2000

A Comparative Study Of Indiana Superintendent's Perceptions Of Principal Evaluation Instruments

Ginger Lee Studebaker
Indiana State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI®

VITA

Ginger L. Studebaker

Personal:	Born to Don and Ann Hill on May 7, 1963.
Education:	
2000	Ph.D. Educational Administration Indiana State University
1991	M.B.A. Business Administration Ball State University
1986	B.S. Business Education Ball State University
Professional Experience:	Principal South Newton High School Kentland, IN 1996 to present
	Assistant Principal Heritage Hills High School Lincoln City, IN 1993 to 1996
	Business Education Teacher Tipton High School Tipton, IN 1986 to 1993
Professional Affiliations:	Indiana Principal Leadership Academy Association of Curriculum and Development Indiana Association of School Principals National Association of Secondary School Principals Phi Delta Kappa

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDIANA SUPERINTENDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Department of Educational Leadership,

Administration, and Foundations

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Ginger L. Studebaker

May 2000

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation of Ginger L. Studebaker, Contribution to the School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State University, Series III, Number 801, under the title A Comparative Study of Indiana Superintendent's Perceptions of Principal Evaluation Instruments is approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree.

4.24.00
Date

Committee Chairperson

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

Committee Member

4/21/00
Date

For the School of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were (1) to determine the difference between formative or summative principal evaluation instruments used by large and small school districts in the state of Indiana, (2) to determine if principals in the state of Indiana are evaluated, based on formative or summative instrument identification, for outcomes which are congruent with the administrative evaluation instrument used by their district, (3) to compare large and small school districts' use of administrative evaluation instruments based on the skills necessary for effective leaders described by Hoyle, English, and Steffy, and (4) to compare the perceptions of superintendents, from large and small school districts, regarding their principal evaluation instruments and their congruency with effective leadership skills.

Surveys were sent to 69 Indiana public school superintendents. Thirty-one school districts had a student enrollment over 7000, and thirty-eight districts had a student enrollment of less than 1000. The 21-item survey

was used to test five research hypotheses. Sixty-four surveys were returned.

The following conclusions were drawn from this data:

Superintendents representing small school districts in Indiana use formative evaluation instruments and large school districts use summative evaluation instruments as a primary instrument when evaluating principals.

School districts in Indiana utilizing a formative evaluation instrument differ in opinion about the outcomes being congruent with formative measures.

Superintendents representing small school district in Indiana utilizing a summative evaluation instrument rate outcomes for their district instrument similarly to large school districts using a summative evaluation instrument.

Superintendents representing small and large school districts in Indiana report their district instrument evaluates for the essential skills as defined by English, Steffy, and Hoyle in Skills for Successful 21st Century School Leaders.

Superintendents representing small school districts in Indiana have a larger degree of discrepancy regarding their perceptions of their district evaluation instrument compared to large school districts in Indiana when

reporting their district evaluation instruments congruence with the skill measures as defined by English, Steffy, and Hoyle.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with deep admiration I acknowledge Dr. Robert L. Boyd, committee chairperson, for his encouragement and assistance as I pursued this study. I also thank Dr. Dale Findley, Dr. Jim Jacobs, Dr. Gregory Ulm, and Dr. Todd Whitaker for their willingness to serve on my committee.

I am grateful to Mr. Alan Cox, Principal of Dr. Phillips High School, Dr. David Bess, Superintendent of South Newton Schools, and the 1999-2000 School Board of Trustees for South Newton School Corporation. Their support and assistance has afforded me the opportunity to pursue and achieve my goal.

I want to express my appreciation for my sister, Jennifer Weaver, and her endless giving and genuine concern for me as I studied at Indiana State University. I am thankful for my parents, Charles and Ann Grenda, and for their faith in me.

I acknowledge the sacrifices my children, Staton and Sydney, made as I completed the Wednesday Residency Program and this study.

Finally, I am sincerely thankful for the love, commitment, and dedication of my husband, Randy; we are even.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

"After years of education, training, and on-the-job seasoning, some educators move to the forefront as a result of their experiences, while others become lost in the ever-changing environment that characterizes education today" (Hoyle, English, and Steffy, 1998, p. 181). Public school administrators have consistently been held to high standards; challenged to meet the increasing expectations of local communities and state educational organizations. The changing roles of school administrators and the increasing demand for ethical, effective leaders of our public schools has created the need for uniform standards and forced a review of the current evaluation instruments of public school administrators. Ann Weaver Hart (1998) suggests that "practices of principal evaluation have not kept pace in focus, sophistication, or reliability with changes in schools and schooling or with developments in teacher evaluation" (p. 37). The recent collaboration of

educational professionals in the state of Indiana to create standards for public school administrators is an example of the need for identified standards of performance for all public school leaders.

Members of the Indiana Professional Standards Board (1998) have stated the following performance standards for administrators:

1. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the greater school community.

2. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

3. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

4. A school administrator is an educational

leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

5. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by acting with integrity and fairness and in an ethical manner.

6. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

From school leaders of large urban schools to school leaders of small rural schools, communities demand proficiency in a myriad of leadership skills. The effectiveness of school leaders is often based on perceptions created and sustained by community members. School principals must be held accountable for developing the skills necessary to be effective leaders.

The differing roles effective principals must assume demand the creation of an evaluation instrument based on the skills needed for each role. Although many different

types of evaluation instruments have been used to measure administrative effectiveness, John Hoyle, Fenwick English, and Betty Steffy, in Skills for Successful 21st Century Leaders (1998), list skills necessary for administrators to effectively lead an educational organization. Hoyle, English, and Steffy synthesized the standards and performance indicators from publications by the American Association of School Administrators', the National Council for the Accreditation of Colleges of Education's, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. The ten skills they have listed are:

1. Visionary Leadership
2. Policy and Governance
3. Communication and Community Relations
4. Organizational Management
5. Curriculum Planning and Development
6. Instructional Management
7. Staff Evaluation and Personnel Management
8. Staff Development
9. Educational Research, Evaluation, and Planning
10. Values and Ethics of Leadership. (p. viii)

These skills described by Hoyle, English, and Steffy are similar to the Indiana Performance Standards for Administrators. Although the essential skills are the same for all localities, the evaluation of school principals, in Indiana, were studied to determine if they were based on the essential skills defined by Hoyle, English, and Steffy.

The researcher held positions in two school districts and found administrative evaluations were not based on state standards or essential skills. After six years as a building administrator the researcher received three written evaluations, each summative in format. The researcher's goal was to determine if infrequent, summative evaluations are typical for administrators in Indiana schools districts. It appears as though larger school districts have increased financial and personnel resources to prepare administrator evaluations and to monitor administrator performance and guide administrator professional growth. Larger school districts, are held accountable for all aspects of school leadership by community members and business partners due to the influence they have on large populations.

Administrators in small school districts have the advantage of direct contact with the superintendent resulting in increased opportunities for personalized

professional growth plans as part of an evaluation process, and small school administrators are held equally accountable as large districts for all aspects of school leadership due to the connectedness of small communities with their local school.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were (1) to determine the difference between formative or summative principal evaluation instruments used by large and small school districts in the state of Indiana, and (2) to determine if principals in the state of Indiana are evaluated, based on formative or summative instrument identification, for outcomes which are congruent with the administrative evaluation instrument used by their district. This study also (1) compared large and small school districts' use of administrative evaluation instruments based on the skills necessary for effective leaders described by Hoyle, English, and Steffy, and (2) compared the perceptions of superintendents, from large and small school districts, regarding their principal evaluation instruments and their congruency with effective leadership skills. Comparisons and significant differences were determined by surveying

superintendents of public school districts in the state of Indiana.

Statement of the Problem

Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998) describe a number of skills effective school leaders must master. These skills include; leading others, collaboratively formulating policy, articulating a vision, understanding systemic change, development of a curriculum design system, development of assessment, evaluation, and staff development systems, conducting research, and modeling a value system for our democratic society (p. viii). Although, "every school leader needs a well-defined educational philosophy or ideology to make the deeply personal decisions that may not be handled by the knowledge base and skills alone" (Hoyle et al., 1998, p. viii). The skills are necessary to provide a basis for continued reference when defining effective administrative practices.

Defined skills help educational organizations focus on developing effective models of administrative evaluations. While, Indiana has created a set of administrative standards similar to the skills listed by Hoyle, English, and Steffy, this study researched whether formative and summative evaluation instruments used in Indiana school

districts adequately address the evaluation of administrators. In addition, the perceived outcomes of administrative evaluations were researched to determine if the outcomes were parallel with the effective use of either formative or summative instruments. This study compared superintendents' perceptions of their districts' instruments with essential leadership skills, as determined by Hoyle, English, and Steffy, and it compared whether summative or formative instruments were congruent with the outcomes the instrument purports to meet. This study was stratified according to district enrollment with districts of more than 7000 students enrolled considered large schools and districts with fewer than 1000 students enrolled considered small schools. Larger school districts, with increased resources, may have additional resources to fund the cost of administrator evaluation and may be held accountable by more community patrons and business partners compared with smaller school districts with limited resources.

Research Questions

The following research questions, based on the perceptions of superintendents guided this study:

1. Is there a difference in the use of formative and

summative administrative evaluation instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

2. Is there a difference in the outcomes evaluated using formative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

3. Is there a difference in the outcomes evaluated using summative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

4. Is there a difference in the use of essential skills to evaluate principals between small and large school districts in Indiana?

5. Is there a difference in the congruence with essential skills of principal evaluations between small and large school districts in Indiana?

Null Hypotheses

H_1: There is no significant difference in the use of formative or summative administrative evaluation instruments between small and large school districts in Indiana.

H_2: There is no significant difference in the outcomes evaluated using formative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana.

H_3: There is no significant difference in the outcomes

evaluated using summative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana.

H_4: There is no significant difference in the use of essential skills to evaluate principals between small and large school districts in Indiana.

H_5: There is no significant difference in the congruence with essential skills of principal evaluations between small and large school districts in Indiana.

Significance of the Study

Administrative evaluations and methods to employ the best administrators are numerous; however, the use of effective evaluation instruments to measure skills for effective school leaders and the use of the most appropriate instrument based on the outcomes desired may not be as easy to determine. The public expects school board members to hire and maintain competent and effective administrators to manage and lead the functions of the schools. Without valid evaluation instruments the leadership of a school corporation may not be accurately measured. Although, research studies have focused on essential leadership skills necessary for effective administrators, "a number of researchers have lamented the fact that little research has actually studied principal

evaluation practices" Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985; Natriello, Deal, Dornbusch, & Hong, 1977; Rentsch, 1976 (cited in Ginsberg & Thompson, 1993).

Delimitations and Limitations

1. This study was delimited to public school districts located in Indiana.
2. This study was delimited to public schools districts with student enrollments of more than 7000 or less than 1000.
3. This study was delimited to superintendent perceptions regarding evaluations.
4. The study was delimited to the 1999-2000 school year.
5. The findings were limited by the responses voluntarily returned.
6. The findings were limited by the accuracy of individual perceptions reported.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

Administrative Evaluations - written summative or formative information used to assess the performance of

administrative personnel, specifically principals for this study.

Essential Skills - ten skills (visionary leadership; policy and governance; communications and community relations; organizational management; curriculum planning and development; instructional management; staff evaluation and personnel management; staff development; educational research, evaluation and planning; and values and ethics of leadership) listed by English, Steffy, and Holye in Skills for Successful 21st Century School Leaders (1998).

Evaluation Instrument - specific device used to evaluate administrative personnel.

Formative evaluation measures - measurement based on data gathered for the purpose of improving job performance; the process.

Large School - a school district with enrollment over 7,000 students.

Outcomes - the end result for which the information contained on an evaluation instrument will be used.

Small School - a school district with enrollment under 1,000 students.

Summative evaluation measures - measurement based on data gathered for the purpose of determining the impact of job performance; the product.

Superintendent - executive officer of a school corporation reporting to a board of trustees.

Organization of Study

This study is organized into four additional chapters. Chapter 2 provides a review of the related literature, Chapter 3 provides information regarding the data collection procedures and Chapter 4 reports the statistical findings of the null hypotheses. The last chapter provides a summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of the related literature is divided into six sections. These sections include: (1) a historical review of evaluations, (2) the changing roles of the principalship, (3) performance standards for principals, (4) the purpose and types of evaluation, (5) evaluation instruments and standards, and (6) a summary.

Performance standards are more popular today than ever, however, for the focus of this study the researcher concentrated on the building level administrator standards established by the state of Indiana and the skills listed by Hoyle, English, and Steffy in Skills for Successful 21st Century School Leaders.

Historical Review

The development of the principalship began in colonial America.

> One-room schoolhouses were the norm in colonial America. The simple environments mirrored values and resources of those times. As the population increased, the country became more demographically heterogeneous. Population growth induced more and larger school; and in urban areas, high concentrations of population encouraged the creation of school districts and the separation of grammar and high schools. As schools became larger, they required multiple faculty. This condition led to the practice of designating one of the instructors as 'head' teacher—a teacher who has some authority over other faculty. This position of head teacher eventually became know as the principal and was the first office in American schools with administrative and supervisory duties. (Brubacher, 1966) . . . There was, however, little professional development of the principalship prior to the nineteenth century. Those who occupied the post relied on common sense and innate abilities to perform largely management-related tasks. (Kowalski and Reitzug, 1993, p. 8)

Karier (1982) and Bolin (1987) found that "supervision emerged as a field of practice around the turn of the century in response to increased levels of bureaucracy in schools and the public demand for more control over the curriculum" (Bolin and Panaritis 1992, p. 30). Philbrick (1976) stated that "early supervisors were inspectors, assigned the task of ascertaining 'the tone and spirit of the school, the conduct and application of the pupils, the

management and methods of the teacher, and the fitness and conduction of the premises.'" (cited in Bolin and Panaritis 1992, p. 32).

Two essential areas that encompass what supervision is supposed to be and do have centered on the following;

1. The function of supervision is an important one whether it is carried out by a superintendent (as in the early history of the field), a supervisor, curriculum worker, or peer.

2. Supervision is primarily concerned with the improvement of classroom practice for the benefit of students, regardless of what else may be entailed (e.g., curriculum development or staff development). (Bolin and Panaritis 1992, p. 31)

Bolin and Panaritis (1992) found "in the early 1900s, efficiency in organization of supervision and increased control over the curriculum were seen as ways to deal with teacher deficits. The role of the supervisor expanded to include that of on-the-job teacher trainer" (p. 33).

The changing roles principals assume have made the creation of a definitive principal evaluation instrument challenging. In terms of supervision, "the principal was viewed as a values broker in the 1920s; as a scientific manager in the 1930s; as democratic leader in the 1940s; as a theory-guided administrator in the 1950s; as a bureaucratic executive in the 1960s; as a humanistic

facilitator in the 1970s, and as an instructional leader in the 1980s" (Beck and Murphy (1993)(cited in Rinehart and Russo 1995, p. 52)).

"There is a growing emphasis on evaluating principal's performance, evidenced by an increase in the number of states with statutory provisions addressing this issue. The 27 states that had laws in 1984 (ERS, 1985) grew to 38 in 1988 (Peters and Bagenstos) and 41 at present" (Rinehart and Russo 1995, p. 52). This increased emphasis on principal evaluations has continued for the past several years based on the demand for reform and accountability.

Administrative evaluations have been used to measure a variety of skills, and Rinehart and Russo (1995) believe "the development of programs to evaluate the performance of principals has been unable to keep pace as the roles of principals have changed over the past seven decades" (p. 52).

Changing Roles

Ginsberg and Thompson (1992) stated "along with a changing role, the principal has daily responsibility for many tasks, processes and competencies. During the course of a day, the principal's job is complicated by diverse interruptions such as student discipline, phone calls or

emergency situations" (Rinehart and Russo, 1995, p. 52). The variety and complexity of these differing roles makes it difficult to find one effective evaluation instrument.

Ginsberg and Thompson (1992) also assert "at the same time, the principal serves many groups of constituents within and outside the school, each of which may have a different set of performance standards." (Rinehart and Russo, 1995, p. 52).

Ginsberg and Thompson quote Dubin (1990),

> in a study of the perceptions of chief executive officers regarding the role of the principal, [he] found four different functions mentioned: (a) a school superintendent described the principal as being all things to all people—a leader, counselor, benevolent dictator, manager, manipulator, enforcer, motivator, and change agent; (b) a college dean explained that the principal must have the power, the skills, and the knowledge to restructure the context of the school to facilitate learning and that the most critical feature of the principal as leader is the ability to plan and involve people in the planning process; (c) a university president viewed the principal as a decision maker; and (d) the president of a private company believed that the principal must be a leader. (Ginsberg and Thompson, 1992, p. 60)

The principal is required to know everything from the school calendar to the curriculum guide in order to share information with student groups, teachers, parents, and community organizations. In addition, the principal must maintain high staff morale and a safe school environment.

(Rinehart and Russo, 1995).

David Holdzom in his research stated:

> On the one hand, the principal is expected 'to harness and get control of the unpredictability of the school community.' The principal, then is concerned with orderliness, stability and environmental control.
>
> On the other hand, the principal is in charge of teaching and learning. Related responsibilities include the encouragement of developing/implementing new curricula, upgrading staff quality, altering attitudes, and encouraging parent involvement.
>
> The picture that ultimately emerges from this research is of a principal with too many tasks: maintaining order, dealing with student discipline, representing the school to the community, acting as a buffer between the district and the school's faculty, building community support, fulfilling teacher's expectation of their own autonomy, developing staff skills, and keeping information flowing into and out of the school/district. (Holdzkom, 1985, p. 33)

In Principals In Action, Morris, Crowson, Gehrie, and Hurwitz, Jr. state "the principal is in the middle, answerable to multiple constituencies—students, teachers, parents, and superiors. Each constituency has a well-developed and forcefully asserted view of how the school should be run. Everyone claims to be an expert on education and in a position to advise, or even direct, the principal. The principal must oversee the learning process effectively, be fully engaged in school-community relations, manage the flood of paperwork, guide staff

development, meet student needs, oversee the financial and physical resources of the school, plan and innovate, manage the crises and disruptions of each day, and be everybody's friend" (1984, p. 183).

The researcher had determined, through personal experience, the endless managerial tasks related to the principalship include:

1. completing state attendance and discipline reports,
2. monitoring student discipline and attendance statistics,
3. assessing student grade reports,
4. preparing for state testing programs,
5. purchasing equipment,
6. accurately accounting for school funds, and
7. monitoring athletic and co-curricular events.

These managerial tasks consume valuable time and rarely provide opportunities to utilize leadership skills to influence the curriculum or instructional practices.

Rinehart and Russo (1995) state the following:

> Smylie and Crowson (1992) investigated principal evaluation in two restructured school districts in the Chicago metropolitan area. They indicated that the principal's role included '. . . making shared decisions work in the school, training the school staff in how-to-do-it, getting the results of the decision-making

> process accepted by all, and learning to be effectively 'accountable' while simultaneously losing managerial control'. (p. 82, p. 55)

These managerial tasks and related factors have influenced the traditional evaluation instruments used for principals. These roles of the non-traditional, restructuring principal are more likely in our society than ever before, however, our evaluation instruments may not have changed to accommodate these leadership responsibilities. Richard Manatt (1997) stated that "the overarching purpose of performance evaluation is to improve performance year after year [and] it just doesn't happen using the old, almost ceremonial approach" (p. 9).

Performance Standards for Principals

Many organizations have developed performance standards for school administrators. Stufflebeam and Nevo stated:

> principal evaluation, like any other professional field, requires standards to guide professional practice, hold the professionals accountable, and provide goals for upgrading the profession's services. Fortunately, superintendents and others who evaluate the qualifications, proficiencies, performance, and special achievements of principals do have access to a carefully developed, regularly monitored, and periodically updated set of standards for judging principal evaluation systems, plans, and reports. We strongly advocate that educators involved with principal evaluation obtain, study, and

> rigorously apply these standards in their efforts to plan, conduct, apply, evaluate, and improve principal evaluations. (Stufflebeam and Nevo, 1993, p. 37)

"The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) recently developed a set of standards for school administrators. These standards, published by the Council of Chief State School Officers in 1996, are clearly written. Six general standards are enumerated:

1. Vision of Learning. Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the greater school community.

2. School Culture and Instructional Program. Advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

3. Management. Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

4. Collaboration with Families and the Community. Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

5. Acting with Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

6. Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (Coutts 1997, p. 20).

These standards are similar to the 21 principal performance domains introduced by the National Commission for the Principalship, which include:

1. Functional Domains
   - Leadership
   - Information Collection
   - Problem Analysis
   - Judgment
   - Organizational Oversight
   - Implementation
   - Delegation

2. Program Domains
   - Instructional Program
   - Curriculum Design
   - Student Guidance and Development
   - Staff Development
   - Measurement and Evaluation
   - Resource Allocation

3. Interpersonal Domains
   - Motivating Others
   - Sensitivity
   - Oral Expression
   - Written Expression

4. Contextual Domains
   - Philosophical and Cultural Values
   - Legal and Regulatory Applications
   - Policy and Political Influences
   - Public and Media Relations. (Fletcher and McInerney 1995, p. 16)

Ginsberg and Thompson (1993) stated "clearly, whether focusing on job task, administrative functions, or behavior competencies, the nature of work that principals perform is not standardized, and involves much spontaneity and great individual autonomy" (p. 61).

Leading educational organizations have listed standards for school administrators and many scholars have done the same.

> Sergiovanni (1987) expanded on the concept of the principal as leader to include the principal as:(a) statesperson - primarily concerned with the school's mission, philosophy, values, beliefs, goals, and objectives; (b) educational leader - concerned with the articulation and development of educational programs; (c) supervisory leader - exercised through working with teaches in a manner that facilitates their ability to work more effectively; (d) organizational leader - to make sure that school purposes, objectives, and work requirements are what determine school organization structure; (e) administrative leader - concerned with providing the necessary support systems to facilitate teaching and learning; and (f) team leader - concerned with helping develop mutual support and trust among teachers and between teachers and administrators. (Ginsberg and Thompson, 1993, p. 61)

"The National Association of Secondary School Principals (1990) identified 12 skill dimensions, which include problem analysis, judgement, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, educational values, stress tolerance, oral communication, written communication,

organizational ability, range of interests, and personal motivation" (Ginsberg and Thompson, 1993, p. 60). "Coghan, Lake, and Schroder (1983), on behalf of The Florida Council of Education Management, researched competencies that differentiate high-performing principals from average principals. The basic competencies included commitment to school mission, concern for image, tactical adaptability, developmental orientation, delegation, written communication, and organizational sensitivity. The high-performing competencies included proactive orientation, decisiveness, interpersonal search, information search, concept formation, conceptual flexibility, managing interaction, persuasiveness, achievement motivation, management control, organizational ability, and self presentation" (Ginsberg and Thompson, 1993, p. 61). At the National Association of Secondary School Principals 83rd Annual Convention, Dr. Gerald N. Tirozzi stated "the principal of the new millennium will:

- Drive curriculum change
- Implement high quality professional development programs for teachers
- Improve pedagogy in the classroom
- Promote the self-worth of **each** student

- Be a pillar of strength for equity and excellence for all children—ensuring that NO child is academically left behind" (Tirozzi, 1999).

All of these skills, performance domains, and competencies are similar, however, based on the complexity of each area, measurement and evaluation are often difficult.

Other indicators of necessary skills are described by Hoyle, English, and Steffy, (1998) in Skills for Successful 21st Century School Leaders, which includes ten standards necessary for the preparation of school leaders. Those ten standards are as follows:

1. Visionary Leadership. This standard includes the skills and dispositions needed to lead other to peak performance, driven by a clear and compelling vision centered on the success of all children and youth.

2. Policy and Governance. This standard looks at school governance in a democracy and the formulation of policy derived from collaborative efforts to build the best schools for students and the community.

3. Communication and Community Relations. The clear and ethical articulation of the district or school vision, mission, and priorities to the community and mass media are among the key skills school leaders must master to build consensus and support for public schools.

4. Organizational Management. Build[ing] on the growing knowledge about systemic change and the

skills required to make data-driven decisions that show good stewardship of resources.

5. Planning and Development. This standard and its related skills center on school leaders' abilities to develop a curriculum design and delivery system for diverse school communities based on high standards and what we know about students' developmental needs.

6. Instructional Management. This standard involves the development of a data-based student achievement monitoring and reporting system, and the skillful analysis and assignment of available instructional resources to enhance student learning.

7. Staff Evaluation. [This standard] details the skills and dispositions required to develop a staff evaluation system based on the latest research and best practices.

8. Staff Development. [This standard discusses] the need for targeted staff development to improve the performance of individuals, schools, and school systems.

9. Educational Research, Evaluation, and Planning. This standard involves skills in conducting research and using research methods to improve program evaluation and short- and long-term planning.

10. Values and Ethics of School Leadership. The skills and dispositions in this . . . [standard] focus on understanding and modeling appropriate value systems, ethics, and moral leadership for our democratic, multicultural society and schools. (Hoyle, English, and Steffy 1998)

Ginsberg and Thompson (1993) state "not only does the nature of a principal's work make evaluation problematic, even when more specific functions are mandated, much

ambiguity remains. The school effectiveness literature emphasizes a number of functions for principals, which are extremely difficult to operationalize. For evaluation purposes, therefore, many of the commonly accepted duties that effective principals should perform are not easily assessed" (Ginsberg and Thompson, 1993, p. 62).

Purpose and Type of Evaluation

The purpose of administrator evaluations varies from school district to school district. "Bolton (1980) states that administrators require information [from evaluations]:

- To improve administrative performance and guide selection of professional development activities.
- To identify areas of programmatic weakness so changes in procedures, programs, or job responsibilities can occur.
- To provide a basis for professional recognition and advancement in compensation.
- To document the effectiveness of the administrator as protection from unwarranted criticism (As cited by Johnson, 1998, p. 25).

In Schools for the Twenty-First Century, Phillip Schlechty states:

> performance evaluation serves a variety of purposes. First, it should provide those who work in the system with a basis for knowing what is expected and what they are to do with respect to those expectations. Second, it provides people with information from which to judge how well

> their performance, the performance of those they supervise, the performance of their department or unit, and the performance of the system in general conform to requirements and expectations. Third, it provides a basis for analyzing the sources of performance problems and a grounds for taking action to correct these problems. Fourth, it provides a data base for assessing the merit of any corrective action that is taken to address performance problems the evaluation system might reveal. Finally, it provides a basis for personnel action—both actions intended to celebrate heroes and heroines and actions intended to lead to dismissal. (1990, p. 111)

Weiss (1989) developed an Administrative Appraisal Process and determined "the purposes of the process are:

- to encourage communication within the organization;
- to facilitate mutual goal setting between the school principal and the superintendent;
- to foster a commitment to mutually developed objectives;
- to encourage the systematic annual evaluation of the school principal by the superintendent of schools;
- to sensitize the evaluator to the needs and problems of the principal;
- to encourage the evaluator to provide assistance to the principal;
- and to motivate the principal towards self-improvement" (p. 3).

Ginsberg and Berry stated: "the most commonly cited purpose for evaluation in the literature was the

improvement of performance. This formative function for principal evaluation is increasingly taking on significance, as the principal is being recognized as the key player in an effective school. Another purpose for evaluation of principals discussed in the literature was job placement from one position to another" (Ginsberg and Berry, 1990, p. 222).

Therefore, the purpose and the process of evaluation are important and change depending upon the circumstances. The type of evaluation also varies based on outcomes being measured.

Formative and summative evaluations are traditional methods used for evaluation purposes but are often misunderstood. Cullen (1995) determined

> the term *formative* may be applied to an evaluation system that seeks to continue the development of or to improve the subject of the evaluation; . . . Summative evaluation, on the other hand, refers to an evaluation system that seeks to provide a statement or summation of the evaluatee's performance, usually as an aid to decision making, but also possibly to fulfill legal or bureaucratic requirements. (p. 354)

Although concerned primarily with teacher evaluation, Wheeler, Haertel, and Scriven (1992) in A Product of the Teacher Evaluation Models Project give an accurate definition of both formative and summative evaluation

instruments. They define formative evaluation as "an evaluation conducted primarily for the purpose of professional development, i.e., improving the teacher by identifying that teacher's strengths and weaknesses" (p. 14). They define summative evaluation as "an evaluation conducted primarily for the purpose of making personnel decisions . . . (e.g. merit pay, reassignment, promotion, dismissal, tenure) (p. 25).

Barber (1984) stated when the

> concepts of summative and formative evaluation are applied to personnel evaluation, we can more clearly see the distinctions between the two components. Reward and/or punishment evaluation systems are clearly summative evaluation in the sense that the identification of effective . . . behaviors or the identification of . . . competency and . . . behavior can be looked at and judged through the eyes of another person, the evaluator. On the other hand, . . . evaluation systems designed to allow individuals to improve their . . . performance are clearly formative in nature. (p. 76)

Ginsberg and Berry state "evaluations may have the purpose of gathering data to help improve performance (formative), or may use the collected information to make decisions about promotion or firing (summative) (Ginsberg and Berry, 1990, p. 205).

Kowalski and Reitzug state "typically, performance evaluation serves a summative function, that is, to determine whether the individual is meeting job

expectations. The process also may serve a formative purpose-helping employees to improve job-related performance. For the most part, educators have concentrated on summative processes to respond to legal and political accountability mandates" (Kowalski and Reitzug, 1993, p. 36).

Evaluation focused on improvement differs from evaluation focused on past performance and requires different types of evaluation instruments. Kowalski (1998) believes "ultimately, the purpose of evaluating any school employee should be to improve the quality of education" (p. 43).

Evaluation Instruments

"According to *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* (Joint Committee, 1988), 'Evaluations of educators should promote sound education principles, fulfillment of institutional missions, and effective performance of job responsibilities, so that the educational needs of students, community, and society are met" (Cullen, 1995, pp. 362-363).

Kowalski (1998) believes "anyone who is being evaluated wants to know the rules - that is, the areas for which he or she will be held accountable." (p. 43)

"According to Brown and Irby (1997a,p.3), 'Administrator appraisal has historically been approached from basically two procedural vantage points; (1) informal, inconsistent evaluation, and (2) formal checklists on observable management functions.' The informal models continue in numerous school districts today, especially in rural schools, but hold little promise for continuous improvement in practice of administrators or the district or school. The formal checklist method holds more promise in that checklist frequently reflect the current skills and standards developed by professional associations at the state or national levels" (Hoyle, English, and Steffy, 1998, p. 110).

Many types of evaluation instruments have been utilized for a variety of purposes. For example, "the assessment center concept began to emerge in education circles in systems of higher education. The major use of administrator performance assessment has been for selection purposes" (Sirotnik and Durden, 1996, p. 544).

The 360-Degree Feedback model is well-received by "the School Improvement Model (SIM) research team at Iowa State

University's College of Education . . . [who] identified five persistent problems with single-source assessments:

- self-serving 'like-me-ness' expectations;
- favoritism;
- scant data;
- evaluators who refuse to confront marginal performance; and
- varying degrees of rigor in making evaluation ratings (Manatt and Benway, 1998, p.18).

Manatt and Benway (1998) tout the 360-degree feedback model because it uses "supervisor evaluation, self-evaluation, student achievement, student feedback, student attendance, holding power (few dropouts), teacher performance data, teacher feedback, parent feedback, and school climate" to provide information for administrator evaluations (p. 18).

Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998) stated "checklists have been a key part of the Management by Objective (MBO) model, which calls for the superintendent to begin each year in conference with the school board or its evaluation committee, setting performance goals for the school year. Then in early spring the superintendent and the board decide how many of the goals on the checklist have been

met. The board bases its judgement about the superintendent's position and contract on this list of accomplishments. The superintendent follows the same process with all office and building administrators to determine their yearly progress" (p. 110).

Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998) further state "this process is the same as the Leadership by Objectives and Results (LBO/R) model . . . [However], LBO/R included feedback from superiors, subordinates, and peers, but did not involve teachers, other staff members, and parents as the 360 Degree Feedback model does" (p. 110).

"The Administrative Portfolio Appraisal System (APAS) (Brown and Irby, 1996; Brown et al., 1997) . . . was developed in response to administrator needs and concerns regarding evaluation" (Brown, Irby, and Neumeyer, 1998, p. 19). Self-assessment, formative and summative evaluation, refocusing and planning, and informed practice are components of the Administrative Portfolio Appraisal System (Brown, Irby, and Neumeyer, 1998, pp. 20-21).

These evaluation instruments and many others developed and designed by school districts across the United States serve as models of the best practices currently used for evaluating principals.

Summary

The research reveals little focused wide-range research has been completed to give definitive information as to the most effective instrument used to evaluate school principals. The nature of the principals changing roles, which are often difficult to define, and the many parties to which the principal is responsible may make it ineffective to use one instrument for evaluation.

The purpose for principal evaluations may be undetermined prior to the administration of the evaluation and may be based on tradition rather than principal performance. The recent identification of skills necessary to perform as an administrator help give definition to the design of an evaluation instrument for principals. However, all of these issues make it difficult to find or design the perfect instrument for effective principal assessment.

The literature review identified the numerous assessment and evaluation instruments, which exist for educators. The complexity of the instruments and the outcomes they measure can be difficult to comprehend and use. The structure of the principalship may create a need for several types of evaluation instruments to conduct a fair and valid assessment of performance. Schelechty

states "there is no single place where school systems could more appropriately invest time, money, and resources, than in the creation of a comprehensive evaluation system—a system that focuses on new teachers and new administrators (principals, assistant principals, and so on)" (1990, p. 117).

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purposes of this study were (1) to determine the difference of formative or summative principal evaluation instruments used by large and small school districts in the state of Indiana, and (2) to determine if principals in the state of Indiana are evaluated, based on formative or summative instrument identification, for outcomes which are congruent with the administrative evaluation instrument used by their district. This study also (1) compared large and small school districts' use of administrative evaluation instruments based on the skills necessary for effective leaders described by Hoyle, English, and Steffy, and (2) compared the perceptions of superintendents, from large and small school districts, regarding their principal evaluation instruments and their congruency with effective leadership skills. Comparisons and significant differences

were determined by surveying superintendents of public school districts in the state of Indiana with school enrollments greater than 7,000 or less than 1,000.

Description of the Population

Public school superintendents in large and small school districts in the state of Indiana comprised the population for this study. Information was obtained from the 2000 Indiana School Directory published by the Indiana Department of Education and sorted by the Department of School Finance and Educational Information.

Description of the Survey Instrument

The researcher developed the survey instrument in conjunction with Dr. Robert Boyd, Department of Education Administration, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana. The researchers doctoral committee members reviewed the survey instrument. The survey instrument was constructed to identify the perceptions Indiana school superintendents hold relative to administrative evaluation instruments used in their school districts (See Appendix B).

Prior to the dissemination of the survey, the researcher validated the survey by collecting completed

surveys from a validation committee whose members were Dr. David Bess, Superintendent of South Newton School Corporation, Dr. Lou Lindinger, Superintendent of North Newton School Corporation, Mr. Ron Etienne, Superintendent of North Spencer School Corporation, Dr. Vicki Davis, Principal, Greenbrier Elementary School, and Mr. Al Logsdon, Principal, Heritage Hills High School. The five individuals completing the validation process did not represent small or large school districts as defined by this study. The responses from these colleagues were used to:

1. determine survey completion time,
2. improve questions,
3. improve format,
4. determine content validity, and
5. incorporate suggestions for instrument revision.

Any item identified by three of the five validation committee respondents as invalid was considered invalid for this study. In January 2000, a letter was mailed with the survey instrument to each validation committee member with directions to alter or comment on the instrument. (Appendix C) By February 4, 2000, all members had responded and one survey item was altered for clarification. However, no major changes to the survey were recommended.

The survey instrument is divided into five areas: (1) district data, (2) frequency of evaluation, (3) identification of district's evaluation instrument, (4) evaluation outcomes, (5) skills measured by the district's evaluation instrument, and (6) superintendent's perceptions of evaluation congruency with essential skills as described by English, Steffy, and Hoyle in Skills for Successful 21st Century School Leaders.

The survey was designed to allow superintendents to check their responses on a Likert scale. The survey is composed of 21 items. (Appendix B) The first section, district data, includes three items, and the second section, evaluation instruments, includes one item with a forced response. Section three, evaluation outcomes, includes six items identified as formative or summative for the researcher, and four response categories for the survey respondent. Section four, skill measures, lists 10 items and section five, evaluation instrument perceptions has one item, these sections have four response categories for the survey respondent. The category responses include: "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree."

Data Collection Procedures

The study was conducted in the state of Indiana during the 2000 calendar year. Superintendents leading school districts with enrollments of more than 7000 students and less than 1000 students, listed by the Indiana Department of Education through the School Finance and Educational Information Department were asked to respond to the survey.

A cover letter, a stamped self-addressed return envelope and the survey instrument were mailed to each superintendent on February 7, 2000. (Appendix D) Follow-up letters were sent to those superintendents who did not respond to the initial survey. (Appendix E) A total of 64 surveys were returned by February 21, 2000. Sixty-two surveys or 90% of the surveys were usable.

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested.

H_1: There is no significant difference in the use of formative or summative administrative evaluation instruments between small and large school districts in Indiana.

H_2: There is no significant difference in the outcomes evaluated using formative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana.

H_3: There is no significant difference in the outcomes evaluated using summative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana.

H_4: There is no significant difference in the use of essential skills to evaluate principals between small and large school districts in Indiana.

H_5: There is no significant difference in the congruence with essential skills of principal evaluations between small and large school districts in Indiana.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the chi square and analysis of variance. "Chi square is a descriptive measure of magnitude of the discrepancies between the observed and expected frequencies. The larger these discrepancies, the larger chi square will be." (Ferguson and Takane, 1989, page 214) "If the calculated value of chi square is equal to or greater than the critical value required for significance, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is an accepted level of significance for each degree of freedom. If the difference between the observed and expected frequencies is significant, the researcher is reasonably assured these differences cannot be explained by sample error" (Ferguson and Takane, 1989, p. 216).

"The analysis of variance is a method for dividing the variation observed in experimental data into different parts, each part attributable to a known source. The research may assess the relative magnitude of variation resulting from different sources and ascertain whether a particular part of the variation is greater than expected under the null hypothesis" (Ferguson and Takane, 1989, page 250). Descriptive statistics for each test were also included.

Testing of the Null Hypotheses

H_1 was analyzed using a chi square test to determine difference between the use of formative or summative evaluation instruments according to district size.

H_2 was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance with the independent variable represented by the formative evaluation instrument and the dependent variable represented by total formative outcomes.

H_3 was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance with the independent variable represented by the summative evaluation instrument and the dependent variable represented by total summative outcomes.

H_4 was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance with the size of school representing the independent variable and the dependent variable represented by the

total for skills measured.

H_5 was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance with the independent variable represented by superintendent's perceptions and the dependent variable represented by the congruency with essential skills. The level of significance in each statistical test was established at the .05 level.

Summary

The data submitted by superintendents through the completion of the survey was statistically analyzed for significance. The researcher determined the extent to which formative or summative administrative evaluation instruments were used and if principals were evaluated for outcomes that are congruent with such forms of evaluations. The study indicated the level at which principals are evaluated based on researched essential skills, referred to as skill measures. The perceptions superintendents hold of the current evaluation instruments was determined. This study provides additional research for superintendents and school principals regarding evaluation instruments currently in use.

Chapter 4

Statistical Analysis and Findings

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the study as defined by the research questions based on the perceptions of superintendents in the state of Indiana. Surveys were mailed in February 2000 to 69 superintendents in the state of Indiana. Sixty-four superintendents responded to the survey. Twenty-seven superintendents represented large school corporations (student enrollment more than 7,000) and thirty-four superintendents represented small school corporations (student enrollment less than 1,000). One superintendent returned an incomplete survey due to his school boards policy regarding survey completion and one superintendent was recently hired in a school district and she did not feel her completion of the survey would reflect valid information for her district.

Descriptive and statistical data were used to study report findings, answer the research questions, and analyze the null hypotheses.

The research questions were:

1. Is there a difference in the use of formative and summative administrative evaluation instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

2. Is there a difference in the outcomes evaluated using formative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

3. Is there a difference in the outcomes evaluated using summative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

4.Is there a difference in the use of essential skills to evaluate principals between small and large school districts in Indiana?

5. Is there a difference in the congruence with essential skills of principal evaluations between small and large school districts in Indiana?

Summary of Findings

The following tables and discussion provide information based on the data reported on the returned surveys.

Descriptive Data

Superintendents from large and small school districts rated the frequency of their principal evaluations

similarly (Table 4.1). Both large and small school districts evaluated their principals on a yearly basis, and a small percentage of both evaluated their principals twice a year. One small school corporation reported no formal evaluation instrument was being used in his school corporation.

Table 4.1
Frequency of Evaluations
for Large and Small School Districts

Frequency of Evaluations/Size	Small School District	Large School District
Less than once a year	2	2
Once a year	27	19
Twice a year	5	6
More than twice a year	0	0
No evaluation	1	0

A total of 30 superintendents reported using formative evaluation instruments and 21 superintendents reported using summative evaluation instrument. One superintendent reported having no instrument for evaluation of principals, 7 superintendents chose both responses (which excluded them from the testing of H_1, H_2, and H_3), and 10 superintendents did not respond to this question. Twenty (66.7%) superintendents representing small schools reported using

formative evaluation instruments while eight (38.1%) reported using summative evaluation instruments. Among superintendents representing large schools 13 (61.9%) reported using summative evaluation instruments and 10 (33.3%) reported using formative instruments. (Table 4.2)

Table 4.2
Descriptive Data Based on Formative or Summative Instrument for Large and Small School Districts

Classification	Type of Instrument	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Small District	Formative	20	9.25	1.16
Small District	Summative	8	8.00	1.20
Large District	Formative	10	10.60	1.43
Large District	Summative	13	7.85	1.41

Table 4.3 lists the mean scores associated with the superintendents report of their school districts evaluation instruments congruence with the essential skills described by English, Steffy, and Hoyle. Large and small school districts had similar mean scores based on the total score

of the 10 skill items. However, the standard deviation for the small school districts is much greater than that of the large districts.

The mean scores of large districts are higher than small districts regarding the perceptions superintendents hold regarding their evaluation instruments congruence with the essential skill measures. The standard deviation of the small school districts is larger than the large school districts which indicates a degree of discrepancy among superintendents perceptions in small school districts more so than large school districts.

Table 4.3
Descriptive Data Based on Size and Congruence with Skill Measures and Superintendent's Perception

Classification	Congruence with Skill Measures and Perceptions	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Small District	Congruence with Skills Measures	34	29.12	6.15
Small District	Superintendent Perception	34	2.62	.82
Large District	Congruence with Skills Measure	27	31.7	3.65
Large District	Superintendent Perception	27	3.07	.47

Null Hypothesis

This study was based on five hypotheses. These hypotheses are discussed and findings are presented in the following text and tables.

Null Hypothesis One

There is no significant difference in the use of formative or summative administrative evaluation instruments between small and large school districts in Indiana.

This hypothesis was tested using a chi square test. The results of the chi square tests are shown in Table 4.4. The results revealed a significant difference between large and small school districts use of formative and summative evaluation instruments, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 4.4
Chi Square Table Listing
the Level of Significance for
Large and Small School Districts
Formative and Summative Evaluation Instruments

	Value	Df	Significance
Pearson Chi Square	4.07	1	.044*
N of Valid Cases	51		

*level of significance at .05.

Null Hypothesis Two

When using formative instruments, there is no significant difference in the outcomes when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana.

The data for hypothesis two was tested using a one-way analysis of variance. The result revealed a significant difference among the mean scores of the large and small school districts on their total score for responses to three questions related to formative evaluation outcomes, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The summary of analysis of variance is shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5
Analysis of Variance
Summary Table of Differences
Among Large and Small School Districts
Total Scores For Formative Evaluation Outcomes

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Small Dist. Mean	Large Dist. Mean
Between Groups	12.15	1	12.15	7.71	.010*	9.25	10.06
Within Groups	44.15	28	1.57				
Total	56.30	29					

*level of significance at .05.

Null Hypothesis Three

When using summative evaluation instruments, there is no significant difference in the outcomes evaluated when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana.

The data for hypothesis three was tested using a one-way analysis of variance. The summary of analysis of variance is shown in Table 4.6. The result revealed no significant difference among the mean scores of the large and small school districts on their total score for responses to three questions related to summative evaluation outcomes, therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 4.6
Analysis of Variance
Summary Table of Differences
Among Large and Small School Districts
Total Scores For Summative Evaluation Outcomes

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Small Dist. Mean	Large Dist. Mean
Between Groups	.12	1	.12	.066	.80*	8.00	7.85
Within Groups	33.69	19	1.77				
Total	33.81	20					

*level of significance at .05.

Null Hypothesis Four

There is no significant difference between small and large school districts in Indiana in the use of essential skills to evaluate principals.

The data for hypothesis four was tested using a one-way analysis of variance to the .05 level of significance. The summary of analysis of variance is shown in Table 4.7. The scores of each of the ten skills were added to determine a total score. The result revealed there was no significant difference among the mean scores of the large and small schools districts on their responses to ten questions related to skill measures, therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 4.7
Analysis of Variance Summary Table of Differences
Among Large and Small School Districts
Total Skill Measure Scores

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Small Dist. Mean	Large Dist. Mean
Between Groups	100.64	1	100.64	3.72	.058*	29.12	31.70
Within Groups	1595.16	59	27.04				
Total	1695.80	60					

*level of significance at .05

Null Hypothesis Five

There is no significant difference in the congruence with essential skills of principal evaluations as perceived by superintendents of small and large school districts in Indiana.

The data for hypothesis five was tested using a one-way analysis of variance to the .05 level of significance. The summary of analysis of variance is shown in Table 4.8. Superintendents responded to one question based on their perception of their district evaluation instrument and the 10 skill measures. The result revealed a significant difference among the mean scores of superintendents of large and small school districts on perceptions therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 4.8
Analysis of Variance Summary Table
of Differences Among Superintendents Perceptions
for Large and Small School Districts

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Small Dist. Mean	Large Dist. Mean
Between Groups	3.34	1	3.34	6.63	.013*	2.62	3.07
Within Groups	27.88	59	.47				
Total	31.02	60					

*level of significance at .05.

Summary

Analysis of the data resulted in the rejection of three of the five hypotheses formulated for this study. Hypothesis one was accepted and reveals that more small school districts use formative evaluation instruments than do large school districts and more large school districts use summative evaluation instruments than do small school districts. Hypothesis two was rejected and suggests those school districts using formative evaluation instruments differ in opinion about the outcomes being congruent with the formative measure. Hypothesis three was accepted and suggests those school districts using a summative evaluation instrument agree that they are measuring outcomes which are summative in nature. Hypothesis four was accepted and indicates that both large and small school districts evaluation instruments are measuring for essential skills as described by English, Steffy, and Hoyle. Hypothesis five was rejected and indicates superintendents of large school districts perceive their instrument more closely measures for the essential skills than do superintendents of small school districts.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter summarizes, states conclusions, and makes recommendations for further study.

The purposes of this study were (1) to determine the difference between formative or summative principal evaluation instruments used by large and small school districts in the state of Indiana, and (2) to determine if principals in the state of Indiana are evaluated, based on formative or summative instrument identification, for outcomes which are congruent with the administrative evaluation instrument used by their district. This study also (1) compared large and small school districts' use of administrative evaluation instruments based on the skills necessary for effective leaders described by Hoyle, English, and Steffy, and (2) compared the perceptions of superintendents, from large and small school districts,

regarding their principal evaluation instruments and their congruency with effective leadership skills. Comparisons and significant differences were determined by surveying superintendents of public school districts in the state of Indiana.

The following research questions were the basis for this study:

1. Is there a difference in the use of formative and summative administrative evaluation instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

2. Is there a difference in the outcomes evaluated using formative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

3. Is there a difference in the outcomes evaluated using summative instruments when comparing small and large school districts in Indiana?

4. Is there a difference in the use of essential skills to evaluate principals between small and large school districts in Indiana?

5. Is there a difference in the congruence with essential skills of principal evaluations between small and large school districts in Indiana?

Sixty-nine superintendents serving large and small school districts in Indiana public schools were asked to

respond to the survey questions. A second request was mailed to those who did not respond initially. A total of 62 superintendents completed and returned the survey.

The one way analysis of variance and the chi square test were used to analyze the results of the research. The level of significance for the study was determined at .05.

The results of the data were tabulated and analyzed using the SPSS System Windows 9.0 version.

Summary of Findings

The following findings were drawn from this data:

Descriptive Data Findings

Most superintendents in this study, regardless of school district size, report the frequency of administering their evaluation instruments to be once a year. Based on the frequency of use, it would appear as though school districts using a formative evaluation instrument should be evaluating at least twice a year, once to write or review goals and once to determine goal completion.

Superintendents representing small school districts in this study use formative evaluation instruments twice as often as large school districts. The opposite is true for large schools, almost twice as many superintendents representing large school districts reported using

summative evaluation instruments compared to small school districts. These findings suggest that small school districts may devote more time to mentoring and developing their principals. These findings suggest large school districts have increased time constraints regarding the completion of the formative evaluation process or increased legal emphasis placed on the process of evaluation.

Superintendents representing small school districts in Indiana utilizing a formative evaluation instrument rate outcomes for their district evaluation instrument with less varying degree than large school districts using a formative evaluation instrument. This information suggests the small school districts use this type of evaluation frequently and agree on the outcomes their instruments measure.

Superintendents representing small school districts in Indiana utilizing a summative evaluation instrument rate outcomes for their district instrument similarly to large school districts using a summative evaluation instrument. This information suggests there is a clear understanding regarding the outcomes of summative evaluation instruments.

Superintendents representing small school districts varied to greater degree than those representing large school districts on their responses regarding their

evaluation instruments congruence with the skill measures. Superintendents representing large school districts more strongly agree that their instrument measures for the skill measures than superintendents representing small school districts.

Superintendents representing small school districts in Indiana have a larger degree of discrepancy regarding their perceptions of their district evaluation instrument compared to large school districts in Indiana when reporting their district evaluation instruments congruence with the essential skills as defined by English, Steffy, and Hoyle. Superintendents representing large school districts reported identified their perception to a stronger degree than superintendents representing small school districts.

Hypothesis Testing Findings

Superintendents representing small school districts in Indiana use formative evaluation instruments more often than summative evaluation instruments as a primary instrument when evaluating principals. This would suggest that small school districts in Indiana are making an effort to develop and mentor their principals.

Superintendents representing large school districts in Indiana use summative evaluation instruments more often than formative evaluation instruments as primary instruments when evaluating principals. This information suggests large school districts in Indiana are not using evaluation instruments that help develop principals professionally.

Superintendents representing small and large school districts in Indiana report their district instrument evaluates for the essential skills as defined by English, Steffy, and Hoyle. This suggests that schools have aligned their evaluation instruments for principals with the Indiana Standards.

Conclusions

This study revealed that at least one school district in the state of Indiana does not have an evaluation instrument for principals.

This study revealed that small school districts use an evaluation instrument that the research suggests is valuable to effectively evaluate principals. Our large urban schools continue to use the ceremonial approach to principal evaluation when research suggests individuals must develop goals that directly effect their professional

growth. Although much of the research suggests that more than one type of evaluation instrument is necessary to have a well-developed view of a principals job performance, simply summarizing performance does not adequately prepare principals for the challenges they face.

This study suggests that superintendents understand and have developed evaluation instruments for building administrators that meet the standards of the Indiana Professional Standards Board.

Recommendations

The researcher suggests the following recommendations for future study based on the questions brought forth in this study:

1. A study should be undertaken with the principals and superintendents of large and small school districts to identify if there are different perceptions of principals and superintendents from the same school districts regarding principal evaluation instruments.

2. A study should be undertaken to determine if the perceptions of superintendents regarding principal evaluation instruments differ based on factors other than size.

3. A study should be undertaken to determine the varying types of principal evaluation instruments used by school districts in the state of Indiana.

4. A study should be undertaken to determine how school districts are using evaluation instruments to improve principal performance.

5. A study should be undertaken to determine the purpose of evaluation instruments used to assess school principals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barber, Larry (1994). Teacher Evaluation and Merit Pay. Evaluation of Teaching: The Formative Process, Phi Delta Kappa, Hot Topics Series, 1983-1984, 75-84.

Bolin, Frances S., & Panaritis, Philip. (1992) Searching for a Common Purpose: A Perspective on the History of Supervision. Supervision in Transition, The 1992 ASCD Yearbook, 30-43.

Brown, Genevieve, Irby, Beverly J., & Neumeyer, Charles (1998). Taking the Lead: One District's Approach to Principal Evaluation. NASSP Bulletin 82, (602), 18-25.

Coutts, J. Douglas (1997). Why Principals Fail: Are National Professional Standards Valid Measures of Principal Performance. ERS Spectrum, 15 (4), 20-24.

Cullen, Karen (1995). Literature Review Findings: Evaluation of Superintendents. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9 (4), 351-367.

Ferguson, George A., & Takane, Yoshio. (1989). Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (Sixth Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Fletcher, Thomas E., & McInereny, William D. (1995). Principal Performance Areas and Principal Evaluation. ERS Spectrum 13, (4), 16-21.

Ginsberg, Rick & Berry, Barnett (1990) The Folklore of Principal Evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 3, 205-230.

Ginsberg, Rick & Thompson, Tom (1993). Dilemmas and Solutions Regarding Principal Evaluation. Peabody Journal of Education, 68 (1), 59-64.

Hart, Ann Weaver (1992) The Social and Organizational Influence of Principals: Evaluating Principals in Context. Peabody Journal of Education, 68 (1), 37-57.

Holdzkom, David (1985). Educational Managers: A Literature Synthesis. Project presented for North Carolina Department of Public Instruction Personnel Services.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., Charleston, West Virginia, p 33.

Hoyle, John R., English, Fenwick W., & Steffy, Betty E. (1998). Skills for Successful 21st Century School Leaders. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Indiana Professional Standards Board. (1998, May 20). Building Level Administrators Content Standards [On-line]. Available: www.state.in.us/psb/Standards/standards.htm

Johnson, Lewis R. (1998). Performance Evaluation of Special Education Administrators: Considerations and Recommendations. NASSP Bulletin 82, (594), 24-32.

Kowalski, Theodore J., & Reitzug, Ulrich C. (1993) Contemporary School Administration An Introduction. White Plaines, NY: Longman Publishing Group.

Manatt, Richard P. & Benway, Michael (1998). Teacher and Administrator Performance Evaluation: Benefits of 360-Degree Feedback. ERS Spectrum, 16 (2), 19-23.

Morris, Van Cleve, Crowson, Robert L., Porter-Gehrie, Cynthia, Hurwitz, Jr., Emanuel (1984) Principals in Action the Reality of Managing Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Rinehart, James S. & Russo, Charles J. (1995). The Kentucky Education Reform Act and the Evaluation of School Principals. International Journal of Education Reform, 4 (1), 51-60.

Schlechty, Phillip C. (1990) Schools for the Twenty-First Century Leadership Imperatives for Educational Reform. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A., & Durden, Phyllis C. (1996) The Validity of Administrator Performance Assessment System: The ADI as a Case-in-Point. Educational Administration Quarterly 32 (4), 539-564.

Stufflebeam, Daniel, & Nevo, David. (1993) Principal Evaluation: New Directions for Improvement. Peabody Journal of Education, 68 (2), 24-46.

Tirozzi, Gerald, N. (1999). NASSP 83rd Annual Convention. Celebrating Leadership for Learning. [Brochure].

Weiss, Kathy (1989, March). Administrative Appraisal Process. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Orlando, Florida.

Wheeler, Patricia, Haertel, Geneva, and Schriven, Michael. (1992). Teacher Evaluation Glossary. Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation. The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University, MI.

Appendix A

Indiana Professional Standards Board

Standards for Building Level Administrators
May 20, 1998

Standard #1: A Vision of Learning.

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the greater school community.

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

1. the vision, mission, and goals of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members.
2. the core beliefs of the school are modeled for all stakeholders.
3. the vision is developed with and among stakeholders.
4. the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are celebrated.
5. progress toward the vision and mission is communicated to all stakeholders.
6. the greater school community is involved in school improvement efforts.
7. the vision shapes the educational programs, plans, and actions.
8. an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated.
9. data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals.
10. relevant demographic data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the school mission and goals.
11. barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed.

12. resources are sought to support the implementation of the school mission and goals.

13. the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised.

Knowledge

The administrator has a knowledge and understanding of:

1. learning goals in a pluralistic society.
2. the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans.
3. theories of educational leadership (e.g., the categories of systems theory, change theory, and motivational theory).
4. information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies.
5. effective communication (e.g., writing, speaking, listening, use of technology).
6. negotiation skills for consensus building.
7. the foundations of education.

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

1. the educability of all.
2. the ideal of the common good.
3. a school vision of high standards of learning.
4. continuous school improvement.
5. providing the opportunity for inclusion of all stakeholders in the school community.
6. ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults.
7. a willingness to continuously examine one's own assumptions, beliefs, and practices.
8. the work ethic required for high levels of personal and organizational performance.

Standard #2: School Culture and Instructional Program.

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

1. all individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect.
2. professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals.
3. there is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance.
4. the responsibilities of all are defined.
5. student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated.
6. barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed.
7. diversity is considered in developing learning experiences.
8. lifelong learning is encouraged and modeled.
9. multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students and staff.
10. the school is organized and aligned for success.
11. curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated, and refined.
12. curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, the recommendations of learned societies, and the needs of the community.
13. the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis.
14. a variety of sources of information are used to make decisions.
15. student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques.
16. multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students.
17. a variety of supervisory models are employed.
18. student guidance programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families.
19. technologies are used for teaching and learning.
20. data from pure research are used in decision making.

Knowledge

The administrator has a knowledge and understanding of:

1. school cultures.
2. student growth and development.
3. applied learning theories.
4. applied motivational theories.

5. curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement.
6. principles of effective instruction.
7. measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies.
8. diversity and its meaning for educational programs.
9. adult learning and professional development models.
10. the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals.
11. the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth.

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
1. student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling.
2. the proposition that all students can learn.
3. the proposition that students learn in a variety of ways.
4. lifelong learning for self and others.
5. professional development as an integral part of school improvement.
6. a safe and supportive learning environment. preparing students to be contributing members of society.

Standard #3: Management.

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
1. knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used in reaching management decisions.
2. operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning.
3. emerging trends are recognized, studied, and applied as appropriate.
4. operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place.
5. collective bargaining and other contractual agreements related to the school are effectively managed.

6. the school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively.
7. time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals.
8. potential problems and opportunities are identified.
9. problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner.
10. financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of schools.
11. the school acts entrepreneurially to support continuous improvement.
12. organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed.
13. stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting schools.
14. responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability.
15. effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used.
16. conflict is effectively managed.
17. effective group-process and consensus-building skills are used.
18. effective communication skills are used.
19. there is effective use of technology to manage school operations.
20. fiscal resources of the school are managed responsibly, efficiently, and effectively.
21. a safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained.
22. confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained.

Knowledge

The administrator has a knowledge and understanding of:

1. theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development.
2. human resources management and development.
3. operational policies and procedures at the school and district level.
4. principles and issues relating to school safety and security.
5. principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management.

6. principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space.
7. legal issues impacting school operations.
8. current technologies which support management functions.

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
1. making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching.
2. accepting responsibility.
3. high quality standards, expectations, and performances.
4. involving stakeholders in management processes.
5. cultivating a safe and trusting environment.

Standard #4: Collaboration with Families and the Community.

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
1. high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community occurs.
2. relationships with community leaders are established and nurtured.
3. respect is given to individuals and groups whose values, opinions, and cultures may conflict.
4. information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly.
5. there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations.
6. the school and community serve one another as resources.
7. available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals.
8. partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups to strengthen programs and support school goals.

9. community stakeholders are treated equitably.
10. effective media relations are developed and maintained.
11. a comprehensive program of community relations is established.
12. public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely.
13. community collaboration is modeled for staff.
14. opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided.
15. multicultural awareness, gender sensitivity, and racial and ethnic appreciation are promoted.

Knowledge

The administrator has a knowledge and understanding of:
1. emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community.
2. the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community (e.g., social, cultural, leadership, historical, and political).
3. community resources (e.g., parental, business, governmental agencies, community, and social services).
4. community relations and marketing strategies and processes.
5. successful models of school, family, business, community, government, and higher education partnerships.
6. community and district power structures.

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
1. schools operating as an integral part of the larger community.
2. collaboration and communication with families and community.
3. involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes.
4. the proposition that diversity can enrich the school.
5. families as partners in the education of their children.
6. using community resources to enhance the education of students.
7. informing the public.

8. schools and families keeping the best interests of children in mind.

Standard #5: Acting with Integrity and Fairness and in an Ethical Manner.

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by acting with integrity and fairness and in an ethical manner.

Performances

The administrator:

1. demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics.
2. demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance.
3. accepts responsibility for school operations.
4. considers the impact of one's administrative practices on others.
5. uses the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain.
6. treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect.
7. protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff.
8. demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community after examining and considering the prevailing values.
9. recognizes and respects the legitimate authority of others.
10. welcomes and encourages the community into the school.
11. fulfills legal and contractual obligations.
12. makes decisions based on ethical implications within the spirit of the law.

Knowledge

The administrator has a knowledge and understanding of:

1. the purpose of education and the role of leadership in a changing society.
2. the values, ethics, and challenges of the diverse school community.
3. professional codes of ethics.

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

1. the ideal of the common good.
2. the principles in the Bill of Rights.
3. bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process.
4. subordinating one's own interest to the good of the school community.
5. accepting the consequences for upholding one's principles and actions.
6. using the influence of one's office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families.
7. development of a caring school community.

Standard #6: The Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Context.

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students and staff by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes to encourage that:

1. the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural environment in which schools operate is influenced on behalf of students, their families, and staff.
2. communication occurs within the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate.
3. there is the opportunity for ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups.
4. the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities.
5. public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students.
6. lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community.

Knowledge

The administrator has a knowledge and understanding of:

1. principles of representative governance that support the system of American schools.
2. the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation.
3. the law as related to education and schooling.
4. the political, social, cultural, and economic systems that impact schools.
5. models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of schooling.
6. global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning.
7. the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system.
8. the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society.

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

1. education as a key to opportunity, social mobility, and self-realization.
2. recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures.
3. the importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education.
4. actively participating in the policy-making context in the service of education.
5. using legal systems to protect student, staff, and parental rights.

APPENDIX B

A Comparative Study of Superintendent's Perceptions of Principal Evaluations In The State Of Indiana

Superintendent's Survey

District Data

Please mark each question with your response. Choose only one response for each question.

1. Gender of person completing this response.

_____ Male _____ Female

2. Classification of district.

_____ Rural _____ Suburban _____ Urban

3. Frequency of administrative evaluation in your district.

_____ Less than once a year

_____ Once a year

_____ Twice a year

_____ More than twice a year

_____ No formal evaluation instrument in district

Evaluation Instruments

Please mark the question with your response. **Choose only one response for the question.**

4. The evaluation instrument primarily used by our school district to evaluate building principals is based on:

_____ formative measures (measurement based on data gathered for the purpose of improving job performance, ie: process)

_____ summative measures(measurement based on data gathered for the purpose of determining the impact of job performance, ie: product)

Directions: Using the following criteria, circle one response for each item.

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree

Evaluation Outcomes

The primary outcomes of evaluation instruments completed for principals of our school corporation are:

5.	To understand a principal's yearly goals	SA	A	D	SD
6.	To discuss a principal's self appraisal	SA	A	D	SD
7.	To determine a principal's increased compensation	SA	A	D	SD
8.	To comply with established legal requirements for dismissal or retention	SA	A	D	SD
9.	To understand a principal's plan for skill improvement	SA	A	D	SD
10.	To compare a principal's performance with duties listed in the job description	SA	A	D	SD

Skill Measures

The evaluation instrument used by our school corporation to evaluate principals measures for the following skills:

11.	Visionary Leadership: leading others to peak performance	SA	A	D	SD

12. Policy and Governance: formulating policy in collaboration with others	SA	A	D	SD
13. Communications/Community Relations: ethical articulation of school vision for all community members	SA	A	D	SD
14. Organizational Management: knowledge of systemic change and ability to make data-driven decisions	SA	A	D	SD
15. Curriculum Planning and Development: development of a curriculum design and delivery system	SA	A	D	SD
16. Instructional Management: development of data-driven student assessment system	SA	A	D	SD
17. Staff Evaluation/Personnel Management: development of a staff evaluation system	SA	A	D	SD
18. Staff Development: creating a system for effective staff development	SA	A	D	SD
19. Educational Research: conducting research and using research methods	SA	A	D	SD
20. Values and Ethics of Leadership: modeling an Appropriate value system for Our democratic society	SA	A	D	SD

Evaluation Instrument Perceptions

The perceptions I hold of our current administrative evaluation instrument are as follows:

21. Our evaluation instrument is congruent with the skill

measures list in questions
numbered 12-20 of this survey. SA A D SD

Check if you wish to receive a copy of the research findings _____

Appendix C

Validation Letter

January 28, 2000

Name
Address
City, State ZIP

Salutation:

The purpose of this letter is to request your assistance to validate and improve a survey instrument for research related to the evaluation of principals in the state of Indiana.

I am conducting a study to determine the perceptions superintendents hold regarding principal evaluations. Based on your professional experience please provide comments about the enclosed survey regarding the following:

1. survey completion time
2. clarity of questions
3. survey format
4. suggestions for revisions
5. content validity

Please mark directly on the survey instrument. Circle any items you feel are not valid for this survey and include your comments for the remaining questions at the end of the survey or on the reverse side of the survey. Please return your comments and suggestions by Tuesday, February 1 via fax at 219-474-6592.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Ginger Studebaker
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

February 7, 2000

Dear Superintendent:

This letter is to request your participation in a research study comparing public school principal evaluation instruments. Your responses to the enclosed survey will provide information to be analyzed and incorporated into my doctoral dissertation in the Department of Educational Administration at Indiana State University under the direction of Dr. Robert L. Boyd, Committee Chairperson.

Your responses will remain confidential and individual schools and superintendents will not be identified. The identification mark on the first page of the survey will be used to record the receipt of your survey and provide information to my dissertation committee regarding survey return rates.

The enclosed survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete. Please complete and return the survey in the envelope provided by February 14.

Thank you in advance for your assistance. If you would like a copy of the research findings please mark the survey accordingly.

Sincerely,

Ginger Studebaker

Dr. Robert L. Boyd
Committee Chairperson