 3 4
27. Encourages others to seek opportunities for continuous improvement. | 0 1 2 3 4
28. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. | 0 1 2 3 4
29. Recognizes all types of achievement. | 0 1 2 3 4
30. Incorporates staff participation in the building improvement plan and shared decision making process. | 0 1 2 3 4

**SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**
**Feedback to Secondary Principal**

**Rating Scale:**

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/Not applicable

Please select your group:

1. Administrator
2. Parent/Community
3. Teacher (grade level ___)
4. Student

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Demonstrates high standards of honesty and integrity. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Effectively manages building resources. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Seeks accomplishment through teams and works cooperatively with others. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Provides timely responses to staff/parents/students. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Promotes understanding and cooperation. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Encourages and supports creative thinking and innovation. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Considers global consequences in decision making and actions. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Is committed to student learning as a primary focus. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Encourages others to seek opportunities for continuous improvement. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Demonstrates initiative. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Shares knowledge, information, and expertise with others. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Communicates openly and honestly. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Recognizes all types of achievement. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Cares about all students (racial and ethnic fairness). 1 2 3 4 5
17. Disciplines fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
18. Supports teachers, parents, and students. 1 2 3 4 5
19. Demonstrates dedication and enthusiasm. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Coordinates instruction of the curricula. 1 2 3 4 5
21. Incorporates staff participation in the building improvement plan and shared decision making process. 1 2 3 4 5

**SOURCE:** WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
## Feedback to Secondary Principal

**Rating Scale:**
No mark=Do not know/not applicable; 1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always

### Please select your group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Administrator</th>
<th>2. Parent/Community</th>
<th>3. Teacher (Grade Level _____)</th>
<th>4. Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Feedback Items

1. Demonstrates high standards of honesty and integrity.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
2. Effectively manages building resources.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
3. Seeks accomplishment through teams and works cooperatively with others.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
4. Provides timely responses to staff/parents/students.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
5. Promotes understanding and cooperation.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
6. Encourages and supports creative thinking and innovation.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
7. Considers global consequences in decision making and actions.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
8. Is committed to student learning as a primary focus.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
9. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations.  
   - Rating: 1 2 3 4
10. Encourages others to seek opportunities for continuous improvement.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
11. Demonstrates initiative.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
12. Shares knowledge, information, and expertise with others.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
13. Communicates openly and honestly.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
14. Listens effectively and seeks to understand.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
15. Recognizes all types of achievements.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
16. Cares about all students (racial and ethnic fairness).  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
17. Disciplines fairly.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
18. Supports teachers, parents, and students  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
19. Demonstrates dedication and enthusiasm.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4
20. Coordinates instruction of the curricula.  
    - Rating: 1 2 3 4

**SOURCE:** WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Secondary Principal

Rating Scale:

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/Not applicable

Please select your group:

1. Administrator
2. Parent/Community
3. Teacher (grade level _______)
4. Student

1. Demonstrates high standards of honesty and integrity. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Effectively manages building resources. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Provides timely responses to staff. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Provides timely responses to parents. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Provides timely responses to students. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Promotes understanding and cooperation. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Encourages and supports creative thinking and innovation. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Considers global consequences in decision making. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Encourages others to seek opportunities for continuous improvement. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Demonstrates initiative. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Shares knowledge, information, and expertise with others. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Recognizes all types of achievement. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Supports teachers. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Supports parents. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Secondary Principal, continued

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/Not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supports students.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Coordinates instruction of the curricula.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Incorporates staff participation in the building improvement plan and shared decision making process.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Provides support to teachers on student discipline.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Is &quot;highly visible&quot; throughout the school.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Effectively runs meetings, with a clear agenda and discussion limited to relevant topics.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEEDBACK TO SECONDARY ADMINISTRATORS

Name of administrator being rated: ________________________________

Rating Scale:
5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

Please indicate your position:

Parent/Community
Teacher (grade level _______ )
Student

1. Demonstrates high standards of honesty and integrity. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Effectively manages building resources. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others. 5 4 3 2 1
4. Provides timely responses to staff/parents/students. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Promotes understanding and cooperation. 5 4 3 2 1
6. Encourages and supports creative thinking and innovation. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Considers global consequences in decision making and actions. 5 4 3 2 1
8. Is committed to student learning as a primary focus. 5 4 3 2 1
9. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations. 5 4 3 2 1
10. Encourages others to seek opportunities for continuous improvement. 5 4 3 2 1
11. Demonstrates initiative. 5 4 3 2 1
12. Shares knowledge, information, and expertise with others. 5 4 3 2 1
13. Communicates openly and honestly. 5 4 3 2 1
14. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: WEST DES MOINES COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
WEST DES MOINES SECONDARY ADMINISTRATOR FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION CODE</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community</td>
<td>1. Les Aasheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2. Kent Abrahamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3. Charlie Axtell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Jan Beatty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Bob Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>6. Lori Diebel – Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Steve Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Vicky Poole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Jay Prescott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Fae Ramsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Jack Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Georgianna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Bill Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Bob Woodard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Kathryn Zaun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the enclosed scan sheet, please rate the performance of [ ] on the following behaviors:

1 = Do not know       2 = Not at all
3 = Some of the time  4 = Most of the time  5 = Always

1. Demonstrates very high standards of honesty and integrity.
2. Manages effectively building resources (e.g., human, physical, financial).
3. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively on teams.
4. Provides timely responses to staff/parents/students.
5. Encourages understanding and cooperation.
6. Encourages and supports creative thinking and innovation.
7. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions.
8. Commits to student learning as primary focus.
9. Maintains an environment of high expectations.
10. Encourages others to seek opportunities for continuous improvement.
12. Shares knowledge and expertise with others.
13. Communicates openly and honestly.
14. Listens effectively and seeks to understand.
FEEDBACK TO ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (ELEMENTARY SCHOOL)

Name of administrative assistant being rated: _________________________________

Please select your group:
1. Parent/Community ________
2. Teacher ________
3. Student ________

Rating Scale:
5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

1. Demonstrates high standards of honesty and integrity. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Provides timely responses to staff/parents/students. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Encourages understanding and cooperation. 5 4 3 2 1
4. Consistently enforces rules. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Communicates openly and honestly. 5 4 3 2 1
6. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Deals with problems in a tactful manner. 5 4 3 2 1
8. Disciplines fairly. 5 4 3 2 1
9. Cares about all students (racial and ethnic fairness). 5 4 3 2 1
10. Promotes understanding and cooperation. 5 4 3 2 1
11. Provides support to teachers on student discipline. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
CLIENT FEEDBACK TO SECRETARIES

Name of secretary being rated: _____________________________

Rating Scale:
5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

INTEGRITY
1. Adheres to the highest standards of ethics. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Actions are consistent with words. 5 4 3 2 1

RESULTS
3. Produces high quality work. 5 4 3 2 1
4. Produces a high volume of work. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Provides timely and responsive service. 5 4 3 2 1

TEAMWORK/CONFLICT RESOLUTION
6. Works cooperatively with others in the district. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Tries to resolve conflicts directly with parties involved. 5 4 3 2 1

EMPOWERMENT
8. Makes commitments and meets them. 5 4 3 2 1
9. Supports opportunities for improving methods and processes. 5 4 3 2 1
10. Accepts responsibility and accountability for failures and successes. 5 4 3 2 1

ENERGY/PASSION/INITIATIVE
11. Takes initiative and is a self-starter. 5 4 3 2 1
12. Executes tasks and projects with intensity, focus, and effort. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Client Feedback to Secretaries, continued

5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

SELF-CONFIDENCE

13. Acknowledges own strengths and limitations; seeks candid feedback. 5 4 3 2 1
14. Fosters a "can do" attitude. 5 4 3 2 1
15. Stays focused under pressure. 5 4 3 2 1

DEVELOPMENT

16. Continues to further and develop knowledge. 5 4 3 2 1
17. Shares knowledge and expertise with others. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMUNICATIONS

18. Communicates openly and honestly with sensitivity. 5 4 3 2 1
19. Uses communication vehicles effectively: spoken, written, and electronic. 5 4 3 2 1
20. Listens effectively; is responsive to input. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
CLIENT FEEDBACK TO SECRETARIES

Name of secretary being rated: ________________________________

Rating Scale:

5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

INTEGRITY

1. Adheres to the highest standards of ethics. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Actions are consistent with words. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Information is handled in a confidential manner. 5 4 3 2 1

RESULTS

4. Uses work time efficiently. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Provides timely and responsive service. 5 4 3 2 1

TEAMWORK/CONFLICT RESOLUTION

6. Works cooperatively with others in the district. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Tries to resolve conflicts directly with parties involved. 5 4 3 2 1

EMPOWERMENT

8. Makes commitments and meets them. 5 4 3 2 1
9. Supports opportunities for improving methods and processes. 5 4 3 2 1
10. Accepts responsibility and accountability for failures and successes. 5 4 3 2 1

ENERGY/PASSION/INITIATIVE

11. Takes initiative and is a self-starter. 5 4 3 2 1
12. Executes tasks and projects with intensity, focus, and effort. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Client Feedback to Secretaries, continued

5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

SELF-CONFIDENCE

13. Acknowledges own strengths and limitations; seeks candid feedback.  
    5 4 3 2 1

14. Fosters a positive attitude.  
    5 4 3 2 1

15. Stays focused under pressure.  
    5 4 3 2 1

DEVELOPMENT

16. Continues to further and develop knowledge.  
    5 4 3 2 1

17. Shares knowledge and expertise with others.  
    5 4 3 2 1

COMMUNICATIONS

18. Communicates openly and honestly with sensitivity.  
    5 4 3 2 1

19. Uses communication vehicles effectively:  
    spoken, written, and electronic.  
    5 4 3 2 1

20. Listens effectively; is responsive to input.  
    5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
# PARENT/GUARDIAN FEEDBACK TO BUS DRIVER

**Name of bus driver being rated:**

**Route Number:**

## Rating Scale:

5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

## INTERACTIONS WITH STUDENTS

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Is fair and consistent in following district discipline guidelines.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cares about safety of my child on and off bus.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Treats my child with respect and dignity.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is sensitive to the needs of my child.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Demonstrates effective communication skills in dealing with my child.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DRIVING PERFORMANCE

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Drives in a proper and responsible manner.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Drives appropriately during adverse weather conditions.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Slows down at pickup points and looks carefully for my child.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Is helpful when my child is entering and leaving the bus.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Stays on schedule and is punctual.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Provides a clean and sanitary bus.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ATTITUDE

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Follows highest standards of ethics: &quot;Does the right thing.&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Provides courteous service to my child.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Treats my child as a valued customer.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Demonstrates positive attitude toward the safety of my child.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

**SOURCE:** RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
FEEDBACK TO INSTRUCTIONAL AIDES

Name of aide being rated: ____________________________________________

Rating Scale:

5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

1. Develops and maintains positive relations with students. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Maintains confidentiality in sensitive matters. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Cooperates with teachers in the best interest of the student. 5 4 3 2 1
4. Maintains a positive attitude. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Executes tasks and projects with intensity, focus, and effort. 5 4 3 2 1
6. Uses communication vehicles effectively: spoken, written, and electronic. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Conducts self in a professional manner. 5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
May 12, 1998

Dear Student:

Riverhead Middle School seeks your help with reviewing counselor performance. The District’s Performance Evaluation System calls for a review of middle school counselors. A component of this evaluation process includes seeking feedback from students regarding the job performance of counselors. The enclosed feedback instrument is intended to solicit input from students on various criteria indicative of exemplary counseling. This process of evaluation and feedback is designed to enhance communication and to enable continuous improvement and effectiveness of the middle school counselor.

Enclosed is a 10-item survey, a scanform, and return envelope. Use a number two pencil to fill in the numbered circle which best represents your perception of how well each criterion is being met. The lowest level of performance is a score of 1 and the highest is a score of 4. If you feel that you have no basis for making a judgement (do not know), leave that number unmarked. No mark will register zero (0). Please return the survey and scanform in the enclosed envelope to Ms. Bonnie Campbell no later than June 8, 1998. We thank you for your help in this important matter.

Thank you.

enclosures:
Survey
Scanform
Return Envelope
May 12, 1998

Dear Student:

Riverhead High School seeks your help with reviewing counselor performance. The District's Performance Evaluation System calls for a review of high school counselors. A component of this evaluation process includes seeking feedback from students regarding the job performance of high school counselors. The enclosed feedback instrument is intended to solicit input from students on various criteria indicative of exemplary counseling. This process of evaluation and feedback is designed to enhance communication and to enable continuous improvement and effectiveness of the high school counselor.

Enclosed is a 16-item survey, a scanform, and return envelope. Use a number two pencil to fill in the numbered circle which best represents your perception of how well each criterion is being met. The lowest level of performance is a score of 1 and the highest is a score of 4. If you feel that you have no basis for making a judgement (do not know), leave that number unmarked. No mark will register zero (0). We invite you to add your written comments on the bottom portion of the feedback survey. Please return the survey and scanform in the enclosed envelope to Ms. Bonnie Campbell no later than June 8, 1998.

We greatly appreciate your help in this important undertaking.

Thank you.

enclosures:
Survey
Scanform
Return Envelope
SAMPLE COUNSELOR FEEDBACK

Name of counselor being rated: ____________________________________________

Rating Scale:

5=Do not know/Not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My counselor works with all students, not just &quot;special&quot; or &quot;problem&quot; students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My counselor is well prepared.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My counselor is available to help students during class time and other times during the school day.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My counselor treats all students fairly.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I've gained useful information from my counselor.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My counselor encourages me to feel good about myself.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My counselor appears to work well with other adults.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My counselor appears to truly care about my academic well being.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My counselor appears to truly care about my social well being.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>I like the color red.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My time with my counselor is interesting.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We do the same thing every week.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I pay attention to what we talk about.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We talk about things my friends and I need to know.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My counselor expects too much of me.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sometimes my counselor gives me things to work on.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My counselor is always ready with things for us to do.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My counselor helps me follow the rules.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My counselor is fair to everybody.</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My counselor cares if I waste our time together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I try to do what my counselor and I agree on even when we’re not together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I can get help from my counselor when I need it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My counselor tells me that I do good work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My counselor helps me figure out how I can do better in school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My counselor is ready for me when it is time for our meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I know what my counselor expects from me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My counselor is easy to understand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My counselor helps me feel better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My counselor explains new things in a way that is easy for me to learn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My counselor gives me a chance to talk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
## Middle School Counselor Assessment

**Rating Scale:**

0=Do not know/not applicable; 1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My counselor treats me courteously, fairly and respectfully.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My counselor encourages me to explore ways to achieve my goals.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My counselor demonstrates concern about my courses and grades.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My counselor responds to my request for appointments in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My counselor encourages me to feel good about myself.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My counselor is available to help me.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When I have a question, concern, or problem my counselor helps me.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My counselor provides me with problem solving and decision making skills.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My counselor provides me with career information.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My counselor assists me with planning my 9th grade schedule and 4-year plan (8th grade students only.)</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to each of the following questions.

1. Do you use Guidance computers, book, and files?
2. Would you like to spend more time with your counselor?
3. How many times have you seen your counselor this year?
4. What changes would you like to see in Guidance?
5. What can we do to better meet your needs?

Comments:

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
# High School Counselor Assessment

**Rating Scale:**

0=Do not know/not applicable; 1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My counselor treats me courteously, fairly and respectfully.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My counselor encourages me to explore ways to achieve my goals.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My counselor demonstrates concern about my courses and grades.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My counselor responds to my request for appointments in a timely fashion.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My counselor encourages me to feel good about myself.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My counselor is available to help me.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When I have a question, concern, or problem my counselor helps me.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have been given useful information about colleges and/or careers.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My counselor helps me select and understand school courses and graduation requirements.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My counselor encourages me to be successful and take responsibility for myself.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to each of the following questions.

1. Do you use Guidance computers, book, and files? _______________________
2. Would you like to spend more time with your counselor? _______________________
3. How many times have you seen your counselor this year? _______________________
4. What changes would you like to see in Guidance? _______________________
5. Has the counseling department helped you meet your post graduate needs? _______________________
6. What can we do to better meet your needs? _______________________

**Comments:**

**SOURCE:** RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
October 27, 1997

Dear (Parent/Community Member):

(Dr. Doug Buchanan, Associate Superintendent of Teaching and Learning Services) seeks your help with reviewing his job performance. The West Des Moines Community School Performance Evaluation System calls for an annual review of all administrators. A component of this evaluation process includes seeking feedback from (parents and/or members of the community) regarding the job performance of the associate superintendents. The enclosed feedback survey is intended to solicit input from constituents on various criteria indicative of exemplary leadership. This process of evaluation and feedback is designed to enhance communication and to enable continuous improvement and effectiveness of the superintendency.

Enclosed is a 15-item feedback survey, a scanform, and return envelope. Use a number two pencil to fill in the numbered circle which best represents your perception of how well each criterion is being met. The lowest level of performance is a score of 1 and the highest is a score of 4. If you feel that you have no basis for making a judgement, please fill in the 5 (five) circle for Do Not Know. We invite you to add your written comments on the backside of the feedback survey. Please return the survey and scanform in the enclosed envelope to the Learning Resource Center no later than (Date).

We greatly appreciate your help in this important undertaking, which has as its ultimate goal the improvement of teaching and learning at West Des Moines Community Schools.

Thank you,

Enclosures:
- Feedback survey
- Scanform
- Return envelope
### Feedback to Associate Superintendents

Please rate the performance of (Dr. Doug Buchanan) on the following behaviors:

1 = Not at All; 2 = Some of the Time; 3 = Most of the Time; 4 = Always, 5 = Do Not Know

#### Please select the administrator being evaluated:
- (K) Doug Buchanan
- (L) Tom Downs
- (M) Galen Howsare

#### Please select your group:
- (1) Administrator Leadership Team
- (2) Learning Resource Center Personnel
- (3) Parent/Community Member
- (4) Secondary Teacher (7-12)
- (5) Elementary Teacher (K-6)
- (6) Secondary Support (7-12)
- (7) Elementary Support (K-6)

#### Integrity
1. Walks the talk; actions are consistent with words.  
   1 2 3 4 5

#### Results
2. Effectively manages district resources (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.)  
   1 2 3 4 5
3. Provides timely and responsive customer services.  
   1 2 3 4 5
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively on teams.  
   1 2 3 4 5

#### Teamwork/Conflict Resolution
5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community.  
   1 2 3 4 5
6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals.  
   1 2 3 4 5

#### Empowerment
7. Encourages innovation and creative thinking.  
   1 2 3 4 5

#### Vision
8. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions.  
   1 2 3 4 5
9. Keeps service to students as primary goal.  
   1 2 3 4 5
10. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan: Building a learning community for the 21st century.  
    1 2 3 4 5

#### Energy/Passion/Initiative
11. Seeks opportunities for improvement and supports them.  
    1 2 3 4 5

#### Self-Confidence
12. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues.  
    1 2 3 4 5

#### Development
13. Shares knowledge and expertise with others.  
    1 2 3 4 5

#### Communications
    1 2 3 4 5
15. Seeks first to understand the client's point of view.  
    1 2 3 4 5

**SOURCE:** WEST DES MOINES COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Associate Superintendent for Educational Services

Rating Scale:

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

INTEGRITY

1. Actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

RESULTS

2. Accomplishes established goals and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Effectively manages district resources. (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION

5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Provides timely and germane staff supervision/evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5

EMPOWERMENT

8. Provides opportunities for ongoing professional development. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Encourages innovative and creative thinking and an environment of high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Facilitates an environment of high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5

VISION

11. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Keeps service to students as primary goal. 1 2 3 4 5

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Associate Superintendent for Educational Services, continued

1=Not at all; 2=To some extent; 3=To a great extent; 4=Always; 5=Do not know/not applicable

VISION, CONTINUED

13. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan:
   Building a learning community for the 21st century. 1 2 3 4 5

SELF-CONFIDENCE

14. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 1 2 3 4 5

DEVELOPMENT

15. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMUNICATIONS

16. Communicates openly and honestly. 1 2 3 4 5
17. Listens effectively and seeks to understand. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
FEEDBACK TO SUPERINTENDENT

Name of superintendent being rated: ________________________________

Rating Scale:
5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

Please indicate your position:

1. Central Office
2. Principal
3. Parent/Community Member
4. Secondary Teacher
5. Middle School Teacher
6. Elementary teacher
7. Secondary Support
8. Middle School Support
9. Elementary Support

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Demonstrates positive leadership when directing, motivating, and coordinating the activities of others. 5 4 3 2 1

2. Works effectively with Assistant Superintendent, district-wide and building administrators, community members, and Board of Education to meet goals. 5 4 3 2 1

3. Demonstrates the ability to guide diverse teams to accomplish goals. 5 4 3 2 1

4. Provides adequate opportunities for staff development and for employee self-assessment. 5 4 3 2 1

5. Determines when change is needed and effectively manages change through communication, problem solving, and, when appropriate, application of technology. 5 4 3 2 1

6. Sets standards to improve the district and involves community and employees. 5 4 3 2 1

7. Develops goals, prioritizes demands, manages resources to achieve objectives, and links plans with District philosophy. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Superintendent, continued

5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS, CONTINUED

8. Completes multiple projects in timely fashion. 5 4 3 2 1
9. Organizes and uses information collected from both internal and external sources. 5 4 3 2 1
10. Makes timely decisions which reflect the impact on District goals and operations, students, faculty and administration. 5 4 3 2 1
11. Communicates clearly to all audiences. 5 4 3 2 1
12. Solves problems in the best interest of the District by finding common solutions or effective compromise. 5 4 3 2 1

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE FACTORS

13. Meets regularly with and orients members of the administrative team. 5 4 3 2 1
14. Monitors student achievement. 5 4 3 2 1
15. Conducts confidential student discipline hearings assuring due process rights for all parties. 5 4 3 2 1

WORKING WITH THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

16. Demonstrates ability to be the Board’s executive officer through communication, well-defined recommendations, and serving as spokesperson for collective bargaining. 5 4 3 2 1
17. Offers professional advice on all matters requiring Board action, placing before the Board such facts and quality information needed to make informed decisions. 5 4 3 2 1
18. Keeps the Board informed on problems, solutions, and general operations of the school system. 5 4 3 2 1
19. Provides effective assistance and guidance to the Board in developing and maintaining Board policies. 5 4 3 2 1
20. Assists the Board in self-improvement through conducting inservice activities, evaluation sessions, and development of Board goals. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Superintendent, continued

5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

WORKING WITH THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, CONTINUED

21. Attempts to create and maintain a harmonious and trustworthy working relationship with the Board.
   5 4 3 2 1

MAINTAINING A PERSONNEL REALATIONS PROGRAM

22. Makes decisions with counsel and advice of appropriate staff and accepts responsibility for decisions.
   5 4 3 2 1

23. Solicits broad-based participation of staff members and groups in planning procedures and policy interpretations.
   5 4 3 2 1

MANAGING OPERATIONS

24. Provides leadership skills to assist the Board in the process of planning long- and short-range goals.
   5 4 3 2 1

25. Develops annual goals and implements plans to attain goals, which include progress reports to all stakeholders.
   5 4 3 2 1

26. Effectively supervises fiscal operation of the district.
   5 4 3 2 1

WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY

27. Establishes and maintains a community relations program through communication with both the general public and parents.
   5 4 3 2 1

28. Establishes open communication with the news media through high visibility and regular meetings.
   5 4 3 2 1

29. Presents a positive image of the school both within and outside the community.
   5 4 3 2 1

30. Solicits parent and community input and commitment to district goals, policies, and programs.
    5 4 3 2 1

31. Maintains communications with other governmental agencies in the best interest of the District.
    5 4 3 2 1

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: RIVERHEAD CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
FEEDBACK TO SUPERINTENDENT

Name of superintendent being rated: ____________________________

Rating Scale:

5=Do not know/not applicable; 4=Always; 3=To a great extent; 2=To some extent; 1=Not at all

Please indicate your position(s)

1. Central Office
2. Principal
3. Parent/Community member
4. Secondary Teacher
5. Middle School Teacher
6. Elementary Teacher
7. Secondary Support
8. Middle School Support
9. Elementary Support

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Demonstrates positive leadership when directing, motivating, and coordinating the activities of others. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Works effectively with district-wide and building administrators, community members, and Board of Education to meet goals. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Demonstrates the ability to guide diverse teams to accomplish goals. 5 4 3 2 1
4. Provides adequate opportunities for staff development and for employee self-assessment. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Determines when change is needed and effectively manages change through communication, problem solving, and, when appropriate, application of technology. 5 4 3 2 1
6. Sets standards to improve the district and involves community and employees. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Develops goals, prioritizes demands, manages resources to achieve objectives, and links plans with District philosophy. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Superintendent, continued

5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS, CONTINUED

8. Completes multiple projects in timely fashion. 5 4 3 2 1

9. Organizes and uses information collected from both internal and external sources. 5 4 3 2 1

10. Makes timely decisions which reflect the impact on District goals and operations, students, faculty, and administration. 5 4 3 2 1

11. Communicates clearly to all audiences. 5 4 3 2 1

12. Solves problems in the best interest of the District by finding common solutions or effective compromise. 5 4 3 2 1

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE FACTORS

13. Meets regularly with and orients members of the administrative team. 5 4 3 2 1

14. Monitors student achievement. 5 4 3 2 1

15. Conducts confidential student discipline hearings assuring due process rights for all parties. 5 4 3 2 1

WORKING WITH THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

16. Demonstrates ability to be the Board’s executive officer through communication, well-defined recommendations, and serving as spokesperson for collective bargaining. 5 4 3 2 1

17. Offers professional advice on all matters requiring Board action, placing before the Board such facts and quality information needed to make informed decisions. 5 4 3 2 1

18. Keeps the Board informed on problems, solutions, and general operations of the school system. 5 4 3 2 1

19. Provides effective assistance and guidance to the Board in developing and maintaining Board policies. 5 4 3 2 1

20. Assists the Board in self-improvement through conducting inservice activities, evaluation sessions, and development of Board goals. 5 4 3 2 1

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Superintendent, continued

5 = Do not know/not applicable; 4 = Always; 3 = To a great extent; 2 = To some extent; 1 = Not at all

WORKING WITH THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, CONTINUED

21. Attempts to create and maintain a harmonious and trustworthy working relationship with the board.

MAINTAINING A PERSONNEL RELATIONS PROGRAM

22. Makes decisions with counsel and advice of appropriate staff and accepts responsibility for decisions.

23. Solicits broad-based participation of staff members and groups in planning procedures and policy interpretations.

MANAGING OPERATIONS

24. Provides leadership skills to assist the Board in the process of planning long- and short-range goals.

25. Develops annual goals and implements plans to attain goals, which include progress reports to all stakeholders.

26. Effectively supervises fiscal operation of the district.

WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY

27. Establishes and maintains a community relations program through communication with both the general public and parents.

28. Establishes open communication with the news media through high visibility and regular meetings.

29. Presents a positive image of the school both within and outside the community.

30. Solicits parent and community input and commitment to district goals, policies, and programs.

31. Maintains communications with other governmental agencies in the best interest of the District.

COMMENTS:

SOURCE: CAMP VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Superintendent
Educational Service Center

Rating Scale

0 = Do not know/Not applicable; 1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always

Please indicate your position:
1. Central Office
2. Principal
3. Parent/Community Member
4. Secondary Teacher
5. Middle School Teacher
6. Elementary Teacher
7. Student Leader

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

1. Demonstrates positive leadership when directing, motivating, and coordinating the activities of others. 0 1 2 3 4
2. Works effectively with Associate Superintendents, central administrators, community members, and Board of Education to meet goals. 0 1 2 3 4
3. Provides adequate opportunities for staff development and for employee self-assessment. 0 1 2 3 4
4. Determines when change is needed and effectively manages change through communication and problem solving. 0 1 2 3 4
5. Sets standards to improve the district and involves community and employees. 0 1 2 3 4
6. Develops goals, prioritizes demands, manages resources to achieve objectives, and links plans with District philosophy. 0 1 2 3 4
7. Communicates clearly to all audiences. 0 1 2 3 4
8. Demonstrates sensitivity to the diversity of the population within the schools and community, and promotes a positive view of diversity. 0 1 2 3 4

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Feedback to Superintendent, Educational Service Center, continued

0 = Do not know/Not applicable; 1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always

**GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS, CONTINUED**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Creates a feeling of unity and enthusiasm among those in contact with the Superintendent.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shows a willingness to try new approaches or methods.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Has the ability to see and articulate a &quot;bigger picture&quot;.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maintains high standards of ethics, honesty, and integrity in all personal and professional matters.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Keeps current on educational issues and on sound initiatives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE FACTORS**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Meets regularly with, and orients members of the administrative team.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Monitors student achievement and makes recommendations for improvement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Utilizes team effort to organize a planned program of curriculum development, evaluation, assessment, and improvements.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WORKING WITH THE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Demonstrates ability to be the Board's executive officer through communication and well-defined recommendations.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Offers professional advice on all matters requiring Board action, placing before the Board such facts and quality information needed to make informed decisions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Keeps the Board informed on problems, solutions, and general operations of the school system.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Attempts to create and maintain a harmonious and trustworthy working relationship with the Board.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**
203

Feedback to Superintendent, Educational Service Center, continued

0 = Do not know/Not applicable; 1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always

WORKING WITH THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, CONTINUED

21. Makes recommendations to the Board for expansion, new construction, remodeling, etc. of buildings and equipment of the district. 0 1 2 3 4

22. Advises and makes recommendations to the Board on personnel matters involving contract negotiations and contract management, specifically, on such matters that affect the budget. 0 1 2 3 4

DEVELOPING AND MANAGING STAFF PERSONNEL AND OPERATIONS

23. Makes decisions with counsel and advice of appropriate staff and accepts responsibility for decisions. 0 1 2 3 4

24. Effectively plans and manages financial operations of the district. 0 1 2 3 4

25. Assigns administrative functions which demonstrate his/her ability to manage with an administrative team philosophy. 0 1 2 3 4

26. Maintains open, effective communication lines with all staff and makes periodic on-site visits. 0 1 2 3 4

WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY

27. Establishes and maintains a community relations program through communication with both the general public and parents. 0 1 2 3 4

28. Establishes open communication with the new media and maintains appropriate visibility. 0 1 2 3 4

29. Presents a positive image of the schools by participation in community life and activities. Participates in professional organizations. 0 1 2 3 4

30. Encourages open communication with students, staff, and parents through and established process. Solicits parent and community input and commitment to district goals, policies, and programs. 0 1 2 3 4

31. Strives to build effective relationships between business, municipalities and the school district. 0 1 2 3 4

SOURCE: WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Waterloo Community Schools
Feedback to Director of Operational Services
Jack Fitzgerald

Rating Scale:
1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

INTEGRITY
1. Walks the talk; actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

RESULTS
2. Effectively manages district resources (e.g. human, physical, financial, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5
3. Provides timely and responsive customer services. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively on teams. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK/CONFLICT RESOLUTION
5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals. 1 2 3 4 5

EMPOWERMENT
7. Encourages innovation and creative thinking. 1 2 3 4 5

VISION
8. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Keeps service to students as primary goal. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Supports the implementation of the district’s systemic plan. 1 2 3 4 5

ENERGY/PASSION/INITIATIVE
11. Seeks opportunities for improvement and supports them. 1 2 3 4 5

SELF-CONFIDENCE
12. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues. 1 2 3 4 5
DEVELOPMENT

13. Shares knowledge and expertise with others.  

COMMUNICATIONS


15. Seeks to provide necessary equipment related to carrying out service areas.
Waterloo Community School District
Feedback to Director of Volunteer Services
Michelle Temeyer

Rating Scale:
1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

INTEGRITY
1. Actions are consistent with words. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMUNITY RELATIONS
2. Enables community members to accomplish work for the district. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Brings school and community together to benefit students and staff. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Facilitates cooperative arrangements with community groups. 1 2 3 4 5

RESULTS
5. Accomplishes established goals and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Effectively manages district resources (e.g. human, physical, financial, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5
7. Provides timely responses to staff/parents/students and others. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION
9. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Provides timely and germane staff supervision/evaluation. 1 2 3 4 5

EMPOWERMENT
12. Provides opportunities for ongoing professional development. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Encourages innovative and creative thinking and an environment of high expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
14. Facilitates an environment of high expectations.

VISION

15. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions.

16. Keeps service to students as primary goal.

17. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan.

SELF-CONFIDENCE

18. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues.

DEVELOPMENT

19. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others.

COMMUNICATIONS

20. Communicates openly and honestly.

21. Listens effectively and seeks to understand.

COMMENTS:
Waterloo Community School District
Feedback to Director of Curriculum

Peggy Wainwright

Rating Scale:
1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

INTEGRITY
1. Actions are consistent with words

RESULTS
2. Accomplishes established goals and objectives
3. Effectively manages district resources (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.)
4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others.

TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION
5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community.
6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals.
7. Provides timely and germane staff supervision/evaluation

EMPOWERMENT
8. Provides opportunities for ongoing professional development.
9. Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations.
10. Facilitates an environment of high expectations.
11. Provides opportunities to focus energy, passion and initiatives toward improvement and supports them
12. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions.
13. Keep service to students as primary goal
14. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan: Building a learning community for the 21st century.

SELF-CONFIDENCE
15. Seeks out different perspective in resolving problems and issues.
DEVELOPMENT

16. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others.

COMMUNICATION

17. Communicates openly and honestly.

18. Listens effectively and seeks to understand.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

19. Demonstrates positive leadership when directing, motivating, and coordinating the activities of others.

20. Demonstrates the ability to guide diverse teams to accomplish goals.

21. Determines when change is needed and effectively manage changes through communication and problem solving.

22. Completes multiple projects in timely fashion.

23. Organizes and uses information collected from both internal and external sources.
## Waterloo Community School District

### Feedback to Director

**Patrick Clancy**

**Rating Scale:**

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRITY</strong></td>
<td>1. Actions are consistent with words.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESULTS</strong></td>
<td>2. Effectively manages district resources. (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively on teams.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Accomplishes established goals and objectives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION</strong></td>
<td>5. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Breaks down barriers to achieve goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Solves problems in the best interest of the students and the district by finding common solutions or effective compromises.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPOWERMENT</strong></td>
<td>8. Encourages innovative and creative thinking and an environment of high expectations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Facilitates an environment of high expectations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-CONFIDENCE</strong></td>
<td>10. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td>11. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td>12. Communicates openly and honestly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Listens effectively and seeks to understand.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISION</strong></td>
<td>14. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Keeps service to students as primary goal.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Supports the implementation of the district’s systemic plan.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Waterloo Community School District
### Feedback to Executive Director of Financial Services
### Greg Schmitz

**Rating Scale:**

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrates sound judgement and effective decision making to achieve the district's goals and objectives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effectively manages resources to provide timely and relevant results.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Actions are consistent with words.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourages innovative and creative thinking and an environment of high expectations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Urges staff to use their judgement and discretion for problem solving and completing daily duties.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Considers global consequences in decision making and actions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAMWORK</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and making improvements.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Communicates effectively.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Presents a positive image of the district.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**


### Waterloo Community School District
#### Feedback to Director of Staff Services

**Sharon Droste**

**Rating Scale:**

| 1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INTEGRITY</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actions are consistent with words.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RESULTS</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectively interprets contract language to bargaining unit employees, administrators and others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides timely responses to staff and others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TEAMWORK/SUPERVISION/CONFLICT RESOLUTION</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates understanding and cooperation among all members of the learning community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks down barriers to achieve goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works cooperatively with others in the district.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EMPOWERMENT</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities for ongoing professional development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes commitments and meets them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>VISION</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps service to students as primary goal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports the implementation of the district’s goals and objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SELF-CONFIDENCE</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DEVELOPMENT</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shares information, knowledge, and expertise with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNICATION

17. Listens effectively and seeks to understand.

WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY

18. Presents a positive image of the school both within and outside the community.
19. Maintains communications with other governmental agencies in the best interest of the district.
Waterloo Community School District
Feedback to Director of Student Services

Bernard Cooper

Rating Scale:
1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEGRITY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Actions are consistent with words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accomplishes established goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effectively manages district resources (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seeks accomplishments through teams and works cooperatively with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Effectively manages district resources (e.g., human, physical, financial, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Considers global consequences (systemic view) in decision making and actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Keeps service to students as primary goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supports the implementation of the district's systemic plan: Building a learning community for the 21st century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELF-CONFIDENCE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Seeks out different perspectives in resolving problems and issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Communicates openly and honestly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Listens effectively and seeks to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Establishes and maintains a community relations program through communication with both the general public and parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Establishes open communication with the news media through high visibility and regular meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Presents a positive image of the school both within and outside the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Solicits parent and community input and commitment to district goals, policies, and programs. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Maintains communication with other governmental agencies in the best interest of the district. 1 2 3 4 5

TEAMWORK/CONFLICT RESOLUTION
16. Works cooperatively with others in the district. 1 2 3 4 5
17. Tries to resolve conflicts directly with parties involved. 1 2 3 4 5

GENERAL PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS
18. Demonstrates positive leadership when directing, motivating and coordinating the activities of others. 1 2 3 4 5
19. Works effectively with the assistant superintendent, district-wide and building administrators, community members, and Board of Education to meet goals. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Demonstrates the ability to guide diverse teams to accomplish goals. 1 2 3 4 5
21. Provides adequate opportunities for staff development and for employee self-assessment. 1 2 3 4 5
22. Sets standards to improve the district and involves the community and employees. 1 2 3 4 5
23. Develops goals, prioritizes demands, manages resources to achieve objectives, and links plans with the district philosophy. 1 2 3 4 5
24. Completes multiple projects in a timely fashion. 1 2 3 4 5
25. Organizes and uses information collected from both internal and external sources. 1 2 3 4 5
### Waterloo Community School District

#### Feedback to Secondary Principal

**Gail Moon**

**Rating Scale:**

No mark = Do not know/not applicable; 1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always

**Please select your group:**

1. Administrator
2. Parent/Community
3. Teacher (grade level)
4. Student

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Demonstrates high standards of honesty and integrity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Effectively manages building resources.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Seeks accomplishment through teams and works cooperatively with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Provides timely responses to staff/parents/students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Promotes understanding and cooperation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Encourages and supports creative thinking and innovation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Considers global consequences in decision making and actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Is committed to student learning as a primary focus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Maintains an environment which promotes high expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Encourages others to seek opportunities for continuous improvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Demonstrates initiative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Shares knowledge, information, and expertise with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Communicates openly and honestly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Listens effectively and seeks to understand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Recognizes all types of achievement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Cares about all students (racial and ethnic fairness).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Disciplines fairly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Supports teachers, parents, and students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Demonstrates dedication and enthusiasm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Coordinates instruction of the curricula.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Incorporates staff participation in the building improvement plan and shared decision making process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waterloo Community Schools  
Feedback to Teachers by Students  
(Grades K-2, Student Version)

Rate your teachers performance on the following items:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My teacher makes the school day interesting for me.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My teacher gives me enough time to do my work.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I pay attention in my teacher's class.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My teacher talks about lessons being studied.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My teacher gives me homework that is too hard.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My teacher gives me homework.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My teacher comes to class on time.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My teacher requires students to follow the rules.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My teacher gives me tests often.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My teacher cares if I waste time in class.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Even when my teacher is not watching, I work in class.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I can get help from my teacher when I need it.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My teacher gives me new work to do when I'm ready for it.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My teacher tells me where I can find more information to help me learn about my lesson.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My teacher is ready for class when it is time to begin.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My teacher is clear in what he/she wants me to do.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My teacher gives me interesting work if I finish my work before class is over.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My teacher teaches hard lessons in small steps.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My teacher gives my work back quickly.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My teacher tells me what new things I can learn in each lesson.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>My teacher gives me work that is too easy.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My teacher knows me well.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My teacher is well prepared.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>My teacher uses a variety of classroom activities and resources.</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waterloo Community Schools
Feedback to Teachers by Students
(Grades 3-5, Student Version)

Rate your teacher on the following items:
1 = never; 2 = not often; 3 = sometimes; 4 = usually; 5 = almost always

1. My teacher makes work interesting for me. 1 2 3 4 5
2. My teacher makes the school day interesting. 1 2 3 4 5
3. We go back over lessons when we finish them. 1 2 3 4 5
4. My teacher gives me work to do at home. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Our discussions are about the subject being studied. 1 2 3 4 5
6. My teacher returns my work quickly. 1 2 3 4 5
7. My teacher makes me feel good when I do good work. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I can get help from my teacher. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I finish my work before class is over. 1 2 3 4 5
10. If I finish my work before class is over, my teacher gives me interesting work. 1 2 3 4 5
11. My teacher gives new work without making me wait a long time for it. 1 2 3 4 5
12. My teacher explains lessons clearly. 1 2 3 4 5
13. My teacher knows me well. 1 2 3 4 5
14. My teacher explains new things in a way that is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
15. My teacher tells me what new things I can learn in each lesson. 1 2 3 4 5
16. My teacher explains new things in a way that is easy to understand. 1 2 3 4 5
17. My teacher is available to help me during class time and other times during the school day. 1 2 3 4 5
18. My teacher uses a variety of classroom activities. 1 2 3 4 5
19. My teacher is well prepared. 1 2 3 4 5
20. The work in my class is too hard for me. 1 2 3 4 5
21. The work in my class is too easy for me. 1 2 3 4 5
22. My teacher begins lessons by explaining what we are going to do and why we are going to do it. 1 2 3 4 5
23. My teacher monitors my work to see if I understand the lesson. 1 2 3 4 5
24. My teacher listens to me. 1 2 3 4 5
25. My teacher cares about me. 1 2 3 4 5
Waterloo Community Schools

Feedback to Elementary Principals from Teachers

Please rate the performance of ________________ on the following behaviors.

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

<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>To what extent does the principal evaluate pupil progress in your school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To what extent is your principal dedicated and enthusiastic?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To what extent does the principal facilitate curriculum and instruction in your school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To what extent does the principal deal tactfully with your problems?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Are you satisfied with the amount of input you have in the principal's decisions that affect you and your classroom?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To what extent are you satisfied, overall, with the principal?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To what extent does the principal supervise or control your work assignment?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does the principal communicate openly and frankly with both staff and students?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the principal effectively run meetings, with a clear agenda and discussion limited to relevant topics?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Is the principal “highly visible” throughout the school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Does the principal provide support to teachers on student discipline?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>At the principal’s initiative, do teachers work together to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Does the principal possess organizational skills to effectively manage programs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Does the principal use a variety of communication skills?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does the principal maintain an awareness and knowledge of recent research about the learning process?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does the principal promote positive relationships with students?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does the principal promote good school/community relations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waterloo Community Schools

Elementary Principal Feedback from Parents

Please rate the performance of ____________________ on the following behaviors.

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<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>To what extent is the building principal supportive of teachers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does the principal evaluate pupil progress in your school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does the principal demonstrate dedication and enthusiasm?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does the principal effectively coordinate curriculum and instruction?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To what extent are you satisfied with the way the principal includes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parents in making decisions about matters that affect you and your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Does the principal in your child’s school consistently enforce rules?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Is it easy to make an appointment to see the principal?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is it easy to talk with the principal?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the principal deal with problems in a tactful manner?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Are you satisfied with the general level of competence of the principal?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Are you satisfied with the extent to which the principal seems to be</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning for the needs of the school and its programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Are you satisfied with the opportunities parents and community members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have for input into decisions made by the principal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Are you satisfied with the extent of principal support for school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Overall, are you satisfied with the principal of your child’s school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Are you satisfied with the way students are treated by the principal?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Do you believe that discipline policies are fair at your child’s school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Do you believe there is racial and ethnic fairness at your child’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waterloo Community Schools
Feedback to Elementary Principals from Teachers

Please rate the performance of __________________ on the following behaviors.

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

1. To what extent does the principal evaluate pupil progress in your school? 1 2 3 4 5
2. To what extent is your principal dedicated and enthusiastic? 1 2 3 4 5
3. To what extent does the principal facilitate curriculum and instruction in your school? 1 2 3 4 5
4. To what extent does the principal deal tactfully with your problems? 1 2 3 4 5
5. Are you satisfied with the amount of input you have in the principal’s decisions that affect you and your classroom? 1 2 3 4 5
6. To what extent are you satisfied, overall, with the principal? 1 2 3 4 5
7. To what extent does the principal supervise or control your work assignment? 1 2 3 4 5
8. Does the principal communicate openly and frankly with both staff and students? 1 2 3 4 5
9. Does the principal effectively run meetings, with a clear agenda and discussion limited to relevant topics? 1 2 3 4 5
10. Is the principal “highly visible” throughout the school? 1 2 3 4 5
11. Does the principal provide support to teachers on student discipline? 1 2 3 4 5
12. At the principal’s initiative, do teachers work together to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades? 1 2 3 4 5
13. Does the principal possess organizational skills to effectively manage programs? 1 2 3 4 5
14. Does the principal use a variety of communication skills? 1 2 3 4 5
15. Does the principal maintain an awareness and knowledge of recent research about the learning process? 1 2 3 4 5
16. Does the principal promote positive relationships with students? 1 2 3 4 5
17. Does the principal promote good school/community relations? 1 2 3 4 5
Waterloo Community School District
Teacher-to-Teacher Feedback

Rating Scale

1 = Not at all; 2 = To some extent; 3 = To a great extent; 4 = Always; 5 = Do not know/not applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develops and maintains positive relations with students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Willingly shares successful teaching techniques/materials.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintains confidentiality in sensitive matters.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provides positive classroom environment.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cooperates with parents in the best interest of the student.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maintains a positive attitude.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Develops and maintains positive relations with colleagues.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
In an effort to compare the traditional evaluation system with input solely by the supervisor, to the 360° Feedback system, please indicate your reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRADITIONAL SYSTEM**

Promotion of sound education principles
1. The traditional evaluation system provides:
   a. feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles 5 4 3 2 1
   b. feedback on the fulfillment of the institutional mission. 5 4 3 2 1
   c. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities. 5 4 3 2 1

Information provided by knowledgeable personnel
2. With the traditional evaluation system, feedback is provided:
   a. by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns. 5 4 3 2 1
   b. on the effective performance of job responsibilities. 5 4 3 2 1

Useful reports/feedback
3. With the traditional evaluation system:
   a. reports are practical for the improvement of job performance. 5 4 3 2 1
   b. strengths as well as weaknesses are identified. 5 4 3 2 1
   c. the instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated. 5 4 3 2 1

**360° FEEDBACK**

Promotion of sound education principles
4. The 360° evaluation system provides:
   a. feedback on the promotion of sound educational principles 5 4 3 2 1
   b. feedback on the fulfillment of the institutional mission. 5 4 3 2 1
   c. feedback on the effective performance of job responsibilities. 5 4 3 2 1

February 1999
Information provided by knowledgeable personnel
2. With the 360° evaluation system, feedback is provided:
   a. by personnel with the knowledge needed to identify strengths and concerns.

   b. on the effective performance of job responsibilities.

Useful reports/feedback
3. With the 360° evaluation system:
   a. reports are practical for the improvement of job performance.

   b. strengths as well as weaknesses are identified.

   c. the instrument matches the job responsibilities of the person evaluated.

Enhanced information
4. The 360° Feedback enhances the traditional system.

Please return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by February 22.

Comments:

February 1999
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ques</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Omiss</th>
<th>NOT at all</th>
<th>Always N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(A)</td>
<td>2(B)</td>
<td>3(C)</td>
<td>4(D)</td>
<td>5(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1 6 12 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 5 15 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1 9 10 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 4 3 13 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 3 12 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 2 9 9 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 9 7 3 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1 9 10 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 2 5 13 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 5 8 6 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 3 10 7 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 2 10 8 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 2 5 13 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 2 9 9 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1 5 13 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 1 5 14 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 6 14 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of questions: 17
Total number responding N = 20
360° Feedback
“Planning for Improvement”

_"O wad some Pow’r the giftie gie us_
_To see ourselvs as others see us!_
_Robert Burns, 1786_

We do 360° feedback to identify areas for improvement

1. List the three top rated-items on the instrument (tools and sources of confidence)
2. Now list the three lowest-rated items on the instrument

How to pick one? Use those items with:

1. The largest differences across raters
2. The lowest score
3. The lowest score with the highest degree of agreement

Another way to pick is to –

1. Select items that are the most central to your professional or personal life
2. Choose those items that are the easiest to change
3. Pick those that are the most fun to develop
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Get specific:

1. I will improve in these areas: __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

2. Now think about it what are possible reasons it's a problem?
   a. You don’t like what you are doing
   b. You don’t understand how to do it
   c. You don’t have the resources

Next, put the goal in writing. See the opposite side of this form

• break it down into observable actions
• have someone hold you accountable
• talk to your direct reports
• ask yourself “Why am I motivated to do this?”
• think about your areas of responsibility which are impacted
• draft a 360° action plan
360° Action Plan

Goal: ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

*e.g., “I will improve my listening skills by maintaining eye contact, facing the speaker, acknowledge that I can listen by nodding and by not interrupting”*

Areas of responsibility in which I will apply this skill:
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Strength, Reason, Resources
What can help me improve? ........................................................................................................
How can I use my strengths? ........................................................................................................
Who will hold me accountable? ...................................................................................................
How will I measure progress? ......................................................................................................
When will I complete the plan? .................................................................................................
APPENDIX D. VIDEOTAPE CRITIQUE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The videotape provides a clear overview of 360° Feedback procedures.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A viewer could facilitate a survey development design team.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The information presented is helpful in deciding if one should consider the development and implementation of a 360° Feedback system.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
APPENDIX E. LETTERS TO ADMINISTRATORS
March 24, 1999

Dear administrator,

In February you received a survey to provide your perspective about the traditional and 360° Feedback system. Your input is needed to improve the 360° Feedback system that is currently being piloted in your school district. With your assistance, the feedback can be enhanced for your district as well as for districts which will use the system in the future.

I recognize the pressures on your time. The survey should take only 10 minutes to complete, and it will be of great help to the Waterloo District and to other districts as well.

Those of you who have experienced the 360° Feedback can provide information which compares the Feedback system with the traditional supervisor-only input evaluation system. Those of you who have yet to experience the 360° Feedback can provide your perception of both systems.

Please complete the enclosed survey instrument and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by April 2.

Your input is greatly appreciated and will be used to enhance the effectiveness of the 360° Feedback system. If you have any questions, please contact the School Improvement Model Center at 515-294-5521.

Sincerely,

Richard P. Manatt
University Professor and
Professor of Educational Leadership

Linda Gray Smith
Research Associate
June 10, 1999

Dear administrator,

Now that you have had a feedback conference based on the information gathered through the 360° Feedback process, please provide me your perceptions of the multi-rater information.

Complete the enclosed survey instrument and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by June 18.

Once again, your input is greatly appreciated and will be used to enhance the effectiveness of the 360° Feedback system. If you have any questions, please contact the School Improvement Model Center at 515-294-5521.

Sincerely,

Richard P. Manatt
University Professor and
Professor of Educational Leadership

Linda Gray Smith
Research Associate
APPENDIX F. PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENTS
September 15, 1999

Camp Verde Unified School District
Mesa, AZ.

Dear Ms. Morse:

I am writing a dissertation on 360° Feedback for K-12 Administrators. A component of the dissertation is the creation of a video-based learning album which will be available for use by others who wish to learn about using multi-source feedback. My major professor, Dr. Richard Manatt, suggested that some of the feedback instruments that your district has used would be helpful to include.

We would like your permission to reproduce the following form(s):
Parent Feedback to Teachers, Spanish letter to families, Feedback to Director of Student Services, Principal Feedback from Parents, Feedback to Elementary Principals from Teachers/Staff, Feedback to Secondary Principal, Feedback to Administrative Assistant (Elementary School), Client Feedback to Secretaries, Feedback to Instructional Aides, Feedback to Superintendent.

We are requesting your permission to include this material in the dissertation material mentioned above and in future published materials. Your district will be credited. Your permission will in no way restrict publication of your material in any other form by you or others authorized by you. If you do not control these rights in their entirety, please inform me of the proper agency to contact.

Below is a release form for your convenience. Please sign this letter, copy a letter for your files, and return a copy to me. Your prompt consideration of this request will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Linda Gray Smith
Fax 660-564-2193

[Signature]

Date: 9-28-99
September 15, 1999

D. Jean Lapinski
Assistant Superintendent
Riverhead Central School District
700 Osborne Avenue
Riverhead, New York 11901-1996

Dear Ms. Lapinski:

I am writing a dissertation on 360° Feedback for K-12 Administrators. A component of the dissertation is the creation of a video-based learning album which will be available for use by others who wish to learn about using multi-source feedback. My major professor, Dr. Richard Mancini, suggested that some of the feedback instruments that your district has used would be helpful to include.

We would like your permission to reproduce the following form(s):

We are requesting your permission to include this material in the dissertation material mentioned above and in future published materials. Your district will be credited. Your permission will in no way restrict publication of your material in any other form by you or others authorized by you. If you do not consent these rights in their entirety, please inform me of the proper agency to contact.

Below is a release form for your convenience. Please sign this letter, copy a letter for your files, and return a copy to me. Your prompt consideration of this request will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Linda Gray Smith
Fax 660-564-2193

I (We) grant permission requested on the terms stated in this letter. Credit line to be used (if different from citation given above):

Agreed to and accepted: ________________________

(Date) 9/21/99
Linda Gray-Smith  
Rural Route #2  
Box 73  
Blockton, Iowa 50836

Dear Linda,

Please feel free to utilize, copy, reproduce or use in any manner the materials related to the West Des Moines Community School District Administrator Incentive Plan. It is hoped that this information is of value to you.

I am enclosing copies of materials that may be of interest to you in the event you do not already have copies. Again, please feel free to utilize them in any way that benefits you.

Good luck and call (515-226-2717) if you have questions.

Respectfully,

C.D. Buchanan, Ed.D.  
Associate Superintendent
September 15, 1999

Dr. John VanPelt
Associate Superintendent for Educational Services
1516 Washington Street
Waterloo, IA 50702

Dear Dr. VanPelt:

I am writing a dissertation on 360° Feedback for K-12 Administrators. A component of the dissertation is the creation of a video-based learning album which will be available for use by others who wish to learn about using multi-source feedback. My major professor, Dr. Richard Manatt, suggested that some of the feedback instruments that your district has used would be helpful to include.

We would like your permission to reproduce the following form(s):
Feedback to Superintendent, Feedback to Associate Superintendent for Educational Services.
Feedback to Director of Operational Services, Director of Board and Community Relations, Feedback to Director of Volunteer Services, Feedback to Secondary Principal, Letter to respondent. Feedback to Executive Director of Financial Services. Feedback to Elementary Principals from Teachers, Elementary Principal Feedback from Parents, Teacher-to-Teacher Feedback, Feedback to Director of Staff Services, Feedback to Director of Student Services, Feedback to Director of Special Services, Feedback to Director of Curriculum, Feedback to Teachers by Students (grades K-2), Feedback to Teachers by Students (grades 3-5).

We are requesting your permission to include this material in the dissertation material mentioned above and in future published materials. Your district will be credited. Your permission will in no way restrict publication of your material in any other form by you or others authorized by you. If you do not control these rights in their entirety, please inform me of the proper agency to contact.

Below is a release form for your convenience. Please sign this letter, copy a letter for your files, and return a copy to me. Your prompt consideration of this request will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Linda Gray Smith
Fax 660-564-2193

I (We) grant permission requested on the terms stated in this letter. Credit line to be used (if different from citation given above):

Agreed to and accepted: [Signature]

Date: 9/20/99
APPENDIX G. HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL
Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

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

13. ☐ Consent form (if applicable)

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

15. ☑ Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

   First Contact                                           Last Contact
   April 26, 1998                                          April 26, 1999
   Month / Day / Year                                      Month / Day / Year

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

   N/A
   Month / Day / Year

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer           Date
    Cariel C. Robinson                                      4/7/98
    Department or Administrative Unit
    Department: Professional Studies in Education

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:

    ☑ Project Approved   ______ Project Not Approved   ______ No Action Required

    Patricia M. Keith                                           4/19/98
    Name of Committee Chairperson                                Signature of Committee Chairperson
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