



1976

## Evaluation Of Elementary Principals In New York State

Anthony Francis Ruocco  
*University of the Pacific*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Ruocco, Anthony Francis. (1976). *Evaluation Of Elementary Principals In New York State*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds/3357](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3357)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).

EVALUATION OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS  
IN NEW YORK STATE

---

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of the Pacific

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

Anthony Francis Ruocco

June 1976

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Dr. Thomas C. Coleman, Dr. Rollin C. Fox and Dr. William Bacon for their guidance throughout the study, as well as their suggestions and criticisms.

Although Dr. Neil Lark and Dr. Clifford Hand could not participate at the final examination, the writer is indebted to them for their readings of preliminary drafts and their suggestions.

Special thanks must be given Dr. Roger Reimer and Dr. John Schippers for their willingness, after late notice, to participate during the final examination. Their comments were direct and meaningful.

The writer is grateful to Mrs. Margaret S. Martin for her careful and meticulous typing, and for her making the final stage of this effort as painless as possible.

Finally, and most importantly, it was my wife, Virginia, and my children, Mark and Claudia, who faithfully and lovingly coped with the moods of a full-time student and part-time husband and father.

Virginia, Mark and Claudia--this is our dissertation.

EVALUATION OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS  
IN NEW YORK STATE

Abstract of the Dissertation

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this study was to review the literature related to evaluation of elementary school principals, to identify current practices, and to develop a model which would include evaluation areas of responsibility, the nature of elementary principal responsibilities and competencies, the procedure for evaluating elementary school principal functions, and how such evaluations should be utilized.

**PROCEDURES:** The population for this study was superintendents throughout New York State in school districts containing an average daily attendance of 5,000 to 20,000 pupils. All 104 superintendents were surveyed and 67 superintendents (64.4 percent) responded. To reinforce the study, 100 elementary principals were selected at random in Nassau and Suffolk Counties for survey purposes. Sixty-five elementary principals (65 percent) responded.

The questionnaire used in this study was developed from a review of the literature and included three dimensions. First, general questions were asked to determine the nature and frequency of visitations and conferences conducted by superintendents for evaluation purposes. The second dimension was designed to determine how superintendents were to utilize evaluations. Finally, the last dimension of the questionnaire consisted of 45 elementary principal responsibilities and competencies. Superintendents and elementary principals were asked to indicate whether each responsibility or competency was an exclusive, primary, supervisory, or coordinating function. In addition, administrator-respondents were asked to indicate how each responsibility was to be evaluated--by written communication, inspection, or conference methods.

The questionnaire was validated by a panel of five administrators and two psychologists.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA:** As a result of the study the following generalizations are drawn: (1) In a majority of the school districts surveyed elementary principals are evaluated periodically; procedures for evaluation are informal; visitations are not conducted on a regular basis; and evaluations are in written form. (2) There is substantial disagreement among the superintendents and elementary principals surveyed as to whether or not regular conferences for evaluative purposes are held with elementary principals. (3) A majority of the school districts surveyed conducted two or three yearly visitations for evaluative purposes during the year preceding the survey. (4) A majority of the administrators surveyed suggested that two, three, or four yearly visitations for evaluative purposes be conducted; and that two, three, or four evaluations be conducted before tenure, with one or two after tenure. According to predominant administrator opinion, an order of priority for utilization of evaluation was developed.

**MODELS:** Two models with a four point rating scale ranging from "Superior" to "Needs Improvement" were developed from the study. The first model was based upon concentrated pluralities of administrator judgements for each designated responsibility and evaluation procedure as distinct separate quantities of analysis. The second model was based upon the greatest concentration of total administrator responses for combined responsibility and evaluation procedure variables for each responsibility. Both models provide a means for rating the elementary principal in the light of the nature of each responsibility and the evaluation procedure to be utilized.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** It was recommended that additional research be conducted to: (1) analyze nationwide elementary principal evaluation forms to determine evaluation criteria utilized by school districts and attitudes of superintendents toward evaluation processes; (2) field test the models developed in this study; (3) determine to what extent current evaluation procedures are cooperatively developed among administrators; (4) analyze in depth the supervisory relationships between superintendents and principals; (5) develop a similar model for the evaluation of high school principals; and (6) achieve mutual agreement between superintendents and elementary principals with regard to responsibilities and changing situational demands.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	ix

Chapter

I	THE PROBLEM AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY . . . . .	1
	Research in Measuring Leadership . . . . .	5
	The Problem . . . . .	7
	Purposes of Study . . . . .	7
	Procedure . . . . .	8
	Development of the Questionnaire . . . . .	8
	Administrator Tasks and Responsibilities . . . . .	9
	A Review of Additional Information . . . . .	10
	Inadequacy of Theories . . . . .	10
	Summary . . . . .	11
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	14
	Man in the Middle . . . . .	15
	National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Approach to Evaluation . . . . .	17
	Inter-Relationships of People in Schools . . . . .	19
	Principal's Responsibilities and Competencies . . . . .	20
	Administrator Values . . . . .	21
	Administrator Skills and Abilities . . . . .	22
	Principal's Functions . . . . .	25
	The Principal and His Superior . . . . .	30
	Administrator Performance and Development . . . . .	31
	Situational Demands . . . . .	35
	Trends for Evaluating Administrative Performance . . . . .	36
	Summary . . . . .	38

Chapter		Page
III	METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	43
	The Questionnaire . . . . .	43
	Groups Surveyed . . . . .	46
	Building the Model . . . . .	48
	Summary . . . . .	50
IV	ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS . . . . .	54
	General Questions . . . . .	54
	Utilization of Evaluations . . . . .	63
	Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies . . . . .	66
	Compilation of Data . . . . .	121
	Summary . . . . .	132
V	DEVELOPMENT OF THE MODEL . . . . .	135
	Crosstabulations (Combined Variables) . . . . .	135
	Degree of Statistical Significance Achieved . . . . .	145
	Summary . . . . .	155
VI	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	156
	Purposes of Study . . . . .	156
	The Literature . . . . .	156
	The Questionnaire . . . . .	158
	Groups Surveyed . . . . .	160
	Analysis of the Data . . . . .	160
	Order of Priority in Utilization of Evaluations . . . . .	162
	The Models . . . . .	164
	Recommendations for Further Study . . . . .	165
	APPENDICES . . . . .	171
A	Datrix Reference Listing . . . . .	172
B	Correspondence - National Association of Elementary School Principals (NEA . . . . .	176
C	Questionnaire and Cover Letters . . . . .	179
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	190

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	General Evaluative Procedures . . . . .	57
II	Percentage of Superintendents Who Conducted Designated Number of Evaluations . . . . .	58
III	Required Number of Visitations . . . . .	60
IV	Required Number of Evaluations Before Tenure . . . . .	62
V	Required Number of Evaluations After Tenure . . . . .	64
VI	Utilization of Principal Evaluation . . . . .	65
VII	Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies . . . . .	67
VIII	Crosstabulations of Responsibilities and Evaluation Procedure . . . . .	76

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
I	Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies . . . . .	122
II	Crosstabulations of Responsibilities with Evaluation Procedure Within Specified Degrees of Freedom . . . . .	127
III	Model for Evaluating Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies (Developed from Table VII) . . . . .	136
IV	Model for Evaluating Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies (Developed from Table VIII) . . . . .	146



## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

How superintendents and central office personnel evaluate principals is determined by their own personalities, competencies, attitudes toward evaluative processes, intellectual abilities, and effectiveness as educational leaders. It is assumed that those administrators who possess greater skills in human relations and administrative leadership will organize the staff for the improvement of instruction through evaluation processes.<sup>1</sup> Evaluation instruments and procedures are often a means for increased superintendent-principal dialogue and interaction which in a constructive way can bring about professional growth for the individual principal.<sup>2</sup> It is presumed that professional growth of principals will have positive effects on teachers, pupils and the educational program.<sup>3</sup> Superintendents' attitudes toward the evaluation

<sup>1</sup> Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), pp. 536-537.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 536.

<sup>3</sup> James Carvell. "Evaluative Administrative Performance," Thrust for Educational Leadership, Vol. 2, No. 2 (November 1972), p. 32.

of principals, therefore, are regarded as critical in the educative and administrative process.<sup>1</sup>

While there is a great deal of material available that defines the characteristics of the elementary principal's leadership and effectiveness, a DATRIX examination indicates that little has been done as guidelines for measuring leadership performance.<sup>2</sup> Although authorities in the field of administration describe leadership, materials on evaluating these practices are minimal.<sup>3</sup> Hemphill et al. state: "It is a rare textbook in educational administration which discusses evaluation of the elementary principal."<sup>4</sup> According to the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NEA), no research pertaining to evaluating a principal's leadership practices and procedures is available.<sup>5</sup> Historically, when evaluating procedures were used in the total teaching-learning situation, the emphasis was upon the

<sup>1</sup>Neal Gross and Robert Herriott. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry (New York: John Wiley, 1965), pp. 4 and 12.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix A.

<sup>3</sup>John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths and Norman Frederiksen. Administrative Performance and Personality (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962), p. 348.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>See Appendix B.

teacher. Evaluation should include the supervisor as well.<sup>1</sup> Efforts to improve the educational process must include an evaluation of the leadership of the school's total program.<sup>2</sup>

Recent studies substantiate the importance of the principal's role in the elementary school. Several studies indicate increased readiness for actual change in schools where the principals function in a democratic rather than an authoritarian role.<sup>3</sup> Further, a number of studies indicate that a principal's effectiveness is directly related to how he and others (e.g., superiors, staff and parent groups) define his role.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Willard S. Ellsbree and Harold I. McNally. Elementary School Administration and Supervision (New York: American Book Company, 1959), p. 183.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 187-190; see also Henry J. Otto and David C. Sanders. Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1964), pp. 385-386.

<sup>3</sup>Kimball Wiles and H.G. Grobman. "The Role of the Principal in Curriculum Development," Educational Administration Supplement, No. 44 (1958), pp. 10-14.

<sup>4</sup>Roald F. Campbell and John A. Ramseyer. The Dynamics of School-Community Relationships (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1958), pp. 19-21; see also Lawrence W. Downey. The Task of Public Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1960), p. 64; see also Egon G. Guba and Charles E. Bidwell. Administrative Relationships (Chicago: The Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957), pp. 1, 65-68.

Ostrander and Dethy indicate that, given a specific situation, different people will have varying ideas as to how a principal should handle a problem.<sup>1</sup> Their thoughts are based upon how they perceive the role of the principal.<sup>2</sup> Parents may expect the principal to investigate a disciplinary matter and reserve judgment (or support the teacher) until all the facts have been gathered. Teachers may expect the principal to automatically support all their actions in disciplinary situations. Although the superintendent may see a disciplinary problem as the exclusive responsibility of the principal, the principal nevertheless expects the superintendent to become involved in its resolution.<sup>3</sup> Such combinations of expectations which different people may hold for a role incumbent are designated as "role-set" by Merton and others.<sup>4</sup>

The principal who is attempting to fulfill the various expectations of different people (role-set) often finds expectations contradictory. This can result in tensions which thwart the goals of the instructional program, and make the principal less effective from a leadership

<sup>1</sup>Raymond H. Ostrander and Ray C. Dethy. A Values Approach to Educational Administration (Huntington, New York: Krieger Publishing Company, 1973), p. 147.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Robert K. Merton. Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 369.

point-of-view.<sup>1</sup> However, on the other hand, a principal's total effectiveness increases when his own conception of his role agrees with or is similar to the expectations of a specified group.<sup>2</sup> Lines of responsibility and authority are defined by mutual consent, and for the overall benefit of those concerned (principal, superior, staff and parent group).<sup>3</sup>

### Research in Measuring Leadership

Research evidence indicates that leadership traits represent but one aspect of leadership. An early study concentrated on specific personality traits which, when applied to administrators, distinguished the leaders from the followers.<sup>4</sup> It assumed that successful leadership behavior was a function of a particular personality unique to an individual.<sup>5</sup> Gouldner, reviewing this literature, reveals the fallacies of such an assumption. He indicates that the

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Richard C. Lonsdale. "Maintaining the Organization in Dynamic Equilibrium" in Behavioral Administration, Daniel E. Griffiths (ed.) (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1964), pp. 142-177; see also Raymond G. Hunt. "Role and Role Conflict" in Focus on Change and the School Administrator, Harry I. Hartley and George E. Halloway, Jr. (eds.) (Buffalo: The State University of New York at Buffalo, 1965), pp. 37-46.

<sup>3</sup>Morphet et al., op.cit., p. 177.

<sup>4</sup>Cecil A. Gibb. "The Principals and Traits of Leadership," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 42 (July 1947), pp. 267-284.

<sup>5</sup>Hemphill et al., op.cit., p. 356.

criteria for successful leadership, as well as the devices for measuring such success, have not been universally accepted. He concluded, "At this time, there is no reliable evidence concerning the existence of universal leadership traits."<sup>1</sup>

Another approach to the study of leadership concluded that leadership behavior is unique to any given situation.<sup>2</sup> Stogdill stated: "The qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of the situation in which he is to function as a leader."<sup>3</sup>

Still another approach to the study of leadership was based on the assumption that there is a commonality among all situations, that situations are not all unique, and that different stages of leadership are necessary under varying circumstances.<sup>4</sup> This approach uses social system analysis in examining leadership behavior in different situations.

---

<sup>1</sup>Alvin W. Gouldner. Studies in Leadership (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 34.

<sup>2</sup>Ralph M. Stogdill. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology, Vol. 25 (January 1948), p. 63.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administration Process," School Review, Vol. 65 (Winter 1957), pp. 423-441.

### The Problem

The problem of this study was to develop a model for the evaluation of elementary school principals in school districts from 5,000 to 20,000 ADA in the State of New York.

### Purposes of Study

The purposes of this study were to:

1. Review the literature related to the evaluation of elementary school principals,
2. Identify current practices related to the evaluation of elementary school principals in school districts of from 5,000 to 20,000 ADA in the State of New York, and
3. Develop a model for the evaluation of elementary school principals which will include competencies, evaluation areas, evidence utilized and the use made of evaluations.

Such a study could assist superintendents and central office personnel in more definitive evaluation procedures which will have increased significance for the educational processes for elementary education. (A model is defined as a system of competencies and areas of evaluation considered essential in the process of determining the effectiveness of elementary principals by central office personnel and worthy of imitation by others and the manner in which such criteria are utilized).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>This definition is an adaptation of the definition for the word "model" as found in: Phillip Babcock Cove, Editor, Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged (Springfield, Massachusetts: G & C Merriam Company, 1967), p. 1451.

### Procedure

Data for the study were obtained from superintendents, central office personnel, elementary school principals, and related literature. These populations were studied by means of a carefully constructed questionnaire. Completed questionnaires were analyzed to make comparisons and verifications, as well as to describe and classify the evaluation procedures and practices.

Under the auspices of Fred Baruchin, Director of Elementary Education of the New York State Education Department, the project was endorsed by that department and covered school districts from 5,000 to 20,000 ADA in the State. To lend further support to the project, the survey's cover letter was directed to superintendents and principals, over the signature of Dr. Thomas C. Coleman, University of the Pacific. The letter indicated that the National Association of Elementary School Principals expressed interest in the successful completion of this research study.

### Development of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire, developed under the supervision of Dr. Thomas C. Coleman and a panel of administrators, was based on a study of fifteen school districts in Nassau and Suffolk Counties (New York State). Each school was contacted to determine the nature of the principal's responsibilities, and the evaluation procedures then used by personnel



to measure his performance. Literature related to the topic, as well as copies of evaluation forms submitted by the school districts, were combined to develop the questionnaire. Five administrators and two psychologists then examined the questionnaire and made appropriate content and psychometric suggestions. After several revisions, Dr. Coleman approved the questionnaire for use in the study.

#### Administrator Tasks and Responsibilities

Critical tasks of administrators, as defined by Graff and Street,<sup>1</sup> were introduced into the questionnaire. A task, as defined by these authors, is "a segment of a job sufficiently distinct to be identified by the qualified observer, and its performance may be judged as being conducive to the overall performance of the job of administration."<sup>2</sup> "A critical task," they continue, "is one whose nonperformance will be detrimental to the outcomes needed for successful educational administration."<sup>3</sup> They further categorize critical tasks into seven operational areas: organization and structure, finance and business management, student personnel, curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, school plant, and transportation.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Orin B. Graff and Calvin M. Street. Improving Competence in Educational Administration (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), pp. 199-215.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 201.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 204-215.

### A Review of Additional Information

Similarly, Grieder, Pierce and Jordan divide educational administration into eight critical tasks: instruction and curriculum development, pupil personnel, community-school leadership, staff personnel, school plant, organization and structure, school finance and business management, and school transportation.<sup>1</sup>

Hemphill et al. assert that the most common evaluation of an administrator's performance is based on subjective judgment. "An elementary school principal's progress," they write, "his promotion, salary, dismissal or transfer, depend primarily on the opinions of his superiors."<sup>2</sup> Educational administration textbooks rarely discuss evaluation of the elementary principal. Further, because little research has been done in this area, very few school systems use formal evaluation systems.<sup>3</sup> Based on the results of their study of school districts, Hemphill et al. advise the introduction of systems of formal evaluation.<sup>4</sup>

### Inadequacy of Theories

The panel decided that current theories of administration were not substantial enough to support adequately an

<sup>1</sup>Calvin Grieder, Truman M. Pierce and K. Forbis Jordan. Public School Administration (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1969), pp. 106-107.

<sup>2</sup>Hemphill et al., p. 348. <sup>3</sup>Ibid. <sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 6-7.

evaluation procedure for this study. They maintained that theory building can best be achieved by establishing a familiarity with current practices. Thus, empirical findings were considered paramount in formulating the questionnaire and conducting the survey. The research team involved in the Hemphill et al. study supported this empirical research for two reasons: "The first, a clear recognition of the inadequacy of the administrative theories; the second, advances made in modern computational methods."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. T.C. Coleman and the panel agreed that the questionnaire should first delineate responsibilities and then determine how superintendents and elementary principals actually defined and evaluated them. It was also felt that a computer analysis would assist in obtaining frequency scores and correlations, because while school administration has few theories, it has even fewer facts. Such a computer approach would make a significant contribution to our knowledge of evaluations of administrative behavior. This opinion was supported by the Hemphill et al. study.<sup>2</sup>

#### Summary

While there is considerable material available that describes the characteristics of the elementary principal's leadership and effectiveness, research indicates that little has been done in terms of measuring leadership performance.

<sup>1</sup>Hemphill, et al., p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

It has been common practice to center evaluating procedures upon teachers. However, it is considered essential that efforts to improve the educational process include the evaluation of the leadership of the school's total program.

The purposes of this study were to review the literature related to evaluation of elementary school principals, to identify current practices, and to develop a model which would include evaluation areas of responsibilities, the procedure for evaluating elementary school principal functions, and how such evaluations should be utilized.

With the assistance of the New York State Department of Education a survey was conducted of all superintendents and a population of elementary principals in school districts with an average daily attendance of from 5,000 to 20,000 students. These populations were studied by means of a carefully constructed questionnaire developed under the supervision of Dr. Thomas C. Coleman and a panel of administrators.

The study is organized into six chapters. Chapter I presents the problem, and purposes of the study. Chapter II reviews the literature relating to the appraisal of administrative performance. Chapter III discusses the methodology and procedures utilized to obtain the necessary data and develop the models for evaluation of elementary principals.

In Chapter IV the data obtained are analyzed for the purposes of building a model for the evaluation of elementary principals. While two separate models are developed in Chapter V, the second model is considered more representative than the first model. Chapter VI contains conclusions and recommendations for further study.

---

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As indicated in Chapter I, while authorities in educational administration describe leadership behaviors, little has been written in the area of evaluation of elementary principals. Under the assumption that efforts to improve the educational process must include the evaluation of the leadership of the school's total instructional program, the literature has been analyzed to determine the fundamental role and functions of the elementary principal, the necessary responsibilities and competencies, as well as the values, skills and abilities he should possess. In addition, the review of the literature examines the unique situational demands which may be placed upon administrators, the important relationship of the elementary principal and his superior, and the inter-relationships of people within the schools as a social system. The chapter also reviews the premises which might underlie an appraisal process for leadership performance, and examines recent trends for evaluating administrative performance in terms of pupil progress and principal competencies.

Man in the Middle

That the elementary principal is the focal point of curriculum change and quality education has been substantiated in the literature.<sup>1</sup> He has been depicted as the "man in the middle."<sup>2</sup> He is expected to apply sound educational principles, implement a modern program of education based upon established tenets of learning and psychology, increase public understanding, and mollify the opinions and power influences of board members and symbiotic community groups.<sup>3</sup>

Goldhammer and Becker wrote that talented principals in quality schools were superb tacticians:

They were constantly devising strategies for better programs. They knew the ropes and didn't hesitate to manipulate the people, processes, or politics to get the resources they needed for those programs, even when it meant going over their superiors' heads. They were too aggressive to live comfortably within the administrative system. In many instances they made their superiors very unhappy, but since they delivered the goods, their maverick behavior had to be tolerated.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Keith Goldhammer and Gerald Becker. "What Makes A Good Elementary Principal?" American Education (April 1970), p. 50.

<sup>2</sup>Larry Burden and Robert L. Whitt. The Community School Principal (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973), p. 107.

<sup>3</sup>Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974), pp. 374-376.

<sup>4</sup>Goldhammer and Becker, op.cit.

Fantini emphasizes the destructive political power struggle resulting from unionization and collective bargaining on the part of teachers.<sup>1</sup> He asserts that the "relationship of educational administration to teachers has drastically altered,"<sup>2</sup> and that conflicting role expectations are becoming more pronounced.<sup>3</sup> The principal is now increasingly bound by legal contractual agreements which force negotiations with union building representatives.<sup>4</sup> He cannot easily deal with his teachers on an individual basis since independent judgments on the part of teachers are bound by collective bargaining agreements.<sup>5</sup>

Fantini also notes that the changing role of the superintendent is even more noticeable. He is "no longer the chief leader of all professionals in the district.... He is management; teachers are labor."<sup>6</sup> He must choose between the organized profession and the public. Under such conditions, "the superintendent must become a child

---

<sup>1</sup>Mario D. Fantini. "The School-Community Power Struggle." The National Elementary Principal, Vol. 54, No. 3 (January/February 1975), p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 58.

<sup>4</sup>Oscar T. Jarvis and Haskins R. Pounds. Organizing and Administering the Elementary School (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1969), pp. 20-21; see also James C. King. "New Directions for Collective Negotiation," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. 67, No. 1 (September 1967), pp. 43-47.

<sup>5</sup>Fantini, op.cit.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.



advocate and protector of the public interest, and in assuming such a role, the administrator is placed in direct opposition to the teachers."<sup>1</sup>

National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Approach to Evaluation

An approach to the evaluation of secondary school principals is developed in a publication by NASSP.<sup>2</sup> In this booklet a distinction is made between evaluation of administrators through their performance of objective pre-determined task-performance criteria and evaluation by exception.<sup>3</sup> The brochure points out that administering by exception involves the administrator's skill of anticipating, identifying, recognizing, and negotiating with the many and varied intangible factors that are of critical importance to the achievement of successful job-targets.<sup>4</sup> A job-target is defined as "an objective that relates to the long-range issues of school improvement"<sup>5</sup> A task is defined as "some concrete duty that the principal must perform as part of his ordinary, day-to-day routine."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Fantini, p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>The Principalship. (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1971), pp. 11-16.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 11-12.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 15-16.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

The importance of tasks and job targets lies in the ultimate significant impact on curriculum and community relations.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, the principal will exercise a major portion of his energies, creativity, and administrative skills in achieving these job targets. According to the authors, ~~the job targets are goals that are worthy of being the core concern of the modern principal.~~<sup>2</sup> They affirm that the principal ought not to be evaluated solely by the manner in which he performs his tasks, but by how well he achieves his job targets.<sup>3</sup> In addition, the principal's response "to the unpredictable problems and intangible factors that arise in the course of administering his school must be an integral part of such evaluation."<sup>4</sup>

The article concludes that the success of the principal be primarily based upon his ability to administer by exception.<sup>5</sup> It is in this capacity that his imagination, creativity, humanity, ingenuity, integrity and flexibility, as well as courage and his concern for the problems of the school and community, will be demonstrated.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Principalship, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

### Inter-Relationships of People in Schools

Formal relationships among the personnel of an educational institution such as a school or school system have a unique behavioral climate. Gardner has stated that each social system has its own logic and dynamics.<sup>1</sup> Action on the part of leadership within these social institutions is confronted with traditional in-bred forces, external influences, prerogatives of subordinates, and varying constraints which affect the institution and its processes.<sup>2</sup>

Abbott analyzed the relationships among behavior, personality and organizational structure and developed a model for investigating the intervening variables which contribute to behavior within an organization.<sup>3</sup> Written criteria of expectations, job descriptions, policies, and procedures define the role-set held for administrators in superordinate positions and assist in identifying a codified system of behavior.<sup>4</sup> Merton mentions the various combinations of role-sets different people hold for an incumbent leader and the manner in which contradictory expectations

---

<sup>1</sup>John W. Gardner. "The Anti-Leadership Vaccine." Annual Report, Carnegie Foundation (New York: Carnegie Foundation of New York, 1965), p. 5.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Max G. Abbott. "Intervening Variables in Organizational Behavior," Educational Administration Quarterly (Winter 1965), pp. 1-14.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

can lead to pressures and tensions for the role of the incumbent.<sup>1</sup> These pressures and tensions can lead to reduced accomplishments on the part of the elementary school principal and thwart achievement of educational goals.<sup>2</sup> Conversely, by delineating the specific responsibilities of the principal and establishing the written criteria upon which the principal's performance is to be judged, stress and tensions which result from contradictory expectations held for the principal who is attempting to fulfill his role, can be reduced.<sup>3</sup>

#### Principal's Responsibilities and Competencies

Brick and Sanchis<sup>4</sup> based appraisal of the principal's performance on two important factors--responsibility and accountability. Responsibility is defined by these authors as the "principal's role and job description."<sup>5</sup> Eleven areas of responsibility are listed for the elementary school principal: curriculum development, instructional

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert K. Merton. Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), p. 369.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Abbott, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup>Michael Brick and Robert Sanchis. "Evaluating the Principal," Thrust for Educational Leadership, Vol. 1, No. 1 (October 1972), pp. 32-34.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

strategies, pupil personnel, community relations, staff personnel, school maintenance, plant operations, transportation, organization and structure, school finance and business management.<sup>1</sup> Each area of responsibility has specific job requirements. In order to achieve accountability, each element in the job description must be transformed into a measurable level of expected performance objectives, and these objectives must be mutually agreed upon by the principal and his evaluator.<sup>2</sup>

#### Administrator Values

Ostrander and Dethy point out that "the success of the administrator is a function of the extent to which there is agreement among the man, his job and the setting."<sup>3</sup>

They indicate that there is a set of criteria for observing the administrator in relating to his role and setting. These are: values, skills, abilities, and perceptions.<sup>4</sup>

Values represent choices made by the individual administrator based upon his perceptions of the comparative worth of various alternative possibilities. "Values are a function of the individual, of the total environment, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Brick and Sanchis, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

<sup>3</sup>Raymond H. Ostrander and Ray C. Dethy. A Value Approach to Educational Administration (Huntington, N.Y.: Krieger Publishing Company, 1973), p. 384.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 384-386

of time."<sup>1</sup> An administrator should understand his own value system in the context of his total setting since he must operate with individuals around him who possess varying value systems.<sup>2</sup> The administrator must know and be able to identify as well as articulate his values.<sup>3</sup> In addition, an administrator needs the ability to adapt his own values "to the values of the society that give purpose and direction to its schools."<sup>4</sup>

#### Administrator Skills and Abilities

The administrator needs certain skills and abilities to operate within the institutional setting. Ostrander and Dethy, citing Katz, characterize these as technical, human, and conceptual skills.<sup>5</sup> Skills are defined as the administrator's "ability to use the knowledge one has in effective ways."<sup>6</sup> Technical abilities include "knowledge and ability about methodology, administrative process, and procedures and techniques which are needed to act as

<sup>1</sup>Ostrander and Dethy, p. 385.      <sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 386.      <sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Robert L. Katz. "Skills of An Effective Administrator," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 33, No. 1, (January-February 1955), pp. 33-44. Cited in Ostrander and Dethy, p. 386.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

educational leader."<sup>1</sup> Human skills involve "the ability to work effectively as a group member and to instill and develop group effort and morale."<sup>2</sup>

Achieving a satisfactory level of performance in the area of human relationships requires that the administrator reconcile institutional and individual dimensions of organizational activity.<sup>3</sup>

It is helpful to relate technical and human skills in terms of the two dimensions of a social system described by Getzels--the nomothetic dimension and the ideographic dimension.<sup>4</sup> The institutional goals established by a social system such as public schools, the incumbent roles established to meet institutional goals, and the expectations held for these roles which define responsibilities of role incumbents, comprise the nomothetic dimension.<sup>5</sup> The ideographic dimension is the personal dimension. It involves the interaction of people and their individual personalities and need dispositions.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ostrander and Dethy, p. 387.      <sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham and Ronald F. Campbell. Educational Administration as A Social Process (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 79.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 80.      <sup>5</sup>Ibid.      <sup>6</sup>Ibid.

Put another way, technical skills are utilized to maintain the institutional nature of the organization, while human skills are needed by the administrator to maintain the individual dimension of organizational activity.<sup>1</sup>

The administrator needs a third area of skills to operate within an institutional setting--conceptual skills.<sup>2</sup>

Conceptual skills are those abilities and skills necessary to integrate all aspects of the administrator's function.<sup>3</sup> "This is the gestalt of the administrator's view."<sup>4</sup> The administrator must be able to bring together all the elements within the institutional setting and perceive the inter-relationships in proper perspective.<sup>5</sup>

Ostrander and Dethy state, "We believe all three skills are necessary for efficient, effective administration."<sup>6</sup> However, of the three skills and abilities described, the ability to conceptualize is the one most highly regarded. Outstanding administrators must possess conceptual skills.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Getzels et al., p. 80; see also Richard C. Lonsdale. "Maintaining the Organization in Dynamic Equilibrium," in Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Daniel E. Griffiths, Ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 142-177.

<sup>2</sup>Ostrander and Dethy, p. 387.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.



### Principal's Functions

Goldman divides an elementary principal's functions into four areas: (1) developing the educational program; (2) obtaining and developing personnel; (3) school-community relations; and (4) managing the school.<sup>1</sup>

### Educational Program

According to Goldman, major responsibility for developing a sound educational program is vested in the school principal.<sup>2</sup> In order to accomplish this task, the principal must clarify and delineate role relationships among teachers, staff specialists, and non-certified personnel.<sup>3</sup> He must define role expectations and set the hierarchal arrangements which clarify authority and responsibility for staff members.<sup>4</sup> The principal functions in a leadership capacity in developing curriculum by assisting the staff in determining broad educational goals, in planning learning experiences, in providing the material and human resources necessary to implement the program, and in establishing and maintaining a cooperative program of ongoing evaluation of classroom instruction.<sup>5</sup>

Within the area of curriculum, the principal functions as a supervisor of instruction to accomplish the

---

<sup>1</sup>Samuel Goldman. The School Principal (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1967), pp. 38-80.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 38-39.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 43-46.

basic purposes of (1) improvement of the instructional program, (2) improvement of teacher job satisfaction, (3) improvement of curriculum, and (4) improvement of physical facilities.<sup>1</sup>

#### Staff Personnel

Goldman describes what the principal's function in the area of obtaining and developing personnel encompasses as teacher selection, teacher orientation, teacher evaluation, as well as teacher growth and development.<sup>2</sup>

Goldman indicates that since the principal is ultimately responsible for the achievement of teachers in his school, he should be directly involved in their selection.<sup>3</sup> The elementary principal must exercise leadership in organizing orientation and in-service programs to assist teachers in implementing established educational goals, and to help with problems related to procedures, routines, and discipline.<sup>4</sup> Provision must be made, too, for individual differences.<sup>5</sup>

Teacher evaluation is an important principal function. Elementary principals must evaluate in order to

---

<sup>1</sup>Goldman, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 51-52.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 52-53.

<sup>5</sup>Goldman citing Andrew Halpin and Don Croft. Organizational Climate of Schools (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1963), p. 60.

make decisions related to retention of probationary teachers, assignment of teachers, and improvement of classroom instruction.<sup>1</sup>

#### Teacher Growth and Development

Goldman points out that the principal is responsible for effective in-service programs and creating the appropriate organizational climate within which teacher growth and development can take place with a high degree of job satisfaction on the part of teachers.<sup>2</sup> (Organizational climate has been defined as the "personality of the school.")<sup>3</sup>

#### School Community Relations

A major function of the elementary school principal is to keep the citizens of the community well informed of the school program.<sup>4</sup> If the public is to actively support its schools, efforts directed toward creating interest in school affairs through appropriate programs are essential:

School community relations define the mutual understandings of school program and community needs which exist between the professionals who work in the schools and the citizens who support them. These understandings are necessary if the school is to reflect the values of the community and also be a positive influence on the future directions of it.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Goldman, The School Principal, pp. 54-58.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>3</sup>Goldman, citing Halpin and Croft, p. 60.

<sup>4</sup>Goldman, The School Principal, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

The elementary school principal is in a key position to establish good public relations.<sup>1</sup> Good school-community relations are not contrived; they are developed and cultivated.<sup>2</sup> Public relations should not be a defensive strategy to meet public criticism; they should be an ongoing process "designed to bind the community together in a mutually rewarding activity."<sup>3</sup> The elementary school principal must have tact, discretion, and leadership ability to bring about favorable community participation in the school program.<sup>4</sup>

#### School Management

Goldman states that the fourth major function of the school principal relates to school management or the "supportive aspects of the instructional program."<sup>5</sup> School management encompasses certain matters which pertain to student personnel, finance matters, operation and maintenance of plant, and auxiliary services.<sup>6</sup>

Problems encountered by the principal involving student personnel include: discipline, guidance and counseling, attendance, student-teacher relationships, changing enrollment, student activities, slow learners, gifted learners, and reports on pupil progress.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Goldman, The School Principal, p. 69.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 51-62.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

Providing special programs and services to pupil personnel is an important part of the principal's function. To a large extent this will depend upon the availability of specialists and the manner in which the specialist, the teacher, and the pupils are brought together to achieve common purposes.<sup>1</sup> Managing the details of collecting information which will contribute to decisions regarding student progress is essential to the student personnel function. This encompasses selecting, gathering and maintaining data on home environments, standardized tests and school achievement type information.<sup>2</sup>

It is incumbent upon the principal to review with his staff the adequacy of resources and material available to accomplish the instructional objective, to prepare budgets, and to oversee the expenditure of funds appropriated to meet the needs of the school's program.<sup>3</sup>

School management includes school plant operation and various other auxiliary services, such as cafeteria, library, health, and pupil transportation.

The many varied school management skills the principal must possess, while not directly related to leadership capability, are nevertheless necessary to conduct the school program.<sup>4</sup> Hemphill and others

<sup>1</sup>Goldman, The School Principal, p. 73.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 74-75.

indicate that managerial tasks are important to successful administrative performance--that "Administrative performance is much more than leadership and....when leadership is stressed to the exclusion of other aspects of administration, an incomplete picture is presented."<sup>1</sup>

### The Principal and His Superior

Gross and Herriott made a study of characteristics descriptive of what they termed the executive performance leadership of elementary school principals.<sup>2</sup> They defined this as "the behavior of executives of professionally staffed organizations that reflect efforts to facilitate the achievement of organizational objectives through influencing staff members."<sup>3</sup> They found that the principal's immediate superior, whatever position he holds, is regarded as an important referent to the school principal. They concluded that "there is a positive relationship between the professional leadership of a principal's immediate administrative superior and the principal's own executive performance leadership."<sup>4</sup> They also found that the "executive performance leadership of elementary school

<sup>1</sup>John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths and Norman N. Frederiksen. Administrative Performance and Personality (New York: Columbia University, 1962), p. 345.

<sup>2</sup>Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott. The Professional Leadership of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: Cooperative Research Branch, Project No. 853, U.S. Office of Education, April 1964), p. 11.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

principals, in part, is affected by the support that they receive from their immediate superiors."<sup>1</sup> These data suggest that the elementary school principal's immediate superior exerts the greatest influence on the administrative performance of an incumbent elementary school principal.<sup>2</sup>

#### Administrative Performance and Development

Most school systems are confronted with various problems of maintaining appropriate levels of performance by the people who have been assigned to administrative positions. Morphet, et al. list several of these problems:

The selection process may produce a mismatch between the man and the position.

The requirements of the position may change.

The behavior of the individual in the position may change.

The available manpower supply to fill the position may be limited.

Personnel within the school system can be promoted to a new position but need training.

Newly employed personnel need assistance.

New problems, procedures, knowledge, positions, and developments create a need for continuing education of personnel.

Social change leads to modification in organizational objectives, which in turn creates a demand for behavioral changes in personnel.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Gross and Herriott, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Morphet et al., p. 428.

Morphet et al. note that to identify strengths and weaknesses and assist administrative personnel to perform effectively through an appraisal process is vital to a school system.<sup>1</sup> They define performance appraisal as "one of the several processes of the personnel function designed to arrive at judgments about the past or present performance and future potential of an individual to the school system against the background of his total work environment."<sup>2</sup>

Morphet et al. indicate certain premises which might underlie an appraisal system.<sup>3</sup> Among these are:

1. Performance appraisal can assist in achieving integration of individual and organization interest;<sup>4</sup>
2. A fundamental purpose of performance appraisal is to facilitate the self-development of individuals;<sup>5</sup>
3. The process of appraisal is at the core of the appraisal system.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Morphet et al., p. 428.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 427-432.

<sup>4</sup>Getzels et al., p. 79; also see Katz, pp. 34-42.

<sup>5</sup>Morphet et al., p. 429; see also Goldman, The School Principal, p. 30.

<sup>6</sup>Morphet et al., p. 429; also see Quest for Quality, Booklet No. 14 (Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association of School Administrators, 1960), p. 44.



4. The nature and quality of the superordinate-subordinate relationship influences to a high degree the effectiveness of the performance appraisal process;<sup>1</sup> and

5. Maintenance and improvement of the performance appraisal system are achieved by effective application of the controlling function, i.e., evaluating on a continuing basis the extent to which results of the appraisal system are meeting with expectations, and making adjustments when necessary.<sup>2</sup>

These authors also mention several noteworthy emerging concepts and practices relating to staff development in a school system which have implications for administrative staff evaluation and development. These are:

1. Development and appraisal is aimed at changing behavior of administrative personnel towards a predetermined goal which is determined by elements relating to the man, the position, and the organization;<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Morphet et al., pp. 428-429.

<sup>2</sup>Morphet et al., pp. 429-430; also see Willard S. Ellsbree, Harold J. McNally and Richard Wynn. Elementary School Administration and Supervision, 3rd ed. (New York: American Book Company, 1967), p. 175.

<sup>3</sup>Morphet et al., pp. 430-431. Also see Daniel E. Griffiths. Human Relations in School Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956), pp. 4-8; also see Katz, pp. 33-42.

2. Performance appraisal is fundamental to plans for improving the performance of administrative personnel;<sup>1</sup>

3. Performance management is beginning to surface as a replacement for the more moderate concept of supervision;<sup>2</sup> and

4. More autonomy will be granted to each school within a school system than is now granted; therefore, staff development and appraisal programs of the future will be decentralized and directed toward making each individual effective in his assignment.<sup>3</sup>

Emerging concepts in the process of appraisal and development of administrative staff personnel include "consideration by school officials of the principle that investment in human resources adds to its capital formation in the form of skills and knowledge; that development means changing human behavior; that learning theory and development plans are inseparable."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bernice Cooper. "An Analysis of the Behaviors of Principals as Observed and Reported in Six Critical Incident Studies," The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 56, No. 8 (April 1963), pp. 410-414.

<sup>2</sup>Morphet et al., pp. 430-431; also see Goldman, The School Principal, p. 33.

<sup>3</sup>Morphet et al., pp. 430-431; also see Donald A. Erickson. "Forces for Change in the Principalship," The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 65, No. 6 (November 1964), pp. 57-64.

<sup>4</sup>Morphet et al., p. 431.

### Situational Demands

Hill conducted a study with the major purpose of determining how subordinates perceived their supervisors to use the same leadership style for each of four different situations.<sup>1</sup> The evidence in this study clearly suggested that the subordinates in the sample taken believed that their supervisors would alter leadership styles as situations changed.<sup>2</sup>

Hill concludes that "effective performance requires the implementation of styles appropriate to situational demands."<sup>3</sup> However, Hill also suggests that the ability to employ different leadership styles is important only if the situation which confronts the manager requires flexibility.<sup>4</sup> There may be situations which are so stable that the adoption and consistent use of one style is most effective.<sup>5</sup> The data reported in this study also indicate that subordinates have a significantly greater level of satisfaction with managers when they perceive them to possess a high degree of leadership style and flexibility.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Walter A. Hill. "Current Developments in the Study of Leadership," Leadership Style Flexibility, Satisfaction and Performance, Edwin A. Fleishman and James G. Hunt, Eds. (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press; London and Amsterdam, Feffer & Simons, Inc., 1973), pp. 62-85.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 78.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

<sup>6</sup>Lewis L. Beall. "Evaluating the Principal," Thrust for Education Leadership, Vol. 2, No. 2 (November 1972), p. 36.

## Trends for Evaluating Administrative Performance

### Pupil Progress

Since all districts in California are now required to adopt evaluation criteria which include the development of standards for expected student progress, any design for the evaluation of principals necessarily implies that pupil progress may be used as a basis for evaluating principals.<sup>1</sup>

Beall contends that the fundamental challenge to principals is to stimulate superior teaching and learning, and that through the current commitment in the State of California to utilize pupil progress as a basis for administrative staff evaluation, the principal's capacity to bring about improvement of instruction will be greatly increased.<sup>2</sup>

Beall concludes that pupil progress should be used as a constructive lever to influence improvement, rather than a basis for dismissing principals; that evaluation of principals must be based on the mutual respect of the principal and the evaluator; that a superior design for evaluation of principals will have clear purposes and procedures, emphasize both people and results with a primary emphasis on people, and enable the principal to utilize student progress as a tool for increasing the principal's job satisfaction.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Beall, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 38-39.

### Principal Competencies

In response to widespread demands for accountability, New York State has been funding thirteen trial projects to develop means of specifying and evaluating beginning principal competencies. The Certification Alternative Project in Administration and Curriculum (CAPAC) developed competency-based criteria for the certification of administrative and supervisory personnel with the purpose of meeting the requirement that educational administration in New York State must be competency based by February 1, 1976.<sup>1</sup> Sause indicated that the policy board of CAPAC developed a model based upon the four-dimensional role of the principal as curriculum, personnel, community leader, and school manager. A study was conducted and a list of responsibilities and competencies necessary to begin to perform the principal role was developed.<sup>2</sup> This study concludes that the role of the principal as school manager and personnel leader is of primary importance. A principal must know how to manage the plant as well as the fiscal operations of the school. In addition, he must have skill relating to the selection, assignment, supervision, and evaluation of staff.<sup>3</sup>

In his analysis of the study, Sause argues that too much stress was placed by respondents on teacher

<sup>1</sup> Edwin F. Sause. "Demonstrating Competency as a Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin (September 1974), p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 19-20.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 27.

effectiveness and too little emphasis placed upon the concern for the product of instruction.<sup>1</sup> Sause calls upon us to measure the effect of administrative behaviors on student performance. He states:

The model principal emerging from these findings is a person who is constantly evaluating personnel in process and is even called upon to 'diagnose and strengthen the quality of instruction in the school'....yet he is not required to provide instructional programs for individual students....nor is he responsible for evaluating the products of instructional programs....This is truly a contradiction.<sup>2</sup>

### Summary

The literature substantiates that the elementary principalship is a focal point to quality education and an effective instructional program in the elementary school. While collective bargaining and various contractual arrangements have drastically altered the principal's role in relation to his staff and community, the principal who exercises the necessary degree of leadership, courage and administrative skill will achieve school and community objectives.

Attempts have been made to evaluate principals through their performance of objective pre-determined task-performance criteria. It was determined in these studies that successful administrators were those who possessed the capacity for courage, imagination, creativity, humanity

<sup>1</sup>Sause, pp. 36-37.      <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

ingenuity, integrity, flexibility, and a deep concern for the problems of the school and community.

Each school or school system has a unique behavioral climate or social setting. Fundamentally evaluation of elementary principals depends upon the orientation, attitudes, and expectations held by various individuals and groups within the school system as a social institution. Effective evaluation occurs when the evaluator as well as the evaluatee have a clear perception of the various combinations of role-sets and contradictory expectations different groups hold for the elementary school principal within a school system. In order to alleviate misconceptions, reduce tensions, and establish the leadership necessary to achieve educational objectives significant to the community, criteria for administrative performance must not only be delineated, but must be understood and mutually agreed upon by persons in authority, as well as those who are evaluated.

Several major areas of elementary principal responsibility are repeatedly mentioned in the literature. These broad areas include: curriculum development, instructional strategies, staff personnel, pupil personnel, school maintenance, plant operations, transportation, organization and structure of school program, school finance, and business management. Accountability for meeting these responsibilities is achieved when the elements in the job description of each elementary principal responsibility are transformed into a measurable level of job performance. In addition,

effective accountability requires that these performance objectives be mutually agreed upon by the elementary principal and his superior.

In evaluating elementary principals, superiors must take into account the man, his values, the job, and the setting. The elementary school principal must have the capacity to articulate his values, and to measure these values against the social setting which lends purpose and direction to a school system.

Broadly speaking, the elementary principal must possess technical, human, and conceptual skills. Technical skills encompass the use and application of knowledge relating to administrative processes and procedures needed to function in a leadership role. Human relationship skills require that the administrator develop group effort through reconciling established institutional goals with individual personalities and need dispositions. Most importantly, the administrator must have conceptual ability to perceive the interrelationships of elements within the social system and how they bear upon the total institutional setting. He must be able to integrate all of the aspects of the administrative function.

It is vital to a school system that strengths and weaknesses of administrative personnel be identified. However, it is important that an emphasis be placed on the process of appraisal. Performance appraisal should not be used as an instrument for terminating an administrator,



but rather the appraisal process should lead to the self-development of individuals. The basic purpose of performance appraisal is to unite personal individual interests with the school system's organizational goals and interests. In this process a great deal will depend upon the nature and quality of the superordinate-subordinate relationship.

The superintendent must take into account the personal attitudes, values, and need dispositions of principals in order to integrate these with broad educational goals established by board policy and community interests. In addition, a performance appraisal system should contain flexibility. The appraisal system itself should be evaluated from time to time to determine whether the implementation of the system is meeting with the expectations established for it.

There are various concepts emerging in the process of appraisal and development of administrative personnel which have implications for a performance appraisal system. One trend is toward greater autonomy within a school system. It is contended that since even greater autonomy will be granted individual schools than is now granted, development and appraisal process will be decentralized, adjusted toward particular local situational demands, and directed toward making the individual administrator effective in his particular assignment. Another trend is that performance management is beginning to replace the more moderate concept of supervision. This means that performance management

objectives must be more closely aligned with organizational goals. This concept emphasizes that in the past too much emphasis was placed on teacher effectiveness and too little upon concern for student progress which is, after all, the product of instruction. While recognizing that the evaluation of principals must be predicated upon the mutual respect of the principal and the superintendent, procedures and purposes for appraisal must include both people and results. Significantly, this trend presents a challenge to principals to stimulate better teaching to accomplish positive results in the area of pupil progress.

This emerging trend implies that administrative staff evaluation may, in the future, depend directly upon levels of student achievement.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the questionnaire and how it was developed, the groups surveyed, the procedures for conducting the survey, and development of the model for evaluation of elementary principals.

#### The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed in several steps. The literature was surveyed to determine major areas of elementary principal responsibilities and competencies. In addition, fifteen selected school districts were contacted to determine superintendent attitudes toward administrative staff evaluation and methods of evaluating elementary principal competencies. Each of these school districts submitted written criteria for evaluation of administrative personnel. An initial questionnaire was developed and submitted for validation to a panel of five administrators and two psychologists. After several revisions, the questionnaire was submitted to Dr. Thomas C. Coleman, Department of Educational Administration, University of the Pacific, Stockton, California for his suggestions and final approval.

The questionnaire was carefully constructed to determine the significant evaluation practices of school districts and to assist in building the model relating to elementary principal responsibilities and competencies. It was divided into three parts: (I) General, (II) Utilization of Evaluations, and (III) Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies (Appendix C).

### General

The general questions sought to ascertain the nature and frequency of evaluations, visitations, and conferences, and the number of evaluations conducted before and after tenure.

### Utilization of Evaluation

The second section was directed toward expected performance functions and how evaluations were conducted by the central administrations. Administrators were asked to place a value of one, two or three upon the following expected performance functions (one being the highest value):

Enhance professional growth and leadership ability,

Assist in the development of sound educational and administrative practices,

Make administrative decisions related to the assignment,

Determine that the school system's adopted educational program is being followed,

Determine if the school system's policies and regulations are being followed,

Assist in identifying individual principal and school problems,

Assist in time of crisis,

Assist in identifying strong administrative practices, and

Improve morale of school principals.

#### Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies

This section of the questionnaire delineates the responsibilities and competencies of elementary principals and was regarded as the core of the model which was developed. Responsibilities were classified into five major areas: (1) instruction and curriculum, (2) staff personnel, (3) pupil personnel, (4) finance and business management, and (5) school-community relations.

Administrators were asked to examine the elementary principals' responsibilities in each area and to indicate whether they believed them to be exclusive, primary, supervisory, or coordinating. These terms were defined as follows:

Exclusive responsibilities: those decisions which should only be made by the elementary principal.

Primary responsibility: those decisions which begin with the principal and relate to the leadership function in terms of initiating impetus toward change.

Supervisory responsibility: those decisions relating to guiding, directing and implementing school and district policies and the achieving of school and district goals and objectives. The purpose of this function is to guide and direct the teaching-learning situation with the expectation that ultimate personnel performance will be of superior quality as a result of supervision.

Coordinating responsibility: those decisions which are best arrived at through the participation of the many and varied ideas of any small or large group of staff members, or those responsibilities which require the consideration of various departmental interests and policies within the school or within the school system.

In addition to designating the nature of the responsibility, the administrators surveyed were asked to indicate how evaluation for each of these was to be made-- that is, by written communication, inspection or conference methods.

#### Groups Surveyed

Through the assistance of Dr. Fred Baruchin, Director of Elementary Education of the New York State Department of Education, all 104 superintendents in New York

State school districts with 5,000 to 20,000 average daily attendance were surveyed, either by direct mail or non-directive interviewing techniques.

The initial survey conducted received only 39 responses. Since this represented only a 37.5 percent response, an additional effort was made through the support of Dr. Baruchin's office by direct telephone contact, and non-directive interviews with superintendents in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Additional personalized questionnaires were mailed to the non-responding superintendents urging them to respond for purposes of achieving a wider representation of opinion. Through this extended effort an additional 28 superintendents completed the questionnaire. In this way, the entire population of superintendents in New York State was surveyed (more than 25 percent through direct interview) and a final 64.4 percent return response received.

While superinendent views were considered paramount for purposes of the study, it was felt that the opinions of those evaluated, namely, elementary principals themselves, would lend greater validity to the study and permit correlations. Accordingly, 100 elementary principals were selected at random in Nassau and Suffolk Counties and an initial survey was taken.

The initial survey of 100 elementary principals resulted in 42 responses. Since this 42 percent response was regarded as inadequate, structured interviews were

arranged with those remaining respondents who would grant appointments. It was only through these direct contact methods that an additional 23 questionnaires were completed, and a total of 65 elementary principals (65 percent) responded.

### Building the Model

An IBM 370-145 computer was utilized to analyze the data obtained. Since the questionnaire was divided into three areas, the computer was programmed to do several separate computations.

Within the area of general questions, yes or no responses were sought. Basically, these questions sought to establish the overall nature of evaluation and the frequency with which evaluations were conducted in the school districts surveyed. The computer was directed to determine the number and percentage of superintendents, elementary principals, and total administrators responding for each positive or negative reply, and also to select the frequencies of designated replies where numbers of visitations or evaluations on a yearly basis were sought.

In order to determine superintendent and elementary principal attitudes toward evaluation and the manner in which evaluations should be utilized, the attempt was made in Section II to establish an order of priority for expected performance functions. The purpose of these data was to



assist superintendents in the superordinate-subordinate relationship in formulating attitudes toward performance appraisal of administrative staff.

Section III, obtained as a result of a review of the literature and validation by the panel was fundamental to the development of a list of 45 generally recognized responsibilities and competencies. It was considered that the model would have value and merit implementation only if each responsibility or competency was defined in terms of whether it was an exclusive, primary, supervisory, or coordinating function, as defined on pages 44 and 45. Moreover, determination of a generally accepted evaluation procedure for each of these responsibilities and competencies would lend even greater validity to an administrative staff appraisal system and further assist in the appraisal process. Hence, it was concluded that the various elementary principal responsibilities and competencies be divided into the areas of instruction and curriculum, staff personnel, pupil personnel, finance and business management, and school-community relations; and that each superintendent and elementary principal designate the nature of each responsibility and the procedure for evaluation. Concentrated opinion and judgments were to be obtained, and the highest pluralities of judgments regarding the nature of elementary principal responsibilities and the method for evaluation would form the basis for developing the model for evaluating elementary school principals.

Ultimately two models were developed. The first model represents the predominant opinions of administrators for each designated responsibility variable and evaluation procedure variable considered independently. The second, or final, model developed from the analysis of the data was based upon combined responsibility and evaluation variables. In order to do this the computer was directed to crosstabulate, or total, the number of administrators who selected the various combinations of nature of responsibility variables with the evaluation procedure variables.

Crosstabulations represent pairs of variables extracted from a set of statistics. The reason crosstabulations were sought was that administrators who selected a certain responsibility variable may have chosen a particular evaluation procedure variable to match the nature of the responsibility. It was desirable, therefore, to know to what degree such matched pairs were selected. Since there were four responsibility variables (exclusive, primary, supervisory, and coordinating) and three evaluation procedure variables (written communication, inspection, and conference) there were twelve major combinations which might be selected by each administrator.

#### Summary

The questionnaire was developed through a review of the literature and validated by a panel of five administrators and two psychologists. After substantial revision

it was submitted to Dr. Thomas C. Coleman, Chairman, Department of Educational Administration, University of the Pacific, for additional suggestions and final approval.

The questionnaire (Appendix C) was divided into three parts: (I) General, (II) Utilization of Evaluation, and (III) Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies.

General questions (Section I) sought to obtain responses regarding the nature and frequency of evaluations, visitations, conferences, and number of evaluations conducted before and after tenure.

In Section II (Utilization of Evaluations) superintendents and elementary principals were asked to designate degrees of preference for expected performance functions of elementary principals.

Section III (Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies) was classified into five areas, i.e., instruction and curriculum, staff personnel, pupil personnel, finance and business management, and school community relations. Superintendents and elementary principals were asked whether they considered these responsibilities to be exclusive, primary, supervisory, or coordinating in nature, and to specify the manner in which each of these should be evaluated--by written communication, by inspection, or by conference methods.

All 104 superintendents in New York State with 5,000 to 20,000 average daily attendance were surveyed. Sixty-seven superintendents (64.4 percent) responded. To reinforce the study and to obtain correlations between evaluators and those evaluated, 100 elementary principals were also selected at random in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Of these elementary principals who were surveyed by direct mail or personal interviews, 65 principals (65 percent) responded. A computer was used in analyzing these data from which were obtained the percentage distributions and crosstabulations of combined responsibility and evaluation procedure factors within specified degrees of freedom.

The model was built from the percentage distributions obtained. In the area of general questions (Section I of the questionnaire) the higher percentage of administrator opinion or frequencies of positive or negative replies determined the outcome for model purposes. In Section II (Utilization of Evaluations) frequencies of administrator responses established an order of priority for the expected performance functions. Section III (Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies) provided the basic information necessary to construct a model delineating the nature of 45 elementary principals' responsibilities as exclusive, primary, supervisory, or coordinating, and how each should be evaluated. This was

done, through the assistance of the computer, by selecting the highest frequencies of total administrator responses for combined responsibility and evaluation procedure variables.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS

In this chapter the results from the questionnaire survey are presented for purposes of building a model for evaluation of elementary school principals.

#### General Questions

Question 1: Are elementary principals evaluated periodically in your district?

Response 1: The results indicate that 88.8 percent of superintendents, and 70.8 percent of the principals in the districts surveyed--or 79.5 percent of all administrators--agree that elementary principals are evaluated periodically.

Question 2: Are procedures for evaluation formal or informal?

Response 2: Formal procedures for evaluation were indicated by 52.2 percent of the superintendents surveyed, while 38.8 percent indicated that evaluation procedures were informal. Among the principals surveyed, 58.5 percent indicated that evaluation procedures were informal, while 27.7 percent indicated they were formal. Of all administrators

48.5 percent stated that evaluation procedures were informal, while 40.2 percent said they were formal. Approximately 11 percent of administrators did not respond to this question.

There is a difference of opinion in this area, inasmuch as 58.5 percent of the principals considered evaluation procedures informal, and 52.2 percent of the superintendents considered them formal. However, the data suggest that the majority of all administrators considered their evaluation procedures as informal.

Question 3: Are visitations for evaluation purposes by central office personnel conducted on a regular basis?

Response 3: 58.2 percent of the superintendents and 69.2 percent of the principals (or 63.6 percent of all administrators) said that visitations for evaluation purposes were not conducted on a regular basis.

Question 4: Are evaluations recorded in written form?

Response 4: 68.7 percent of the superintendents and 52.3 percent of the principals stated that evaluations were in written form. The data for all administrators combined indicate that 60.6 percent made this statement.

Question 5: Are regular conferences for evaluative purposes held with building principals concerning internal building affairs?

Response 5: 62.7 percent of the superintendents stated that regular conferences concerning internal building affairs were held in their districts for evaluative purposes. However, the principals were almost evenly divided in their responses--49.2 percent stated that regular conferences were not held, while 47.7 percent said they were. Collectively, 55.3 percent of all respondents stated that regular conferences were held concerning internal building affairs.

Question 6: Are regular conferences for evaluative purposes held with building principals concerning the leadership function?

Response 6: 64.2 percent of the superintendents vouched that regular conferences for evaluative purposes concerning the leadership function were held with building principals. On the other hand, 62.5 percent among the building principals indicated that such conferences were not held.

Data for Questions 1 through 6 appear in Table 1.

Question 7: How many actual yearly visitations for evaluation purposes did you or your representative conduct last year for each principal?

Response 7: This question was directed solely at superintendents. With no limitation on the number of yearly evaluations, the distribution, as shown in Table II, ranged



TABLE I  
GENERAL EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES  
(PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS)

These percentages reflect the concentration of responses to general questions asked of superintendents and elementary principals. Fundamentally, these general questions encompass the nature of evaluations and the frequency with which they are conducted. (Since Question 2 is related to formal and informal procedures rather than a "Yes" or "No" response, it was placed at the bottom of the table.)

General Questions (1,3,4,5,6,2) On Survey (Yes or No Response)	Superintendents		Elementary Principals		Total Administrator Respondents	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Are elementary principals evaluated periodically in your district?	88.1	11.9	70.8	29.2	79.5	20.5
3. Are visitations for evaluation purposes conducted on a regular basis?	41.8	58.2	30.8	69.2	36.4	63.6
4. Are evaluations recorded in written form?	68.7	31.3	52.3	47.7	60.6	39.4
5. Are regular conferences for evaluative purposes held with building principals concerning internal building affairs?	62.7	37.3	47.7	49.2	55.3	44.7
6. Are regular conferences for evaluative purposes held with building principals concerning the leadership function?	64.2	35.8	37.5	62.5	63.4	36.6
2. Are procedures for evaluation formal or informal?*	Formal 52.2	Informal 38.8	Formal 27.7	Informal 58.5	Formal 40.2	Informal 48.5

\* Of total administrators surveyed, 11.3% did not respond to Question 2.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS WHO CONDUCTED  
DESIGNATED NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS

Question 7 which appears in this table pertains solely to superintendents since it asked how many yearly visitations for evaluation purposes were conducted by the superintendent or his representative. With no limitation placed on the number of yearly evaluations, a distribution within 11 degrees of freedom occurred. It is concluded that two or three yearly visitations were actually conducted by the plurality of respondents (25.4% + 16.4%).

Number of Evaluations	None	1	2	3	4	5	6	10	12	20	25	No Responses
7. How many actual yearly visitations for evaluation purposes did you or your representative conduct last year for each principal?	4.5	9.0	25.4	16.4	6.0	6.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.5	17.9

from 4.5 percent, who said that no evaluations were conducted, to 1.5 percent who stated that they conducted 25 annually. The largest concentration (25.4 percent) of the superintendents conducted two yearly evaluations for each principal, and 16.4 percent conducted three.

Question 8: What would you consider to be a responsible number of such yearly visitations for evaluative purposes?

Response 8: The distribution of responses ranged widely, as shown in Table III. While 1.5 percent of the superintendents and 1.5 percent of the principals said that no yearly visitations for evaluative purposes were necessary, 1.5 percent of the superintendents and one principal, or 0.8 percent of the number of total administrator-respondents, suggested that 40 yearly visitations be made.

However, a plurality of respondents, 20.9 percent, of the superintendents and 20 percent of the principals, or 20.5 percent of all administrators, considered that three yearly visitations for evaluative purposes should be conducted. In addition, 11.9 percent of the superintendents and 24.6 percent of the principals, or 18.2 percent of all administrator-respondents suggested that four visitations be made for evaluative purposes; 13.4 percent of the superintendents and 20 percent of the principals, or 16.7 percent of all respondents, stated that two yearly visitations should be conducted.

TABLE III  
 REQUIRED NUMBER OF VISITATIONS  
 (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS)

The distribution of responses regarding the yearly visitations administrators would consider to be a responsible number for evaluation purposes is depicted in this table. It is concluded that two, three or four yearly visitations are preferred by a majority (16.7 + 20.5 + 18.2 or total of 55.4%) of administrator respondents.

Number of Visitations	None		1		2		3		4		5		6	
	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.
General Question 8 - What would you consider to be a responsible number of such yearly visitations for evaluative purposes?	1.5	1.5	6.0	7.7	13.4	20.0	20.9	20.0	11.9	24.6	11.9	4.6	9.0	4.5
Total Percentage of Administrator-Respondents	1.5		6.8		16.7		20.5		18.2		8.3		6.7	

8		10		12		15		20		40		No Response	
Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.
0.0	1.5	9.0	4.6	0.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	3.0	1.5	1.5	0.8	9.0	12.3
0.8		6.8		0.8		1.5		2.3		1.2		10.6	

Question 9: How many responsible yearly evaluations should be conducted before tenure?

Response 9: While 19.7 percent of the administrator-respondents did not answer this question because tenure for new principals had been abolished in New York State during the time the study was conducted, the results of administrator opinion are considered valid.

The distribution of responses is depicted in Table IV. Although the distribution varies widely, it is significant that 19.4 percent of the superintendents and 13.8 percent of the principals, or 16.7 percent of total administrator-respondents, suggested that two yearly evaluations be conducted before tenure; that 17.9 percent of the superintendents and 21.5 percent of the principals, or 19.7 percent of total administrator-respondents, stated that three yearly evaluations should be conducted, and 10.4 percent of the superintendents and 12.3 percent of the principals, or 11.4 percent of total administrator-respondents, selected four yearly evaluations as appropriate before tenure.

Question 10: How many responsible yearly evaluations should be conducted after tenure?

Response 10: As in Question 9, a considerable number of administrators did not respond to this question, and indicated that at the time of the study tenure no longer applied for new principalships in New York State.

TABLE IV  
 REQUIRED NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS BEFORE TENURE  
 (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS)

The percentage distribution of administrator-respondents to Question 9 is depicted below and indicates that a plurality (16.7% + 19.7% + 11.4% or 47.8%) of administrator-respondents believe that two, three or four yearly evaluations should be conducted before tenure.

A considerable number (19.7%) of administrators did not respond to this question and indicated that at the time the survey was taken tenure no longer applied to new principalships in New York State.

Number of Evaluations General Question 9 - How many responsible yearly evaluations should be conducted before tenure?	1		2		3		4		5		6		8	
	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.
	3.0	1.5	19.4	13.8	17.9	21.5	10.4	12.3	9.0	7.7	6.0	12.3	0.0	3.1
Total Percentage of Administrator- Respondents	2.3		16.7		19.7		11.4		8.3		9.1		1.5	

9		10		15		20		24		30		No Response	
Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.
1.5	0.0	6.0	6.2	3.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	19.4	20.0
0.8		6.1		2.3		0.8		0.8		0.8		19.7	

This group comprised 15.9 percent of the total administrators surveyed.

The distribution (Table V) indicated that a preponderance of opinion favored one or two yearly evaluations after tenure. This is substantiated by the data in Table V which indicates that 25.4 percent of the superintendents and 23.1 percent of the principals, or 24.2 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that one yearly evaluation after tenure was appropriate, and 26.9 percent of the superintendents and 27.7 percent of the principals, or 27.3 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that two yearly evaluations should be conducted.

#### Utilization of Evaluations

With regard to the manner in which evaluation should be utilized, superintendents and principals were asked to place a value on expected performance competencies (one being the highest value).

From the data set forth in Table VI, an order of priority according to the strongest opinions of total administrator respondents was developed; that is, evaluation should be utilized primarily to:

- a. enhance professional growth (80.3 percent),
- b. assist in the development of sound educational practice (77.3 percent),
- c. assist in identifying individual principal and school problems (55.3 percent),

TABLE V

REQUIRED NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS AFTER TENURE  
(PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS)

The percentages below reflect that 24.2% + 27.3% or a total of 51.5% of administrator-respondents indicated that one or two yearly evaluations should be conducted after tenure. These figures are significant for model purposes. As in Question 9 (Table IV) a considerable number of total administrator-respondents (15.9%) did not respond to Question 10 and indicated that (at the time the survey was conducted) tenure no longer obtained for new principalships in New York State.

Number of Evaluations	None		1		2		3		4		5		6	
	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.
General Question 10 - How many responsible yearly evaluations should be conducted after tenure?	0.0	1.5	25.4	23.1	26.9	27.7	11.9	15.4	6.0	10.8	7.5	0.0	1.5	0.0
Total Percentage of Administrator- Respondents	0.8		24.2		27.3		13.6		8.3		3.8		0.8	

8		10		12		15		20		24		No Response	
Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.	Supt.	Prin.
1.5	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	14.9	16.9
1.5		0.8		0.8		0.8		0.8		0.8		15.9	



TABLE VI

## UTILIZATION OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION

(PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS)

Questions 11 through 19 relate to Utilization of Evaluations. Superintendents and elementary principals were asked to place a value on expected performance characteristics (one being the highest value) with regard to manner in which evaluation should be utilized.

From the data obtained in this table, it is concluded that the order of priority for utilization of evaluations has been established for the following performance characteristics listed in the order of strongest total administrator responses; that is, evaluation should be primarily utilized to:

- (a) enhance professional growth (80.3%).
- (b) assist in the development of sound educational practices (77.3%).
- (c) assist in identifying individual principal and school problems (55.3%).
- (d) assist in identifying strong administrative practices (50.0%).
- (e) improve morale of school principals (42.4%).
- (f) assist in time of crisis (41.7%).

The percentage also indicate that secondary significance (the value of 2) for utilization of evaluations was given to the following performance characteristics listed in the order of strongest total administrator-respondents designations:

- (a) determine that the school system's adopted educational program is being followed (45.5%).
- (b) make administrative decision related to assignment (44.7%).
- (c) determine if the school system's adopted educational policies and regulations are being followed (43.2%).

Values One to Three (One being the highest value)	1			2			3			No Response		
	Supt.	Prin.	Total Admin.	Supt.	Prin.	Total Admin.	Supt.	Prin.	Total Admin.	Supt.	Prin.	Total Admin.
Questions 11-19												
Q. 11 - Enhance professional and leadership ability.	80.6	80.0	80.3	7.5	16.9	12.1	9.0	3.1	6.1	3.0	0.0	1.5
Q. 12 - Assist in development of sound educational and administrative practices.	77.6	76.9	77.3	13.4	20.0	16.7	7.5	3.1	5.3	1.5	0.0	0.8

- d. assist in identifying strong administrative practices (50 percent),
- e. improve morale of school principals (42.4 percent), and
- f. assist in time of crisis (41.7 percent).

These data also specify that secondarily (the assigned value of 2) evaluation should be utilized to accomplish the following order of priority of performance functions according to the order of strongest total administrator responses:

- a. determine that the school system's adopted educational program is being followed (45.5 percent),
- b. make administrative decisions related to assignment (44.7 percent), and
- c. determine if the school system's adopted educational policies and regulations are being followed (43.2 percent).

#### Elementary Principal Responsibilities and Competencies

Prior to an examination of the significant results as they pertain to each individual area of responsibility, a researcher investigating this study should familiarize himself with the definition of principal responsibilities as described in the survey. Analysis of the data in Tables VII and VIII derived from this study of responsibilities and evaluation procedures is as follows:

TABLE VII  
ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND COMPETENCIES

Prior to an examination of the results in this table as they pertain to each individual area, a researcher should familiarize himself with the definitions of elementary principal responsibilities as described in the survey (Appendix C).

In this section of the survey elementary school principal responsibilities were categorized into various areas and superintendents and elementary principals were asked to examine each responsibility, indicate whether they believed it to be exclusive, primary, supervisory or coordinating in terms of the elementary principal's functions as an administrator. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate how evaluation for each responsibility should be made (by Written Communications, Inspection or Conference).

This table depicts the percentage distribution of these responsibilities and evaluation procedure designations for superintendents, elementary principals and total administrator-respondents. It has five sections which encompass: Instruction and Curriculum, Staff Personnel, Pupil Personnel, Finance and Business Management, School-Community Relations.

The table also indicates that concentrated pluralities of administrators regard the designated elementary principal responsibilities in the following ways:

- 1) Twenty nine responsibilities (20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64) are coordinating responsibilities to be evaluated by conference methods.
- 2) Eighteen responsibilities (21, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 56, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65) are primary responsibilities to be evaluated by conference methods.
- 3) Eight responsibilities (26, 27, 31, 34, 46, 50, 55, 58) are exclusive responsibilities to be evaluated through written communication.
- 4) Four responsibilities (36, 37, 46, 58) are exclusive responsibilities to be evaluated by conference methods.
- 5) Three responsibilities (58, 59, 61) are primary responsibilities to be evaluated by written communication.
- 6) Two responsibilities (21, 36) are supervisory responsibilities to be evaluated by conference methods.
- 7) Two responsibilities (58, 61) are coordinating responsibilities to be evaluated by written communication.
- 8) Two responsibilities (56, 61) are primary responsibilities to be evaluated by inspection.
- 9) One responsibility (61) is a coordinating responsibility to be evaluated by inspection.

INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

Questions	RESPONSIBILITY												EVALUATION PROCEDURE								
	Exclusive			Primary			Supervisory			Coordinating			Written Communication			Inspection			Conference		
	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.
20. Responsibility for developing curriculum. *	1.5	0.0	0.8	17.9	13.8	15.9	14.9	3.1	9.1	64.2	80.0	72.0	11.9	13.8	12.9	13.4	7.7	10.6	58.2	53.8	56.1
21. Responsibility for implementation of instructional program.	10.4	12.3	11.4	41.8	30.8	36.4	31.3	41.5	36.4	14.9	12.3	13.6	14.9	6.2	10.6	25.4	26.2	25.8	37.3	36.9	37.1
22. Responsibility for selecting instructional materials.	1.5	3.1	2.3	16.4	10.8	13.6	11.9	16.9	14.4	67.2	66.2	66.7	16.4	15.4	15.9	14.9	7.7	11.4	44.8	60.0	52.3
23. Responsibility for determining specific teaching methods.	4.5	9.2	6.8	13.4	16.9	15.2	31.3	29.2	30.3	44.8	40.0	42.4	9.0	7.7	8.3	23.9	15.4	19.7	50.7	46.2	48.5
24. Responsibility for innovation and action research resulting in change of practice.	10.4	4.6	7.6	23.9	27.7	25.8	14.9	9.2	12.1	47.8	49.2	48.5	20.9	9.2	15.2	16.4	13.8	15.2	44.8	44.6	44.7
25. Responsibility for formulating school policies.	7.5	10.8	9.1	23.9	20.0	22.0	16.4	7.7	12.1	49.3	53.8	51.5	22.4	26.2	24.2	7.5	1.5	4.5	41.8	44.6	43.2

TABLE VII (Continued)

## STAFF PERSONNEL

Questions	RESPONSIBILITY												EVALUATION PROCEDURE								
	Exclusive			Primary			Supervisory			Coordinating			Written Communication			Inspection			Conference		
	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.
26. Responsibility for selecting the certificated and classified staff.	20.9	38.5	29.5	32.8	46.2	39.4	16.4	3.1	9.8	23.9	10.8	17.4	40.3	30.8	35.6	9.0	7.7	8.3	29.9	38.5	34.2
27. Responsibility for supervision and evaluation of certificated and classified staff.	34.3	60.0	47.0	38.8	21.5	30.3	11.9	7.7	9.8	9.0	6.2	7.6	43.3	27.7	35.6	13.4	10.8	12.1	20.9	21.5	21.2
28. Responsibility for appointing committees to work together on school problems.	31.3	21.5	26.5	38.8	27.7	33.3	7.5	15.4	11.4	16.4	32.3	24.2	22.4	13.8	18.2	13.4	1.5	7.6	44.8	69.2	56.8
29. Responsibility for assisting teachers in solving teacher problems.	16.4	10.8	13.6	37.3	38.5	37.9	20.9	23.1	22.0	16.4	12.3	14.4	9.0	6.2	7.6	10.4	6.2	8.3	61.2	50.8	56.1
30. Responsibility for freeing teachers from non-professional duties and interruptions that prevent the teacher from giving his maximum effort to teaching.	19.4	30.8	25.0	34.3	32.3	33.3	22.4	10.8	16.7	17.9	21.5	19.7	10.4	13.8	12.1	23.9	9.2	16.7	47.7	47.7	47.7
31. Responsibility for keeping faculty informed on matters of concern to the school.	31.3	38.5	34.8	43.3	36.9	40.2	10.4	3.1	6.8	9.0	13.8	11.4	23.9	21.5	22.7	7.5	1.5	4.5	40.3	33.8	37.1
32. Responsibility for assisting teachers in identifying educational goals and objectives which are realistic to pupils.	13.4	12.3	12.9	35.8	33.8	34.8	16.4	16.9	16.7	23.9	24.6	24.2	17.9	9.2	13.6	9.0	1.5	5.3	47.8	53.8	50.8

TABLE VII (Continued)  
STAFF PERSONNEL (Continued)

Questions	RESPONSIBILITY												EVALUATION PROCEDURE								
	Exclusive			Primary			Supervisory			Coordinating			Written Communication			Inspection			Conference		
	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.
33. Responsibility for stimulating and encouraging professional growth among teachers.	10.4	12.3	11.4	43.3	38.5	40.9	20.9	20.0	20.5	17.9	18.5	18.2	16.4	10.8	13.6	4.5	3.1	3.8	53.7	63.1	58.3
34. Responsibility for assigning certificated and classified staff.	38.8	69.2	53.8	35.8	16.9	26.5	9.0	6.2	7.6	9.0	3.1	6.1	32.8	40.0	36.4	16.4	6.2	11.4	29.9	32.3	31.1
35. Responsibility for maintaining a high level of performance from all staff members.	25.4	23.1	24.2	40.3	41.5	40.9	14.9	10.8	12.9	14.9	12.3	13.6	13.4	10.8	12.1	19.4	13.8	16.7	38.8	38.5	38.6
36. Responsibility for assisting teachers in the interpretation of data relating to pupil performance and progress.	20.9	15.4	18.2	29.9	16.9	23.5	22.4	26.2	24.2	16.4	24.6	20.5	13.4	7.7	10.6	10.4	3.1	6.8	53.7	66.2	59.8
37. Responsibility for utilization of staff for the most effective purposes.	16.4	46.2	31.1	50.7	29.2	40.2	10.4	4.6	7.6	13.4	6.2	9.8	10.4	10.8	10.6	13.4	9.2	11.4	53.7	47.7	50.8

TABLE VII (Continued)

## PUPIL PERSONNEL

Questions	RESPONSIBILITY												EVALUATION PROCEDURE								
	Exclusive			Primary			Supervisory			Coordinating			Written Communication			Inspection			Conference		
	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.
38. Responsibility for maintaining discipline.	23.9	10.8	17.4	29.9	16.9	23.5	9.0	18.5	13.6	32.8	43.1	37.9	10.4	4.6	7.6	20.9	16.9	18.9	41.8	50.8	46.2
39. Responsibility for diagnosing pupil deficiencies.	7.5	4.6	6.1	22.4	15.4	18.9	16.4	21.5	18.9	46.3	49.2	47.7	6.0	13.8	9.8	14.9	4.6	9.8	52.2	56.9	54.5
40. Responsibility for generating solutions to individual student problems.	6.0	3.1	4.5	20.9	24.6	22.7	10.4	12.3	11.4	52.2	53.8	53.0	7.5	4.6	6.1	11.9	4.6	8.3	64.2	70.8	67.4
41. Responsibility for obtaining community services critical to pupil personnel problems (e.g., welfare, counseling, clinical, psychological or medical services, speech therapy, etc.).	3.0	16.9	9.8	34.3	26.2	30.3	16.4	4.6	10.6	38.8	43.1	40.9	20.9	21.5	21.2	14.9	1.5	8.3	46.3	50.8	48.5
42. Responsibility for seeking parental involvement in the solution of academic and non-academic pupil personnel problems.	10.4	16.9	13.6	37.3	23.1	30.3	9.7	7.7	8.3	34.3	40.0	37.1	13.4	9.2	11.4	9.0	1.5	5.3	55.2	60.0	57.6
43. Responsibility for recognizing major problems relating to the health and safety of children (e.g., narcotics, unfavorable traffic conditions, hazards, etc.).	11.9	9.2	10.6	40.3	18.5	29.5	10.4	9.2	9.8	29.9	50.8	40.2	10.4	9.2	9.8	22.4	12.3	17.4	38.8	44.6	41.7

TABLE VII (Continued)  
PUPIL PERSONNEL (Continued)

Questions	RESPONSIBILITY												EVALUATION PROCEDURE								
	Exclusive			Primary			Supervisory			Coordinating			Written Communication			Inspection			Conference		
	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.
44. Responsibility for determining pupil placement.	14.9	13.8	14.4	31.3	16.9	24.2	13.4	6.2	9.8	34.3	49.2	41.7	22.4	10.8	16.7	7.5	3.1	5.3	50.8	63.1	56.8
45. Responsibility for promotion and retention of pupils. *	13.4	16.9	15.2	31.3	15.4	23.5	11.9	7.7	9.8	40.3	49.2	44.7	23.9	9.2	16.7	9.0	1.5	5.3	46.3	55.4	50.8
46. Responsibility for suspension or exclusion of pupils from school.	52.2	66.2	59.1	28.4	13.8	21.2	3.0	6.2	4.5	10.4	7.7	9.1	37.3	24.6	31.1	9.0	1.5	5.3	29.9	35.4	32.6
47. Responsibility for maintaining student records. **	16.4	16.9	16.7	41.8	15.4	28.8	14.9	18.5	16.7	26.9	35.4	31.1	29.9	32.3	31.1	26.9	13.8	20.5	20.9	29.2	25.0
48. Responsibility for providing adequate program of pupil-teacher counseling and conferencing. ***	9.0	7.7	8.3	34.3	23.1	28.8	16.4	20.0	18.2	35.8	36.9	36.4	14.9	9.2	12.1	17.9	1.5	9.8	50.8	60.0	55.3
49. Responsibility for providing adequate program of parent-teacher conferences on pupil progress.	13.4	9.2	11.4	40.3	26.1	33.3	9.0	15.4	12.1	32.8	35.4	34.1	19.4	10.8	15.2	13.4	6.2	9.8	44.8	55.4	50.0
50. Responsibility for scheduling of classes.	46.3	33.8	40.2	34.3	21.5	28.0	0.0	3.1	1.5	14.9	29.2	22.0	32.8	35.4	34.1	16.4	1.5	9.1	25.9	38.5	32.6
51. Responsibility for determining organizational arrangements of school *** (homogeneous, heterogeneous, graded, non-graded, etc.)	9.0	9.2	9.1	20.9	21.5	21.2	11.9	10.8	11.4	55.2	44.6	50.0	17.9	12.3	15.2	10.4	0.0	5.3	47.8	64.6	56.8



TABLE VII (Continued)  
PUPIL PERSONNEL (Continued)

Questions	RESPONSIBILITY												EVALUATION PROCEDURE								
	Exclusive			Primary			Supervisory			Coordinating			Written Communication			Inspection			Conference		
	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.
52. Responsibility for assessment of pupil progress.	6.0	6.2	6.1	17.9	18.5	18.2	20.9	12.3	16.7	49.3	55.3	52.3	16.4	18.5	17.4	16.4	4.6	10.6	41.8	47.7	45.5
53. Responsibility for evaluation of the effectiveness of innovative or new programs. ***	10.4	4.6	7.6	28.4	18.5	23.5	17.9	16.9	17.4	42.3	50.8	47.0	31.3	9.2	20.5	10.4	6.2	8.3	37.3	47.7	42.4
54. Responsibility for evaluation of the effectiveness of the total elementary school program.	16.4	10.8	13.6	20.9	21.5	21.2	13.4	10.8	12.1	47.8	43.1	45.5	29.9	15.4	22.7	16.4	4.6	10.6	34.3	40.0	37.2

TABLE VII (Continued)  
FINANCE AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Questions	RESPONSIBILITY												EVALUATION PROCEDURE								
	Exclusive			Primary			Supervisory			Coordinating			Written Communication			Inspection			Conference		
	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.
55. Responsibility for preparing the school budget.	14.9	15.4	15.2	40.3	27.7	34.1	9.0	7.7	8.3	29.9	40.0	34.8	38.8	23.1	31.8	10.4	6.2	8.3	26.9	35.4	31.1
56. Responsibility for school plant supervision and management.	25.4	30.8	28.0	46.3	30.8	38.6	16.4	12.3	14.4	9.0	23.1	15.9	22.4	12.3	17.4	34.3	24.6	29.5	23.9	26.2	25.0
57. Responsibility for planning or remodeling an elementary building.	1.5	4.6	3.0	26.9	15.4	21.2	14.9	6.2	10.6	50.7	61.5	57.6	19.4	7.7	13.6	14.9	4.6	9.8	40.3	50.8	45.5
58. Responsibility for ordering and receiving school supplies and equipment.	28.4	20.0	24.2	32.8	26.1	29.5	13.4	12.3	12.9	22.4	33.8	28.0	34.3	30.8	32.6	17.9	10.8	14.4	26.9	30.8	28.8
59. Responsibility for inventory of school supplies and equipment.	28.4	15.4	22.0	38.8	27.7	33.3	13.4	15.4	14.4	16.4	33.8	25.0	37.3	40.0	39.4	17.9	15.4	16.7	23.9	20.0	22.0
60. Responsibility for determining equipment to be replaced or purchased.	20.9	12.3	16.7	32.8	23.1	28.0	7.5	6.2	6.8	35.8	49.2	42.4	29.9	18.5	24.2	19.4	16.9	18.2	28.4	38.5	33.5
61. Responsibility for determining repairs to buildings and grounds.	20.9	13.8	17.4	34.3	33.8	34.1	14.9	1.5	8.3	26.9	41.5	34.1	20.9	18.5	19.7	23.9	24.6	24.2	28.4	29.2	28.8

TABLE VII (Continued)  
SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Questions	RESPONSIBILITY												EVALUATION PROCEDURE								
	Exclusive			Primary			Supervisory			Coordinating			Written Communication			Inspection			Conference		
	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.	Supt.	Prin.	Tot. Adm. Res.
62. Responsibility for individual school communication media and processes.	17.9	15.4	16.7	35.8	38.5	37.1	9.0	4.6	6.8	32.8	36.9	34.8	22.4	26.2	24.2	10.4	4.6	7.6	41.8	40.0	40.9
63. Responsibility for citizen participation in school study groups.	16.4	7.7	12.1	32.8	35.4	34.1	6.0	12.3	9.1	40.3	38.4	38.6	20.9	13.8	17.4	9.0	3.1	6.1	50.8	56.9	53.8
64. Responsibility for informal channels of communication.	11.9	3.1	7.6	35.8	40.0	37.9	7.5	7.7	7.6	40.3	44.6	43.2	13.4	12.3	12.9	9.0	4.6	6.8	59.7	63.1	60.6
65. Responsibility for maintaining liaison with symbiotic community groups (PTA, Civic Associations, community interest groups, etc.)	19.4	12.3	15.9	44.8	53.8	49.2	1.5	7.7	4.5	28.4	16.9	22.7	9.0	10.8	9.8	7.5	1.5	4.5	55.2	53.8	54.5

\* Significant at the .10 level for both variables.

\*\* Responsibility is significant at the .05 level

\*\*\* Evaluation procedure is significant at the .05 level

TABLE VIII

CROSTABULATIONS OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE

This table of Crosstabulations of Responsibilities and Evaluation Procedures pinpoints the greatest concentration of total administrator responses for the combined responsibility and evaluation procedure factors.

These crosstabulations are of particular importance since they are particularly valuable for model purposes.

Accordingly, total administrator respondents regard the listed elementary principal responsibilities as follows:

- 1) Thirty responsibilities (20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 32, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64) are coordinating responsibilities to be evaluated by conference methods.
- 2) Nineteen responsibilities (21, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 55, 56, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65) are primary responsibilities to be evaluated by conference methods.
- 3) Seven responsibilities (26, 27, 34, 46, 50, 58, 59) are exclusive responsibilities to be evaluated through written communication.
- 4) Three responsibilities (26, 31, 37) are exclusive responsibilities to be evaluated by conference methods.
- 5) Three responsibilities (26, 55, 59) are primary responsibilities to be evaluated by written communication.
- 6) Two responsibilities (21, 36) are supervisory responsibilities to be evaluated by conference methods.
- 7) One responsibility (55) is a coordinating responsibility to be evaluated by written communication.
- 8) One responsibility (61) is a primary responsibility to be evaluated by inspection.

INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

Responsibility	Excl/ Writ. Comm.	Excl/ Insp.	Excl/ Conf.	Prim/ Writ. Comm.	Prim/ Insp.	Prim/ Conf.	Supv/ Writ. Comm.	Supv/ Insp.	Supv/ Conf.	Coord/ Writ. Comm.	Coord/ Insp.	Coord/ Conf.	df	$\chi^2$	p
20. Responsibility for developing curriculum.	0.8	0.0	0.0	3.0	5.3	6.8	0.0	.8	6.8	9.1	3.8	42.4	30	37.58	N. S.
21. Responsibility for implementation of instructional program.	3.0	2.3	5.3	6.1	9.8	12.9	1.5	12.9	10.6	0.0	0.8	8.3	35	43.78	< .05
22. Responsibility for selecting instructional materials.	0.8	0.8	1.5	3.8	3.0	5.3	1.5	2.3	6.8	9.8	6.1	38.6	36	48.37	< .05
23. Responsibility for determining specific teaching methods.	0.8	0.8	4.5	1.5	1.5	5.3	1.5	8.3	12.9	3.8	4.5	25.8	56	93.89	< .001
24. Responsibility for innovation and action research resulting in chance of practice.	3.0	0.8	0.0	4.5	4.5	9.8	2.3	1.5	6.8	5.3	5.3	28.0	56	95.38	< .001
25. Responsibility for formulating school policies.	6.1	0.8	2.3	3.8	3.8	8.3	2.3	0.0	5.3	11.4	2.3	27.3	42	48.75	< .05

TABLE VIII (Continued)

## STAFF PERSONNEL

Responsibility	Excl/ Writ. Comm.	Excl/ Insp.	Excl/ Conf.	Prim/ Writ. Comm.	Prim/ Insp.	Prim/ Conf.	Supv/ Writ. Comm.	Supv/ Insp.	Supv/ Conf.	Coord/ Writ. Comm.	Coord/ Insp.	Coord/ Conf.	df		p
26. Responsibility for selecting the certificated and classified staff.	11.4	3.0	10.6	12.1	6.1	13.6	4.5	0.0	2.3	5.3	0.0	7.6	49	35.61	N.S.
27. Responsibility for supervision and evaluation of certificated and classified staff.	20.5	3.0	7.6	10.6	6.8	6.8	3.0	0.8	1.5	0.0	0.8	4.5	42	56.78	<.01
28. Responsibility for appointing committees to work together on school problems.	6.1	3.0	12.1	7.6	2.3	20.5	1.5	1.5	6.8	2.3	0.8	17.4	42	133.36	<.001
29. Responsibility for assisting teachers in solving teaching problems.	2.3	0.8	6.8	3.8	3.8	22.7	0.0	3.0	15.2	0.8	0.8	8.3	56	57.68	<.01
30. Responsibility for freeing teachers from non-professional duties and interruptions that prevent the teacher from giving his maximum effort to teaching.	6.1	3.8	7.6	3.8	9.1	14.4	1.5	3.0	9.8	0.8	0.8	13.6	56	54.76	<.01
31. Responsibility for keeping faculty informed on matters of concern to the school.	9.8	0.8	12.9	10.6	2.3	15.2	2.3	0.8	3.0	0.0	0.8	6.1	56	71.16	<.001

TABLE VIII (Continued)  
STAFF PERSONNEL (Continued)

Responsibility	Excl/ Writ. Comm.	Excl/ Insp.	Excl/ Conf.	Prim/ Writ. Comm.	Prim/ Insp.	Prim/ Conf.	Supv/ Writ. Comm.	Supv/ Insp.	Supv/ Conf.	Coord/ Writ. Comm.	Coord/ Insp.	Coord/ Conf.	df		p
32. Responsibility for assisting teachers in identifying educational goals and objectives which are realistic.	1.5	0.0	7.6	7.6	4.5	15.9	0.8	0.8	9.8	2.3	0.0	13.6	63	58.84	<.01
33. Responsibility for stimulating and encouraging professional growth among teachers.	3.0	0.8	6.8	6.1	2.3	26.5	2.3	0.8	12.9	1.5	0.0	9.8	48	53.25	<.05
34. Responsibility for assigning certificated and classified staff.	24.2	4.5	12.9	9.8	3.8	9.8	1.5	2.3	3.0	1.5	0.0	3.0	49	112.53	<.001
35. Responsibility for maintaining a high level of performance from all staff members.	5.3	5.3	7.6	5.3	7.6	15.9	0.8	2.3	5.3	0.8	0.8	9.1	48	62.15	<.001
36. Responsibility for assisting teachers in the interpretation of data relating to pupil performance and progress.	4.5	3.0	7.6	1.5	3.0	15.9	3.0	0.8	14.4	0.8	0.0	16.7	63	84.27	<.001
37. Responsibility for utilization of staff for the most effective purposes.	5.3	2.3	16.7	2.3	8.3	20.5	3.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	8.3	63	107.18	<.001

TABLE VIII (Continued)

## PUPIL PERSONNEL

Responsibility	Excl/ Writ. Comm.	Excl/ Insp.	Excl/ Conf.	Prim/ Writ. Comm.	Prim/ Insp.	Prim/ Conf.	Supv/ Writ. Comm.	Supv/ Insp.	Supv/ Conf.	Coord/ Writ. Comm.	Coord/ Insp.	Coord/ Conf.	df		p
38. Responsibility for maintaining discipline.	4.5	3.0	5.3	2.3	7.6	9.1	0.0	2.3	9.8	1.5	5.3	20.5	49	70.28	<.001
39. Responsibility for diagnosing pupil deficiencies.	1.5	1.5	0.8	1.5	4.5	10.6	1.5	1.5	13.6	5.3	1.5	28.0	48	91.08	<.001
40. Responsibility for generating solutions to individual student problems.	0.0	1.5	1.5	2.3	3.0	14.4	0.8	1.5	9.1	3.0	1.5	39.4	48	82.98	<.001
41. Responsibility for obtaining community services critical to pupil personnel problems (e.g., welfare, counseling, clinical, psychological or medical services, speech therapy, etc.)	2.3	0.0	5.3	8.3	3.8	12.1	2.3	3.0	3.0	7.6	1.5	25.8	48	102.43	<.001
42. Responsibility for seeking parental involvement in the solution of academic and non-academic pupil personnel problems.	3.0	0.0	7.6	4.5	3.8	16.7	0.0	0.8	3.8	3.0	0.0	24.2	45	57.10	<.01
43. Responsibility for recognizing major problems relating to the health and safety of children (e.g., narcotics, unfavorable traffic conditions, hazards, etc.)	3.8	1.5	3.0	3.0	6.1	9.8	0.0	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.8	22.0	63	66.21	<.001



TABLE VIII (Continued)  
PUPIL PERSONNEL (Continued)

Responsibility	Excl/ Writ. Comm.	Excl/ Insp.	Excl/ Conf.	Prim/ Writ. Comm.	Prim/ Insp.	Prim/ Conf.	Supv/ Writ. Comm.	Supv/ Insp.	Supv/ Conf.	Coord/ Writ. Comm.	Coord/ Insp.	Coord/ Conf.	df		p
44. Responsibility for determining pupil placement.	6.1	1.5	4.5	5.3	1.5	12.9	1.5	1.5	4.5	3.8	0.8	28.0	56	54.06	< .01
45. Responsibility for promotion and retention of pupils.	3.8	1.5	3.0	6.1	2.3	9.1	0.8	0.8	6.1	6.1	0.8	28.8	49	79.49	< .001
46. Responsibility for suspension or exclusion of pupils from school.	24.2	1.5	14.4	6.1	2.3	7.6	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.8	0.0	6.1	56	121.68	< .001
47. Responsibility for maintaining student records.	6.8	5.3	2.3	9.1	3.0	6.1	5.3	4.5	4.5	9.1	6.1	10.6	56	65.26	< .001
48. Responsibility for providing adequate program of pupil-teacher counseling and conferencing.	0.8	2.3	0.8	6.1	2.3	12.1	3.0	1.5	11.4	2.3	2.3	25.0	42	52.12	< .01
49. Responsibility for providing adequate program of parent-teacher conferences on pupil progress.	3.0	0.8	3.8	9.1	4.5	12.9	1.5	2.3	6.8	1.5	1.5	22.7	56	76.90	< .001
50. Responsibility for scheduling of classes.	17.4	5.3	10.6	12.1	3.0	9.1	0.8	0.8	0.0	3.0	0.8	10.6	56	101.06	< .001

TABLE VIII (Continued)  
PUPIL PERSONNEL (Continued)

Responsibility	Excl/ Writ. Comm.	Excl/ Insp.	Excl/ Conf.	Prim/ Writ. Comm.	Prim/ Insp.	Prim/ Conf.	Supv/ Writ. Comm.	Supv/ Insp.	Supv/ Conf.	Coord/ Writ. Comm.	Coord/ Insp.	Coord/ Conf.	df		p
51. Responsibility for determining organizational arrangements of school (homogeneous, heterogeneous, graded, non-graded, etc.)	3.0	1.5	2.3	3.0	1.5	10.6	1.5	1.5	4.5	7.6	0.8	34.8	56	131.00	< .001
52. Responsibility for assessment of pupil progress.	3.0	0.8	0.8	2.3	3.8	8.3	2.3	3.8	6.1	9.1	1.5	27.3	56	81.48	< .001
53. Responsibility for evaluation of the effectiveness of innovative or new programs.	2.3	1.5	1.5	4.5	3.0	9.8	3.8	2.3	6.1	8.3	1.5	24.2	56	70.74	< .001
54. Responsibility for evaluation of the effectiveness of the total elementary school program.	5.3	0.8	2.3	3.8	4.5	6.8	3.0	2.3	3.8	10.6	1.5	22.7	63	74.60	< .001

TABLE VIII (Continued)  
FINANCE AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Responsibility	Excl/ Writ. Comm.	Excl/ Insp.	Excl/ Conf.	Prim/ Writ. Comm.	Prim/ Insp.	Prim/ Conf.	Supv/ Writ. Comm.	Supv/ Insp.	Supv/ Conf.	Coord/ Writ. Comm.	Coord/ Insp.	Coord/ Conf.	df		p
55. Responsibility for preparing the school budget.	6.8	0.0	4.5	11.4	6.1	9.1	3.0	1.5	3.0	9.1	0.8	12.9	42	48.04	< .05
56. Responsibility for school plant supervision and management.	7.6	7.6	6.1	4.5	12.1	11.4	3.0	4.5	2.3	1.5	4.5	5.3	35	33.18	N. S.
57. Responsibility for planning or remodeling an elementary building.	0.0	0.8	1.5	2.3	3.8	8.3	1.5	2.3	3.0	9.8	2.3	30.3	63	89.56	< .001
58. Responsibility for ordering and receiving school supplies and equipment.	12.9	4.5	3.8	8.3	6.1	10.6	5.3	2.3	3.0	6.1	1.5	10.6	49	106.18	< .001
59. Responsibility for inventory of school supplies and equipment.	12.9	3.0	3.0	11.4	6.8	8.3	7.6	1.5	3.8	6.8	5.3	5.3	49	107.99	< .001
60. Responsibility for determining equipment to be replaced or purchased.	8.3	3.8	1.5	8.3	4.5	9.1	1.5	0.8	3.0	6.1	8.3	18.2	49	117.54	< .001
61. Responsibility for determining repairs to buildings and grounds.	7.6	3.8	1.5	8.3	10.6	11.4	2.3	2.3	3.0	4.5	7.6	11.4	56	79.53	< .001

TABLE VIII (Continued)  
SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Responsibility	Excl/ Writ. Comm.	Excl/ Insp.	Excl/ Conf.	Prim/ Writ. Comm.	Prim/ Insp.	Prim/ Conf.	Supv/ Writ. Comm.	Supv/ Insp.	Supv/ Conf.	Coord/ Writ. Comm.	Coord/ Insp.	Coord/ Conf.	df		p
2. Responsibility for individual school communication media and processes.	6.1	3.0	3.0	8.3	4.5	14.4	0.8	0.0	3.8	7.6	0.0	18.9	30	79.58	<.001
3. Responsibility for citizen participation in school study groups.	3.0	0.8	6.1	6.1	4.5	15.9	2.3	0.0	4.5	4.5	0.8	25.0	36	43.78	<.05
4. Responsibility for informal channels of communication.	0.8	0.0	4.5	5.3	2.3	23.5	0.8	3.0	3.0	4.5	1.5	29.5	30	55.90	<.01
5. Responsibility for maintaining liaison with symbiotic community groups (PTA, civic associations, community interest groups, etc.)	2.3	1.5	8.3	4.5	2.3	27.3	0.8	0.0	2.3	1.5	0.8	13.6	47	78.39	<.001

A. Instruction and Curriculum

Question 20: Responsibility for developing curriculum.

Response 20: 64.2 percent of the superintendents and 80 percent of the principals, or 72 percent of the total administrator-respondents, felt that developing curriculum was a coordinating responsibility (Table VII): 58.2 percent of the superintendents and 53.8 percent of the principals, or 56.1 percent of total administrator-respondents, felt that the procedure for evaluation of this elementary principal responsibility should be through means of a conference (Table VII).

In the crosstabulations of item of responsibility with the item of evaluation procedure, 42.4 percent of the total administrator-respondents stated that developing curriculum is a coordinating responsibility which should be evaluated by conference (Table VIII).

Question 21: Responsibility for implementation of instructional program.

Response 21: While 31.3 percent of the superintendents and 41.5 percent of the principals, or 36.4 percent of the total administrator-respondents, regarded the implementation of the instructional program as a supervisory responsibility, 41.8 percent of the superintendents and 30.8 percent of the principals, or 36.4

percent (an equivalent percentage) of the total administrator-respondents decided that implementation of the instructional program is a primary responsibility of the elementary principal (Table VII).

Superintendents, 37.3 percent, and principals, 36.9 percent, or a total of 37.1 percent of all administrator-respondents, stated that the evaluation procedure should be by conference (Table VII).

Opinion is therefore equally emphatic that this responsibility is primary and supervisory in nature. This is substantiated in the crosstabulations (Table VIII). Here the combined primary-conference variable is 12.9 percent, and the combined supervisory-conference variable is 10.6 percent. However, a substantial percentage (12.9 percent) of administrators have combined the supervisory function with the inspection procedure. It is important, therefore, that inspection be a part of the evaluation procedure for this responsibility, along with conference methods.

Question 22: Responsibility for selecting instructional materials.

Response 22: 67.2 percent of the superintendents and 66.2 percent of the principals, or 66.7 percent of total administrator-respondents, stated that selecting instructional materials is a coordinating responsibility (Table VII).

58.2 percent of the superintendents and 53.8 percent of the principals, or 56.1 percent of total administrator-respondents, felt that the procedure for evaluation of this elementary principal responsibility should be through means of a conference (Table VII).

In the crosstabulations of item of responsibility with that of evaluation procedure, 42.4 percent of the total administrator-respondents agreed that developing curriculum is a coordinating responsibility which should be evaluated by conference (Table VIII).

Question 23: Responsibility for determining specific teaching methods.

Response 23: 44.8 percent of the superintendents and 40 percent of the principals, or 42.4 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that determining specific teaching methods is a coordinating responsibility (Table VII).

25.8 percent of the superintendents and 22.7 percent of the principals, or 24.3 percent of the total administrator-respondents, declared that conferencing with principals is the appropriate evaluation procedure (Table VII).

25.8 percent of the total administrator-respondents in the crosstabulations of those two variables agreed that determining specific teaching methods was a coordinating responsibility to be evaluated through a conference procedure (Table VIII).

Question 24: Responsibility for innovation and action research resulting in change of practice.

Response 24: 47.8 percent of the superintendents and 49.2 percent of the principals, or 48.5 percent of the total administrator-respondents, thought that innovation and action research resulting in change of practice was a coordinating responsibility (Table VII).

44.8 percent of the superintendents and 44.6 percent of the principals, or 44.7 percent of the total administrator-respondents, thought the procedure for evaluation should be by conference (Table VII).

In the crosstabulations of these two variables for innovation and action research resulting in change of practice, 28 percent of the total administrators selected both the coordinating responsibility and the conference evaluation procedure (Table VIII).

Question 25: Responsibility for formulating school policies.

Response 25: 49.3 percent of the superintendents and 53.8 percent of the principals, or 51.5 percent of total administrator-respondents, held that formulating school policies was a coordinating responsibility (Table VII).

41.8 percent of the superintendents and 44.6 percent of the principals, or 43.2 percent of the total administrator-respondents, thought formulating school policies a responsibility that should be evaluated through the conference procedure (Table VII).



In the crosstabulations of these two variables (Table VIII), 27.3 percent of the total administrator-respondents regarded the responsibility for formulating school policies to be a coordinating responsibility to be evaluated by conference procedure.

#### B. Staff Personnel

Question 26: Responsibility for selecting the certificated and classified staff.

Response 26: 32.8 percent of the superintendents and 46.2 percent of the principals, or 39.4 percent of total administrator-respondents, stated that selecting the certified and classified staff is a primary responsibility. It is also significant that 20.9 percent of the superintendents and 38.5 percent of the principals, or 29.5 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that this was an exclusive responsibility of the principal (Table VII).

Evaluation through written communication was designated by 40.3 percent of the superintendents and 30.8 percent of the principals, or 35.5 percent of the total administrator-respondents (Table VII).

Of almost equal significance is the result that 29.9 percent of the superintendents and 38.5 percent of the principals, or 34.2 percent of total administrator-respondents, thought that the procedure for evaluation should be through the conference method (Table VII).

Four crosstabulations are of almost equal significance. These are found in Table VIII, but are listed below for convenience:

Responsibility for Selecting the  
Certified and Classified Staff

<u>Responsibility and Evalu- ative Procedure</u>	<u>% Total Admin. Resp.</u>
Exclusive and conference	10.6
" " written communication	11.4
Primary " " "	12.1
" " conference	13.6

Question 27: Responsibility for supervision and evaluation of certificated and classified staff.

Response 27: 34.3 percent of the superintendents and 60 percent of the principals, or 47 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that the supervision and evaluation of certificated and classified staff is the exclusive responsibility of the principal (Table VII).

43.3 percent of the superintendents and 27.7 percent of the principals, or 35.6 percent of the total administrator-respondents, believed that evaluation of this responsibility should be through written communication (Table VII).

In the crosstabulations, 20.5 percent of our total administrator-respondents described the responsibility for supervision and evaluation of certificated and classified staff as an exclusive responsibility to be evaluated through written communication (Table VIII).

Question 28: Responsibility for appointing committees to work together on school problems.

Response 28: 38.8 percent of the superintendents and 27.7 percent of the principals, or 33.3 percent of the total administrator-respondents, declared that appointing committees to work together on school problems is a primary responsibility (Table VIII).

44.8 percent of the superintendents and 69.2 percent of the principals, or 56.8 percent of total administrator-respondents, thought that this responsibility should be evaluated through the conference procedure (Table VII).

In the crosstabulations, 20.5 percent of total administrator-respondents stated that appointing committees to work together on school problems is a primary responsibility to be evaluated by the conference procedure (Table VIII).

Question 29: Responsibility for assisting teachers in solving teaching problems.

Response 29: 37.3 percent of the superintendents and 38.5 percent of the principals, or 37.9 percent of total administrator-respondents, stated that assisting teachers in solving teacher problems is a primary responsibility (Table VII).

61.2 percent of the superintendents and 50.8 percent of the principals, or 56.1 percent of the total administrator-respondents felt that this responsibility should be evaluated through the conference procedure.

Crosstabulations indicate that 22.7 percent of total administrator-respondents consider the responsibility

of assisting teachers in solving teacher problems a primary responsibility of the elementary principal, and that it should be evaluated by the conference procedure (Table VIII).

Question 30: Responsibility for freeing teachers from non-professional duties and interruptions that prevent the teacher from giving his maximum effort to teaching.

Response 30: 34.3 percent of the superintendents and 32.3 percent of the principals, or 33.3 percent of the total administrator-respondents, thought that it was the principal's primary responsibility for freeing teachers from non-professional duties and interruptions that prevent the teacher from giving his maximum effort to teaching (Table VII).

47.7 percent of the superintendents and 47.7 percent of the principals, or 47.7 percent of the total administrator-respondents, thought this responsibility for freeing teachers should be evaluated through a conference procedure (Table VII).

The crosstabulations of the responsibility factor and the evaluation procedure factor reveal that 14.4 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that this responsibility was primary and should be evaluated through a conference procedure (Table VIII).

Question 31: Responsibility for keeping faculty informed on matters of concern to the school.

Response 31: 43.3 percent of the superintendents and 36.9 percent of the principals, or 40.2 percent of the total administrator-respondents, believed that it was a primary responsibility of the principal to keep faculty informed on matters of concern to the school (Table VII).

31.3 percent of the superintendents and 38.5 percent of the principals, or 34.8 percent of the total administrator-respondents, felt that this was the principal's exclusive responsibility (Table VII).

40.3 percent of the superintendents and 33.8 percent of the principals, or 37.1 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that this responsibility should be evaluated by conference (Table VII).

23.9 percent of the superintendents and 21.5 percent of the principals, or 22.7 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that this responsibility should be evaluated through written communication (Table VII).

The crosstabulations (consisting of two variables for responsibility and evaluation procedure), indicate that 15.2 percent of total administrator-respondents declared this responsibility to be primary requiring evaluation by conference, and 12.9 percent of total administrator-respondents declared this responsibility to be exclusive requiring evaluation by conference (Table VIII).

It can be concluded, therefore, that keeping faculty informed in matters of concern to the school is both an exclusive and primary function requiring evaluation through written communication as well as conference methods.

Question 32: Responsibility for assisting teachers in identifying educational goals and objectives which are realistic to pupils.

Response 32: 35.8 percent of the superintendents and 33.8 percent of the principals, or 34.8 percent of the total administrator-respondents, thought that assisting teachers in identifying educational goals and objectives which are realistic to pupils was a primary responsibility.

47.8 percent of the superintendents and 53.8 percent of the principals, or 50.8 percent of the total administrator-respondents, believed this responsibility should be evaluated by conference methods.

In the crosstabulation of the two variables inherent in Question 32, 15.9 percent of the total administrator-respondents, declared this a primary responsibility to be evaluated through conference; 13.6 percent of total administrator-respondents considered this a coordinating responsibility to be evaluated by conference methods (Table VIII).

It is therefore concluded for model purposes that this is both a primary and coordinating responsibility to be evaluated by conference.

Question 33: Responsibility for stimulating and encouraging professional growth among teachers.

Response 33: 43.3 percent of the superintendents and 38.5 percent of the principals, or 40.9 percent of the total administrator-respondents, believed that stimulating and encouraging professional growth among teachers was a primary responsibility of principals (Table VII).

53.7 percent of the superintendents and 63.1 percent of the principals, or 58.3 percent of the total administrator-respondents, believed that the conference method is the appropriate evaluation procedure (Table VII).

In the crosstabulations, 26.5 percent of total administrator-respondents, selected the combined primary and conference factors (Table VIII).

It can be concluded, therefore, that stimulating and encouraging professional growth among teachers is regarded as a primary function of the principal, which should be evaluated by superintendents through the conference procedure.

Question 34: Responsibility for assigning certificated and classified staff.

Response 34: 38.8 percent of the superintendents and 69.2 percent of the principals, or 53.8 percent of the total administrator-respondents, stated that it is the exclusive responsibility of the principal to assign certificated and classified staff (Table VII).