Central Washington University

ScholarWorks@CWU

All Graduate Projects   Graduate Student Projects

Summer 1997

A Process Model for Teacher Evaluation of Education Administrators

Marla Caviness

A Process Model for Teacher Evaluation

of

Education Administrators

A Project Report

Presented

to

The Graduate Faculty

of

Central Washington University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the

Requirements for the Degree

of

Master of Education Administration

----

by

Marla Caviness

July 24, 1997

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Graduate Studies

We hereby approve the report of

Marla Caviness

Candidate for the degree of Master of Education Administration

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY:

_____
Dr. Jack McPherson   COMMITTEE CHAIR

_____
Dr. Susan Madley   Committee member

_____
Dr. Frank Carlson   Committee member

A PROCESS MODEL FOR TEACHER EVALUATION
OF
EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

by

Marla Caviness

July 24, 1997

The purpose of this project was to design and develop a process model for teacher evaluation of administrators. To accomplish this purpose, a review of current literature regarding evaluation of school administrators was conducted. Additional information from randomly selected school districts regarding evaluation of administrators was obtained and analyzed. Information from selected school districts regarding involvement of teachers in the process of administrator evaluation was also obtained.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is dedicated to my parents, Bob and Jo Caviness, my brother Craig, sister-in-law Vicki, my nephew Ryan, my friends, and my colleagues for their continued support, encouragement, and perseverance during this endeavor.

The writer would also like to express her appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Jack McPherson for his support and guidance through my entire course of study and for the many hours of assistance in preparing this paper. The writer would also like to express her gratitude to Dr. Susan Madley for her guidance through my internship, course of study, and for being part of my committee. This project was the direct result of one of her classes that the writer was involved with. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Frank Carlson for his participation as a member of my committee.

Finally, special appreciation is given to Morgan Grover, Chief Moses Jr. High band director, for his assistance, patience, support, and friendship throughout this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Introduction

"The question is not if administrators will be evaluated, but how administrators will be evaluated. The challenge is to place into operation an evaluation system that is valid, reliable, meaningful, useful, and 'do-able'" (Herman, p. 89, 1993).

As noted above by Herman, school administrators must be evaluated. The issue under consideration is the means of administrator evaluation. The challenge for evaluators today, and in the future, is to find evaluation tools that are relevant, meaningful, useful, valid, easily administered, and reliable.

It was the contention of St John (1991) that if teachers are subject to systematic and comprehensive performance evaluation, it makes sense for administrators to be similarly evaluated, since no school can be any better than the quality of its leadership. Unfortunately, said St. John, "the evaluation of administrators is too often done either haphazardly or not all" (p. 88).

Bailey (1984) has suggested that gathering information and feedback "from faculty members for the purpose of improving leadership or administrative practices-is one of the most valuable sources available to administrators who are engaging insuch improvement practices" (p. 5).

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project was to design and develop a process model for teacher evaluation of administrators. To accomplish this purpose, a review of current literature regarding evaluation of school administrators was conducted. Additional information from randomly selected school districts regarding

evaluation of administrators was obtained and analyzed. Information from selected school districts regarding involvement of teachers in the process of administrator evaluation was also obtained.

Limitations of the Project

For purposes of this project it was necessary to set the following limitations for this study:

1. Research: The preponderance of literature reviewed in Chapter 2 was limited to research current within the last fifteen (15) years, which focused on: the need for and benefits of school administrators being evaluated; and involvement of teachers in the process of administrator evaluation.

2. Scope: The project was designed for general use and at the discretion of principals, assistant principals, and athletic directors in the school administrator evaluation process.

3. Population Surveyed: The sample surveyed for this project were school administrators from elementary and secondary schools from large (AAA), medium-sized (AA), and small (A), school districts, throughout the state of Washington.

Definitions of Terms

Significant terms used in the context of this study have been defined as follows by the Washington Interscholastic Activities Association 1996-1997 classification system.

1. "A" school districts: These are school districts that have a student population of 151-300.

2. "AA" school districts: These are school districts that have a student population of 401-1000.

3. "AAA" school districts: These are school districts that have a student population of 1001+.

4. Administrator referred to the principal of the elementary, middle, and high schools, surveyed.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature and research summarized on the following pages has been organized to address:

1. Should Administrators be Evaluated?

2. How Should Administrators be Evaluated?

3. What Criteria Should be Used to Evaluate Administrators?

4. Who Should Evaluate the Administrator?

5. Summary

The research addressed in Chapter 2 was identified through an Educational Resources Information Centers (ERIC) computer search. A hand search of various other sources was also conducted.

Should Administrators be Evaluated?

Definitions of the principal's role have changed during the past 40 years. These roles have included manager of learning resources, orchestrator of social subsystems; innovator, expediter, morale builder, facilitator, and organizer; evaluator, supervisor, and leader of instruction; agent for change; and planner and implementer of program development. Many of these role definitions are guided by idealized concepts of what principals should be like rather than conceptualizations grounded in on-the-job performance (Thomas and Vornberg, pp. 59-60, 1991).

As suggested above by Thomas and Vornberg, while it would be difficult for any one person or group to develop an evaluation tool that addresses all essential aspects of the principalship, educators must make the attempt before

state politics intervenes and creates the evaluation tool without educators input. (Thomas and Vornberg, 1991).

Every day school administrators are evaluated. Every time the administrator has contact with a teacher, a parent, a student, another administrator, a community member, or with a school board member, the administrator is evaluated (Herman, 1988). According to Thomas and Vornberg (1991), the need to achieve better results in schools in prior years has focused on teacher's activities in the classroom and student performance. Today, the focus has narrowed in on administrator's performance and how it helps make a school successful.

As observed by St. John (1991):

If systematic and comprehensive performance evaluation makes sense for teachers, it makes double sense for administrators, since no school can be any better than the quality of its leadership. Yet unfortunately, the evaluation of administrators is too often done either haphazardly or not at all (p. 88).

According to Reitzug (1991), in the 1970s, a popular response to cries for accountability in education was student competency tests. During the early 1980s, the competency testing movement expanded with the development of examinations for teachers. However, in the mid 1980s, analysts suggested that administrator competency testing could become a "third generation" in the competency testing movement (p. 65).

Egginton, Jefferies, and Kidd-Knights stated:

In recent years, the literature on school leadership had emphasized the qualities and skills needed to effectively manage and direct a school, and focused attention on the role of the principal. At the same time, increased public demand for greater accountability has caused educators and legislators to more closely scrutinize the requirements for becoming a school administrator (Egginton, et al , p. 62, 1988).

Egginton, et al, (1988) conducted a study in 1988 looking at the growth of administrator competency testing. Their study found that in 1988 12 states required a special test for an administrator to become licensed in that state. Reitzug (1991) performed a similar study also looking at the growth of administrator competency testing from 1980 to 1990. He found that in 1980 that Georgia was the only state performing administrator competency testing; however, by 1990, 15 states required administrator competency testing.

Reitzug (1991) and St. John (1991) also undertook studies on administrator competency testing. A major focus of each study dealt with the need for testing competency. Reitzug found that "eleven of the fifteen states which use administrator competency testing agree that the primary objectives of the test was to ensure that certification candidates have attained the knowledge required to successfully fulfill the duties of a school administrator" (Reitzug, p. 66, 1991).

St. John concluded the five most important reasons to have a comprehensive administrative evaluation tool were "to improve overall job performance, to determine how well annual goals are achieved, to pinpoint specific professional strengths and weaknesses, to identify specific professional development needs, and to increase understanding of the evaluation process" (St. John, p. 88, 1991). According to Herman, (1991) an evaluation system should help the administrator improve his or her performance and knowledge and skill as an administrator. Rammer (1991) suggested that the purposes of evaluation include gathering information for assessment and/or dismissal, validating the selection process, changing goals or objectives, facilitating self-evaluation, modifying procedures, and protecting the individual or school system.

How Should Administrators be Evaluated?

Rammer (1991) considered the structure of the evaluation. He found that McGrail and others (1987) found the Missouri Performance Based Superintendent and Principal Evaluations to be the simplest. The Missouri Evaluation has "three phases: preparatory phase (setting goals), formative phase (data collection), and summative phase (review of data)" (p. 73). Rammer also found that Dornbusch and Scott (1975) offered a formalized, four-stage approach. The four-stage approach began with a beginning of the year conference where two things were done: the allocating of tasks and the setting of criteria. Samplings of the administrator's performance during the year were done. The process culminated with an end-of -the-year appraisal conference.

St. John (1991) designed a system for evaluating school administrators. This system included having "several representative faculty members make a composite evaluation of the involved administrator" in order to provide the involved "administrator with another important perspective of his or her performance" (St. John, p. 89, 1991). According to St. John (1991), the best evaluations have two distinct phases: "1. Evaluation by the immediate supervisor. 2. A self-evaluation that is written independently on the same form used by the supervisor" (p. 89).

Thomas and Vornberg (1991) developed an evaluation model and a process for deciding how the principal should be evaluated. "A model for evaluation can be developed from the items identified as being important for principal's evaluation" (Thomas and Vornberg, p. 61, 1991).

Thomas and Vornberg identified a nine step process by which administrators should be evaluated as paraphrased below:

Step 1: Develop the evaluator's ability to set high but realistic performance expectations in the search for relevant performance information. The principals being evaluated should also be trained on what is expected by the evaluators.

Step 2: Periodically reviewing of the process and performance standards.

Step 3: "The process should assess items that directly pertain to the principal's job description" (p. 61).

Step 4: Develop cooperative goal setting between the evaluator and the administrator. The goals should be integrated within the system's goals.

Step 5: Develop a continuous evaluation process.

Step 6: Develop a timely and comprehensive process. Data should be collected at frequent intervals and used to assist the administrator in decisions for professional growth. If the performance is less than satisfactory, than feedback and coaching should begin immediately.

Step 7: Include four contacts with the administrator: a pre-observation conference, data collection (including direct observation or shadowing of the principal), a post observation conference, and an evaluation or summative conference.

Step 8: Base data on criteria that are measurable, but not necessarily quantifiable by the evaluator.

Step 9: Develop a positive process promoting growth, allowing for failure and a second chance, while identifying and acknowledging effective performances.

What Criteria Should be Used to Evaluate Administrators?

Several studies attempted to define the criteria on which an administrator should be evaluated. Thomas and Vornberg's (1991) study stated that an evaluation process "should include a pre-observation conference, data collection (including direct observation or shadowing of the principal), a post-observation conference, and an evaluation or summative conference" (p.62). St. John (1991) uses the categories of professionalism, planning/decision making, organizing and coordinating, communicating, motivating, performance monitoring and evaluating, professional development, and human and public relations in his assessment model for administrators. According to Herman (1988), there are fourteen areas in which a school administrator must be competent. Herman's areas are "leadership, school climate, planning, instructional management, clinical supervision, staff development, problem solving, auditing and evaluating, belief system, budgeting, stress tolerance, communications with staff, communications with students, and communications with community" (p. 6). Planning, supervising, and decision making were part of Buser and Banks, Jr.'s (1994) study on what criteria to use to evaluate an administrator. Specific responsibilities such as curriculum, budget, and plant management were also included. The study also recommended looking at the personal characteristics of leadership, appearance, preparation, and personality, and looking at the way the administrator was "perceived by the clients-students, teachers, parents, administration, etc" (Buser and Banks, Jr., p. 3 1984).

Research conducted by Egginton, et al (1988) found that several areas have already implemented state-mandated tests for principals. The Los Angles City

Schools created a test in which 10 dimensions serve as the basis for the written examination, performance evaluations of inservice principals, and for the training and development sequence. The Los Angles system's dimensions were "judgment; analysis; instructional leadership; decisiveness; delegation and follow-up; planning and organization; district rules, regulations, and policies; written and oral communication; initiative and innovativeness; and leadership and influence" (p. 67). Florida passed legislation requiring school administrators to pass a test in "eight skill areas-public school curriculum and instruction, organizational management and development, human resource management and development, leadership skills, technology, educational law, school communication, and educational finance (Egginton, et al, p. 68, 1988). Oklahoma has a test that address the issues of "development, organization and control of public education, human development, human relations management, school services and curriculum, and supervision of instruction. Georgia created a test for principals based upon the combined efforts of NES (National Evaluation Systems, Inc.) and Georgia school teachers and administrators, superintendents, teacher educators, and state department personnel. "The test includes seven sub-areas: educational leadership, school law and educational organization, school management, personnel management, instructional supervision, curriculum development, and social issues in school administration (Egginton, et al, p. 69, 1988).

Who Should Evaluate the Administrator?

A survey conducted by Buser and Banks, Jr. (1984) in which 95% of the respondents (composed of superintendents, secondary school principals,

elementary principals, and teachers' associations) said the superintendent should be the evaluator of the principal. 94% responded that the principal should do a self-evaluation. 72% responded that the central office should evaluate the principal. 66% responded that teachers should do the evaluation.

Herman stated that "it may be wise to involve teachers, students, classified employees, central office personnel, parents, and consultants as members of the team charged with developing the administrator evaluation system" (Herman, p. 91, 1993).

Bailey's (1984) study indicated that "faculty feedback-the process of gathering information from faculty members for the purpose of improving leadership or administrative practices-is one of the most valuable sources available to administrators who are engaging in such improvement practices" (p. 5).

According to Murphy and Pimentel (1996), "Teachers, parents, and students (should) know firsthand whether these conditions (safe, orderly, and inviting place to teach and learn) are present. Why not go directly to the source to garner their views?" (p. 75). They also say, "parents, teachers, regularly appraise the performance of school administrators. Their views (have been) surveyed annually and their responses are factored into the evaluation process" (p. 78). "Moreover, sustained improvement is unlikely if a principal acts in isolation without the cooperation of teachers or, worse yet, 'on the backs' of teachers. Thus canvassing teachers' views does more than boost morale. It provides principals with crucial feedback, and they are paying attention as never before" (p. 78).

Prince (1987) conducted a study on the Mississippi Tupelo Public School District principal evaluation system. The Tupelo evaluation consisted of 10

different sampling instruments that focused on the performance of the principal.

Data were collected from teachers, parents, central office staff, students, and board members. Only one-third of the staff are surveyed by each of the three instruments as detailed below:

Form A contained questions about the school climate, the principals' relations with subordinates, the principal's leadership, and the organizational support of the teacher while teaching.

Form B was a verbal survey concerning whether or not the principal met responsibility in directing teacher short term planning, long term planning, classroom visitation, and observation feedback to the teacher.

Form C was a verbal survey which determined to which extent the principal maintained a successful working relationship with individual teachers.

Form D was a random phone survey of parents who had students in that particular school. The parents responded to questions regarding the efficiency and leadership qualities of the principal.

Form E was an interview of the principal on his or her perceptions about all six areas of responsibility on the *Professional Standards Scale: Principals* (PSS:P).

Form F was an inspection of various documents related to required records.

Form G was data collected from the central office staff members concerning the areas in which they delt with the principal and that area only.

Form H was an inspection of the financial records to determine if the principal kept the records in accordance with fiscal responsibility.

Form I was a random sampling of the students on the school climate and discipline.

Form J was a sampling of school board members on items that related to the principal's implementation of specific matters of school board policy, community relations, and building supervision. (Prince, p. 41 & 45, 1987)

Weller, et al (1994) stated that "the logical choice for evaluating the principal is the teacher. Interacting on a daily basis with the principal, teachers have first hand knowledge of effective-school characteristics such the quality of the school's curriculum, the instructional climate of the school, and the presence of positive or negative interpersonal relationships" (Weller, Buttery, and Bland, p.112, 1994). This research, which sought to determine specifically whether or not teachers should evaluate principals, found that where teachers strongly favored their participation in administrator evaluation, principals and superintendents only slightly favored the use of teacher evaluations by superiors.

Weller, et al, (1994) further concluded that although the concept of teacher evaluation was favored by some principals and superintendents. It was the superintendents, not the principals, who favored the idea the least. Weller said, "This may be because superintendents are reluctant to share the principal evaluation process with others, such as teachers, which might result in a decrease of the superintendent's power" (p. 116).

Summary

The research and literature summarized in Chapter 2 supported the following themes:

1. Systematic and comprehensive performance evaluation make sense for administrators since no school can be any better than the quality of its leadership.

2. Administrator evaluation should allow for self-assessment, as well as assessment by superiors and subordinates.

3. Administrator evaluation should facilitate levels of professionalism, planning/decision making, organizing and coordinating, communicating, motivating, performance monitoring and evaluating, professional development, and human and public relations.

4. Administrator evaluation should include annual teacher feed-back because of their daily contact with the administrator.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of this project was to design and develop a process model for teacher evaluation of administrators. To accomplish this purpose, a review of current literature regarding evaluation of school administrators was conducted. Additional information from randomly selected school districts regarding evaluation of administrators was obtained and analyzed. Information from selected school districts regarding involvement of teachers in the process of administrator evaluation was also obtained.

Chapter 3 contains background information describing:

1. Need for the Project

2. Procedures

3. Planned Implementation and Assessment of the Project

Need for the Project

The need for this project was influenced by the following considerations:

1. The writer (Marla Caviness), a veteran secondary-level teacher in the Moses Lake, Washington school district has observed, as a professional educator, the need for evaluation of school administrators.

2. Current research findings and evidence support the need to evaluate school administration in order maximize professional growth and development and better meet the needs of the students they serve.

3. As a prospective school administrator, the writer's professional awareness of the importance of teacher involvement in the evaluation of school administrators has been heightened.

4. Undertaking the project coincided with the writer's graduate studies in Education Administration.

Procedures

To obtain background information related to the evaluation of school administrators, an extensive use of ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) search was undertaken to find current and relevant information on administrators being evaluated by teachers. Additionally, two survey instruments were designed to obtain and analyze information from randomly selected school districts in the state of Washington regarding evaluation of school administrators and the involvement of teachers in the process of administrator evaluation.

The ERIC search proved useful in the development of both survey instruments (see Appendices A and B). Survey A sought to elicit the generalized perceptions of practicing school administrators concerning the issue of administrator evaluation in general. The survey instrument was field-tested by teachers at Moses Lake High School and Chief Moses Jr. High School. The survey was then mailed to the randomly selected group of administrators.

Survey instrument B was specifically designed to determine how school administrators felt about being evaluated by teachers. This instrument was also field-tested by teachers at the above named schools. The survey was then mailed to the selected group of administrators who had previously been identified as being administrators who were evaluated by their teachers. The two population groups surveyed were school administrators from large (AAA), medium-sized (AA) and small (A) school districts, both elementary, middle, and secondary principals, throughout the state of Washington. Administrators who

received survey questionnaire A were requested to complete the survey and mail it back with a copy of the evaluation instrument currently used in the administrator's district. Similarly, administrators who received survey questionnaire B were requested to complete the survey and return it with a copy of the evaluation instrument currently used by teachers in their buildings concerning the evaluation of administrators.

Thirty (30) questionnaires were mailed to the two groups of school administrators. Of thirty (30) survey questionnaire A mailed to school administrators, twelve (40%) were returned. Of eight (8) survey questionnaire B mailed 4 (50%) were returned. A summary and analysis of data obtained from both surveys has been presented in Chapter 4.

Planned Implementation
and Assessment of the Project

The process model for teacher evaluation of school administrators was designed for general use at the discretion of elementary, middle level, and high school principals, assistant principals, and/or athletic directors. The writer may be afforded an opportunity to share results of the project with Moses Lake School District officials at a later time. In the event such opportunity is provided, teacher and administrator dialogue concerning evaluation of school administrators could be conducted in concert with established collective bargaining procedures. Resulting use of the process model and/or its assessment and possible modification would be an outgrowth of procedures followed by professional negotiators.

CHAPTER 4

THE PROJECT

Introduction

The process model presented in Chapter 4 evolved as an outgrowth of the two survey instruments used for the project to obtain information from school districts in the state of Washington regarding evaluation of administrators and the involvement of teachers in the process of administrator evaluation. Accordingly, Chapter 4 had been organized in three parts as follows:

Part 1: Survey A - Evaluation of School Administrators, Presentation and Analysis of Data.

Part 2: Survey B - Teacher Evaluation of School Administrators, Presentation and Analysis of Data.

Part 3: A Process Model for Teacher Evaluation of Education Administrators.

A PROCESS MODEL

FOR

TEACHER EVALUATION

OF

EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

by Marla Caviness

Central Washington University

Summer 1997

PART 1 - SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE A DATA

EVALUATION OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

	f	AVE.
1. NUMBER OF YEARS WORKED		
a. field of education	276	23
b. building principal	127	10.6
c. principal of your current building	78	6.5
ANALYSIS: Respondents had worked an average of 10.6 years as a building principal.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents to Survey A were experienced building administrators.		
	f	%
2. WHO EVALUATES YOU?		
a. superintendent	10	0.83
b. assistant superintendent	2	0.17
c. other		
ANALYSIS: Ten (10) of twelve of respondents, (83%) were evaluated by the superintendent of the		
school district.		
CONCLUSION: Principals had only one official source of professional evaluation - the superintendent.		
	f	%
3. WHO EVALUATES THE MAJORITY OF PRINCIPALS?		
a. superintendent	10	0.83
b. assistant superintendent	2	0.17
c. other		
ANALYSIS: The preponderance of respondents were evaluated by the superintendent of the school district.		
CONCLUSION: Principals had only one official source of professional evaluation - the superintendent.		
	f	AVE.
4. NUMBER OF TIMES A YEAR EVALUATED?	14	1.16
ANALYSIS: Respondents were formally evaluated once a year.		
CONCLUSION: Superintendents only officially evaluated the respondent once a year.		
*Indicates answers given by respondents to open-ended questions or additional comments given to		
forced-choice questions.		

5. WHAT ARE THE MAIN CATEGORIES OF THE EVALUATION?	f	%
a. *School Management & Administration	9	0.75
b. *School Finance	8	0.66
c. *Leadership	8	0.66
d. *Personnel Support and Evaluation	8	0.66
e. *Effort Toward Improvement When Needed	5	0.42
f. *Professional Preparation & Scholarship	5	0.42
g. *Communication	4	0.33
h. *Curriculum & Instruction	4	0.33
i. *Staff Relations	4	0.33
j. *Academic Achievement of Students	3	0.25
l. *Community/Parent Communication	2	0.17
k. *Goal Setting	2	0.17
m. *Facility Maintenance	2	0.17
n. *Reducing Disportionality	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: School management and administration, school finance, leadership, and personnel support and		
evaluation were the main categories of respondent evaluation tools.		
CONCLUSION: The skills which are deemed necessary to be an efficient principals were orientated toward		
business skills not people skills.		
6. HOW IS THE INFORMATION FOR THE EVALUATION COLLECTED?	f	%
a. sporadic visits throughout year.	7	0.58
b. single day observation	1	0.08
c. all contacts throughout the year	11	0.92
d. complaints from parents	5	0.42
e. positive feedback from parents	5	0.42
f. no set guidelines	5	0.42
g. I am not sure	2	0.17
*Survey of the building staff	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Data for the evaluation of the principal was collected throughout the year and during all contacts		
with the superintendent.		
CONCLUSION: Despite being only officially evaluated once a year, principals were in reality evaluated every		
time they had contact with the superintendent.		

7. ARE YOU ASKED/REQUIRED TO SET GOALS BEFORE SCHOOL BEGINS?	f	%
a. yes	11	0.92
b. no	1	0.08
c. sometimes		
ANALYSIS: Eleven (11) of twelve respondents, (92%) were asked to set goals before the school year began.		
CONCLUSION: Principals were asked to decide on a direction for their school before the school year began.		

8. WHAT IS THE PROCESS OF GOAL SETTING?	f	%
*Superintendent asks me for goals, then we discuss them	3	0.25
*I have used self-study & strategic planning goals	2	0.17
*Not Answered	2	0.17
*Follow guidelines set by school district	1	0.08
*Goals originate from self-study, school goals by site council, principal goals reflect school goals	1	0.08
*Site-based team with parents on board, staff meetings, & P.T.O	1	0.08
*Staff & site council input in evaluating 5 year strategic plan	1	0.08
*Strategic 3-5 year plan that is updated yearly	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Discussions with the superintendent about goals, self-study and strategic planning were the main methods of goal setting.		
CONCLUSION: School goal-setting was primarily influenced by individual planning by building principals and subsequent conferencing with the superintendent about those plans.		

9. ARE YOU ASKED TO DO A SELF-EVALUATION?	f	%
a. yes	7	0.58
b. no	4	0.33
*New superintendent - new policy, so do not know what is required	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Seven (7) of twelve respondents, (58%) were asked to do a self-evaluation.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents were asked to reflect upon their strengths and weakness as part of the evaluation process.		

9A. WHAT KIND?	f	%
*Not answered	6	0.5
*Feedback on accomplishment of personal goals	1	0.08
*New superintendent this year - do not know if will be asked or not	1	0.08
*Reflection paper	1	0.08
*Same criteria as superintendent	1	0.08
*Something from SPU	1	0.08
*Sporadic	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Five (5) different types of self-evaluations were described.		
CONCLUSION: Five (5) different types of self-evaluations were required from principals.		

9B. IF NOT ASKED, DO YOU DO ONE ANYWAY?	f	%
a. yes	5	0.42
b. no	4	0.33
*Not answered	3	0.25
ANALYSIS: Five (5) respondents, (42%) did a self-evaluation even when not required to do so.		
CONCLUSION: While many participating school districts did not require self-evaluation, many of the		
respondents believed it was important and did it anyway.		

9C. WHAT KIND?	f	%
*Not Answered	7	0.58
*Goal setting	1	0.08
*Informal - some years ask staff for feedback	1	0.08
*Only informally - with staff	1	0.08
*Reflection with superintendent	1	0.08
*Varies - sometimes relating to goals	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Respondents used a variety of methods for self-evaluation.		
CONCLUSION: Non-required self-evaluations were often informal conversations with the staff or		
superintendent.		

10. DO YOU INVOLVE THE TEACHERS IN THE SELF-EVALUATION?	f	%
a. yes	3	0.25
b. no	2	0.17
c. sometimes	4	0.33
*Superintendent does	1	0.08
*Not Answered	2	0.17
ANALYSIS: 66% of the time, teachers were involved in the principal's self-evaluation.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents used feedback from teachers for evaluation even when not directed to do so by		
the school district.		

11. WHY OR WHY NOT?	f	%
*Not Answered	7	0.58
*Improve leadership traits - my staff needs to help me with this. Who else knows?	1	0.08
*Often do not get good feedback	1	0.08
*Sometimes healthy - doing it all the time sends the wrong message to staff. Superintendent evaluates.	1	0.08
*Teachers are not qualified to evaluate principals. It would become a popularity vote.	1	0.08
*Who else would I get feedback from? Risky though.	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Respondents regarded teacher feedback as two-sided. It could be helpful feedback or a		
popularity vote.		
CONCLUSION: While some principals did not believe that teachers were qualified to evaluate principals, others		
expressly sought it out, claiming that teachers knew the principal best.		

12. WHAT HAS BEEN/COULD BE THE MOST . .		
A. POSITIVE BENEFIT OF TEACHER EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS?	*f*	%
*Let's you see what is important to individual teachers.	2	0.17
*Not Answered	2	0.17
*Re-setting of goals	2	0.17
*Allows them to be heard/feel part of a community of adult learners	1	0.08
*Direct feedback	1	0.08
*Feedback on how to better support their efforts in the classroom at the site	1	0.08
*Honest assessment on communication	1	0.08
*Honest look at our school	1	0.08
*I always want to improve my leadership traits. Who knows better than my staff?	1	0.08
*None	1	0.08
*Reflect on comments to see changes that may need to happen	1	0.08
*Relationships	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: The positive aspects of having teachers evaluate principals delt with letting the teachers voice their opinions about the conduct of the principal and management of the school.		
CONCLUSION: The positive aspects of having teachers evaluate principals focused on the people skills aspect of management (e.g., listening to what people have to say and responding to that information; and including the teachers in the management of the school by giving them "buy-in" into what is going on).		

B. NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF TEACHER EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS	f	%
*Not Answered	5	0.42
*Gripe session / personal pettiness carry over	2	0.17
*Hurt your confidence	1	0.08
*I have a very thin skin & fret/worry over minority views & negatives	1	0.08
*Special interest groups may have too much power - people who have been disciplined can "pay back"	1	0.08
**You can't please everyone, therefore a slap in the face or false ideas of your attitudes, abilities, & or relationships can hurt	1	0.08
*Vent rather than give honest, constructive input - I hope they don't evaluate student work the same way	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: The negative aspects of having teachers evaluate principals delt with respondents dislike of being evaluated by anyone and the lack of training that most people have about how to constructively criticize.		
CONCLUSION: Many people do not like to be evaluated by anyone. Some superiors do not want to be evaluated by subordinates in case the subordinates, fearing the subordinates may not like the management style or personal style of the superior. It takes someone with a secure ego to seek this type of arrangement.		
13. WHO SHOULD EVALUATE THE PRINCIPAL?	f	%
a. superintendent	11	0.92
b. parents	3	0.25
c. assistant superintendent	4	0.33
d. school counselors	1	0.08
e. teachers	4	0.33
f. students	2	0.17
g. others		
*All others informally	1	0.08
*Input from stakeholders	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: 92% of respondents wanted the superintendent to be their primary evaluator; however, several respondents were willing to include other school personnel in the official evaluation process.		
CONCLUSION: Data indicated that many respondents were not opposed to the idea of teachers officially evaluating principals.		

	f	AVE.
14. HOW OFTEN SHOULD THE PRINCIPAL BE EVALUATED?	15	1.25
ANALYSIS: Nine (9) of twelve respondents, (75%) indicated that being evaluated once a year was sufficient.		
CONCLUSION: Being evaluated once a year was sufficient in the opinion of most respondents.		

	f	%
15. WHAT SHOULD THE CATEGORIES FOR EVALUATION BE?	f	%
a. *School Finance	7	0.58
b. *Academic Achievement of Students	6	0.5
c. *Curriculum & Instruction	6	0.5
d. *Personnel Support & Evaluation	6	0.5
e. *Leadership	5	0.42
f. *School Management & Administration	5	0.42
g. *Communication	4	0.33
h. *Professional Preparation & Scholarship	4	0.33
i. *Effort Toward Improvement When Needed	3	0.25
j. *Staff Relations	3	0.25
k. *Facility Maintenance	2	0.17
l. *Not Answered	2	0.17
m. *Effective School Criteria	1	0.08
n. *Malcolm Baldridge Award Criteria on Quality	1	0.08
o. *Openness to All	1	0.08
p. *Shared Decision Making Policy	1	0.08
q. *Vision for Growth	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: School finance, academic achievement of students, curriculum and instruction, and personnel		
support and evaluation were the main categories that respondents suggested they be evaluated on.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents wanted to be evaluated on the business skill aspect of managing a school, not the		
people skill aspect.		

16. HOW SHOULD THE INFORMATION BE COLLECTED?	f	%
a. sporadic visits throughout year.	5	0.42
b. single day observation	0	0
c. all contacts throughout the year	12	0.1
d. complaints from parents	2	0.17
e. positive feedback from parents	3	0.25
f. no set guidelines	1	0.08
g. other		
*Community/central office staff	1	0.08
*Data should be collected many different ways	1	0.08
*Self-evaluation	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Twelve (12) of twelve respondents, (100%) agreed that all contacts throughout the year should be the basis for official evaluation.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents agreed that all contacts throughout the year should be the basis for official evaluation.		
17. SHOULD YOU BE REQUIRED TO SET GOALS FOR YOUR SCHOOL?	f	%
a. yes	12	0.1
b. no	0	0
EXPLAIN ANSWER		
*Not Answered	2	0.17
*Building leader needs to lead - goals establish where we're going	2	0.17
*You always need a vision of where you are going	2	0.17
*Absolutely - and should be carried out	1	0.08
*Everyone must be held accountable - this sets the criteria	1	0.08
*Essential	1	0.08
*Goals provide a way to asses success	1	0.08
*Goals tied to budget	1	0.08
*Good idea - we have to do goals	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Twelve (12) of twelve respondents, (100%) agreed they should be required to set goals before ·the beginning of the school year.		
CONCLUSION: Goal setting was seen as a necessary part of being an effective principal. If the goals were not achieved, questions should be raised as to why not.		

18. SHOULD YOU BE REQUIRED TO DO A SELF-EVALUATION?	f	%
a. yes	10	0.83
b. no	2	0.17
EXPLAIN ANSWER		
*Not Answered	5	0.42
*Any good administrator will self-reflect	1	0.08
*No, but I would like to	1	0.08
*Checking on goals you have set is important	1	0.08
*Compared with superintendent's to see similarities and differences	1	0.08
*Goal setting	1	0.08
*I would do each year & teacher self-evaluation	1	0.08
*Personal & professional growth should be part of an evaluation	1	0.08
ANALYSIS: Ten (10) of twelve respondents, (83%) agreed that principals should be required to do a self-evaluation.		
CONCLUSION: The majority of respondents answered that self-evaluation should be required as it is necessary to see if accomplishing goals.		
*Indicates answers given by respondents to open-ended questions or additional comments given to forced-choice questions.		

Survey Questionnaire A
Conclusions: Composite Summary

1. **Question:** How many years have you worked . . .
   Conclusion: Respondents to Survey A were experienced building administrators.

2. **Question:** Who evaluates you?
   Conclusion: Principals had only one official source of professional evaluation - the superintendent.

3. **Question:** Who evaluates the majority of the principals in your school district?
   Conclusion: Principals had only one official source of professional evaluation - the superintendent.

4. **Question:** How many times per year are you evaluated?
   Conclusion: Superintendents only officially evaluated the respondent once a year.

5. **Question:** What main categories comprise your evaluation?
   Conclusion: The skills which are deemed necessary to be an efficient principals were orientated toward business skills not people skills.

6. **Question:** How is the information about you and your job performance collected for the evaluation?
   Conclusion: Despite being only officially evaluated once a year, principals were in reality evaluated every time they had contact with the superintendent.

7. **Question:** Are you asked/required to set goals for your school before the school year begins?
   Conclusion: Principals were requested to decide on a direction for their school before the school year began.

8. **Question:** If you are asked to set goals for your school, please explain the process used and give examples of some of the goals you have set.
   Conclusion: School goal-setting was primarily influenced by individual planning by building principals and then conferring with the superintendent about those plans seemed to be a way to confirm principal goals were similar to the superintendent's goals.

9. **Question:** Are you asked to do a self-evaluation?
Conclusion: Respondents were being asked to reflect upon their strengths and weakness as part of the evaluation process.

9A. **Question:** What kind of evaluation are you asked to do?
Conclusion: Five (5) different types of self-evaluations were required from principals.

9B. **Question:** If not asked, do you do an evaluation anyway?
Conclusion: While many participating school districts did not require self-evaluation, many of the respondents believed it was important and did it anyway.

9C. **Question:** What kind?
Conclusion: Non-required self-evaluations were often informal conversations with the staff or superintendent.

10. **Question:** Do you involve teachers in your process of self-evaluation?
Conclusion: Respondents did use feedback from teachers for the purpose of evaluation even when not directed to do so by the school district .

11. **Question:** Why or why not?
Conclusion: While some principals did not believe that teachers were qualified to evaluate principals, others expressly sought it out claiming that who better knew what the principal is like than the teachers.

12A. What do you think has been / could be the most . . .
Question: positive benefit from having the teachers evaluate you?
Conclusion: The positive aspects of having teachers evaluate principals focused on the people skill aspect of management - listening to what people have to say and responding to that information. Inclusion into the management of the school gives teachers "buy -in" into what is going on.

12B. **Question:** negative consequences that come from having the teachers evaluate you?
Conclusion: Most people do not like to be evaluated by anyone. Some superiors do not want to be evaluated by subordinates, fearing the subordinates might not like the management style or personal style of the superior. It takes someone with a secure ego to seek this type of arrangement.

13. **Question:** Who do you think should do the evaluation of you?
Conclusion: The data shows that many respondents were not closed to the idea of teachers officially evaluating principals.

14. **Question:** How often do you think you should be evaluated?
Conclusion: Being evaluated once a year was sufficient in the opinion of most respondents.

15. **Question:** What categories do you think should comprise your evaluation?
Conclusion: Respondents wanted to be evaluated on the business skill aspect of managing a school, not the people skill aspect.

16. **Question:** How would you like the information for your evaluation to be collected?
Conclusion: Respondents agreed that all contacts throughout the year should be the basis for the official evaluation.

17. **Question:** Should you be required to set goals for your school? Please explain your answer.
Conclusion: Goal setting was seen as a necessary part of being an effective principal. If the goals were not achieved, questions should be raised as to why not.

18. **Question:** Should you be required to do a self-evaluation?
Conclusion: The majority of respondents answered that self-evaluation should be required as it is necessary to see if accomplishing goals.

PART 2 - SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE B DATA

TEACHER EVALUATION OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

1. NUMBER OF YEARS WORKED	f	AVE.
a. education	105	26.25
b. building principal	53	13.25
c. current building	27	6.75
ANALYSIS: Respondents had worked an average of 13 years as building principals.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents being evaluated by teachers were experienced building administrators.		

	f	AVE.
2. NUMBER OF YEARS EVALUATED BY TEACHERS	39	9.75
ANALYSIS: Respondents were evaluated by teachers an average of 9.75 years.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents were evaluated by teachers for the majority of their tenure as a building principal.		

3. WHO CREATED THE EVALUATION FORM?	f	%
a. principal		
b. classified staff		
c. teachers		
d. previous principal		
e. superintendent	1	0.25
f. school board		
g. community		
h. parents		
i. others		
*Negotiated Instrument at District Level	1	0.25
*Principal & Administrative Team	1	0.25
*Teachers Union	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: ˙Respondents indicated that sources other than themselves created the tool which teachers used to evaluate the principal.		
CONCLUSION: The data shows that being evaluated by teachers was not the idea of the individual respondents.		
*Indicates answers given by respondents to open-ended questions or additional comments given to		
forced-choice questions.		

4. DID TEACHERS HAVE INPUT IN CREATING THE FORM?	f	AVE.
a. yes	1	0.25
b. no	1	0.25
c. some		
*Not Answered	2	0.5
ANALYSIS: The majority of school district (75%) either did not involve teachers in the creation of the		
evaluation tool or did not respond to the question.		
CONCLUSION: Data did not confirm if teachers were involved in the creation of the evaluation tool in		
responding school districts.		

5. DID CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES HAVE INPUT IN CREATING THE FORM?	f	AVE.
a. yes	2	0.5
b. no		
c. some		
*Not Answered	2	0.5
ANALYSIS: In 50% of the school districts, classified staff were involved in creating the evaluation tool.		
CONCLUSION: Creation of the evaluation tool was a group effort in several school districts.		

6. IF THE TEACHERS CREATED THE FORM, DID THE PRINCIPAL HAVE INPUT?	f	%
a. yes	1	0.25
b. no		
c. not here		
*Not Answered	3	0.75
ANALYSIS: 75% of respondents did not answer whether they had input into the creation of the		
evaluation tool.		
CONCLUSION: Data did not confirm if school administrators were involved in the creation of the evaluation		
tool in responding school districts.		

7. DID THE TEACHERS INVOLVE THE CLASSIFIED STAFF?	f	%
a. yes		
b. no		
c. some		
d. do not know	1	0.25
*Not answered	3	0.75
ANALYSIS: 75% of respondents did not answer whether classified staff had input on the creation of the evaluation tool.		
CONCLUSION: Data did not confirm if classified staff were involved in the creation of the evaluation tool in responding school districts.		
8. IF A GROUP CREATED THE FORM, WHO WAS INVOLVED?	f	%
a. open meetings		
b. department chair		
c. department created teacher part		
d. professional firm employed		
e. department meetings		
f. selected committee	1	0.25
g. principal lead meetings	1	0.25
h. other		
*I do not know	2	0.5
ANALYSIS: 50% of respondents indicated the evaluation tool was created in a group format.		
CONCLUSION: Evaluation tools were not created by a single person. Therefore, a variety of ideas and feedback goals could be on the evaluation tool.		

9. HOW WERE THE QUESTIONS DEEMED NECESSARY?	f	%
a. I decided		
b. professional firm employed		
c. combination of parents & teachers		
d. teachers decided		
e. superintendent		
f. committee consisting of	1	0.25
g. other		
*Administrative Team	1	0.25
*Not Sure	1	0.25
*Not Answered	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: 50% of evaluation tools were analyzed by a committee.		
CONCLUSION: Evaluation tools were best analyzed via group process.		

10 WHAT KIND OF QUESTIONS ARE ON THE FORM?	f	%
a. open-ended		
b. closed	2	0.5
c. both	2	0.5
ANALYSIS: Questions on the evaluation tools varied between open-ended and forced-choice questions.		
CONCLUSION: Different questioning techniques were used to evaluate principals.		

11. ARE YOU ASKED TO DO A SELF-EVALUATION?	f	%
a. yes	2	0.5
b. no	2	0.5
ANALYSIS: 50% of respondents were asked to do a self-evaluation.		
CONCLUSION: As with Survey A, self-evaluation was not considered a necessary part of an evaluation		
by most school districts.		

11A. WHAT TYPE OF SELF-EVALUATION?	f	%
*Eleven Areas of Principalship	1	0.25
*Not Answered	3	0.75
ANALYSIS: 25% of respondents described their self-evaluation process.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents who answered this question engaged in a self-evaluation process that considered		
a variety of principalship duties and responsibilities.		
11B. DO YOU DO A SELF-EVALUATION EVEN IF YOU ARE NOT ASKED TO?	f	%
a. yes	2	0.5
b. no	1	0.25
*Not Answered	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: 50% of respondents completed a self-evaluation of their own creation even when it was not		
required of them.		
CONCLUSION: While many participating school districts did not require self-evaluation, many of the		
respondents believed it was important and did it anyway.		
11C. WHAT TYPE OF SELF-EVALUATION DO YOU DO?	f	%
*Survey - Homegrown	1	0.25
*Open ended	1	0.25
*Not Answered	2	0.5
ANALYSIS: 50% of respondents completed an informal self-evaluation that involved other people in their		
building even when not required to do so by the school district.		
CONCLUSION: School administrators are interested in completing self-evaluation tools.		

12. WHY WAS THE EVALUATION FORM CREATED?	f	%
a. I wanted it	3	0.75
b. superintendent wanted		
c. teachers wanted		
d. classified wanted		
f. school board wanted	1	0.25
g. parents wanted		
h. other		
ANALYSIS: 75% of respondents created a self-evaluation form.		
CONCLUSION: 75% of participating school administrators were interested enough in the concept of		
self-evaluation to have created a self-evaluation tool.		

13. WHO COMPLETES THE EVALUATION FORM?	f	%
a. teachers only	1	0.25
b. classified only		
c. teachers and classified	2	0.5
*teachers, classified, & parents	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: In several schools, teachers, classified staff and parents evaluated principals.		
CONCLUSION: In several schools, evaluation skills of the staff were deemed acceptable enough to be a part		
of the principal's evaluation.		

14. HOW IS THE EVALUATION FORM DISTRIBUTED?	f	%
a. faculty meeting	2	0.5
b. directly given to each person		
c. individual conferences		
d. put in teacher boxes	2	0.5
e. department meetings		
f. other		
*mailed to parents	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: ·A variety of ways were used to distribute the evaluation tool.		
CONCLUSION: Evaluation tools are best distributed in a less formal manner.		

15. ARE THE PEOPLE COMPLETING THE FORM ASKED TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES?	f	%
a. by position		
b. by name		
c. optional	1	0.25
d. no identification	3	0.75
ANALYSIS: 75% of evaluation tools did not ask in for identification of the respondent.		
CONCLUSION: The anonymity of evaluation tools allowed respondents to answer with honesty and without fear		
of retribution.		
16. WHO COMPLIES THE INFORMATION?	f	%
a. principal	1	0.25
b. selected staff	1	0.25
c. assist. principal		
d. superintendent	1	0.25
e. school board		
f. other		
*Central Office Staff	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: A variety of people compiled the evaluation tool data.		
CONCLUSION: Evaluation data is best compiled by a variety of people.		
17. IS THE INFORMATION SHARED WITH PEOPLE OUTSIDE THE PRINCIPAL'S OFFICE?	f	%
a. yes	2	0.5
b. no	1	0.25
c. sometimes		
*Incorporated into evaluation by administration	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: 75% of respondents shared the information they gathered with others.		
CONCLUSION: By sharing evaluation data, principals showed willingness to accept constructive criticism.		

18. WHOM IS THE INFORMATION SHARED WITH?	f	%
a. teachers	1	0.25
b. community	1	0.25
c. all the staff	2	0.5
d. superintendent	1	0.25
e. school board	1	0.25
f. parents		
g. other		
ANALYSIS: Data were shared with a variety of people in the school district and community.		
CONCLUSION: School administrators indicated a willingness to share collected data with a variety of people in		
the school district and community.		
19. HAS THE EVALUATION FORM IMPROVED RELATIONS WITH THE STAFF?	f	%
a. yes	1	0.25
b. no		
c. some	2	0.5
d. made it worse		
e. other		
*Not Answered	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: 75% of respondents agreed teacher evaluation of principals did improve, to some degree,		
relationships in the building.		
CONCLUSION: Teacher evaluation of principals can help improve relationships between principals and teachers.		
20. IS THERE A PROCESS TO REVIEW THE EVALUATION FORM?	f	%
a. yes	2	0.5
b. no	1	0.25
*Not an evaluation - process to receive input on how I'm doing	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: There is a process for changing the evaluation tool in the majority of the school districts surveyed.		
CONCLUSION: The evaluation tool was reviewed and changed when necessary.		

20A. WHAT IS THE REVIEW PROCESS?	f	%
*Not Answered	2	0.5
*Currently being reviewed for 1997-98 - used for 5 years	1	0.25
*Entire administrative team collectively	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: Respondents indicated that there were a variety of ways to review the process.		
CONCLUSION: The review process fits the need of the school district.		
20B. WHY IS THE FORM NOT REVIEWED?	f	%
*Not Answered	2	0.5
ANALYSIS: Data was not sufficient to analyze this question.		
CONCLUSION: Data did not confirm any information about this question.		
21. WHAT HAS BEEN THE MOST . . .		
21A. POSITIVE ASPECT OF TEACHER EVALUATION?	f	%
*Can implement necessary change for student achievement and staff satisfaction	1	0.25
*Feedback to provide better support to staff	1	0.25
*Growth on my part	1	0.25
*Trust	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: Respondents agreed that there were positive aspects to teacher evaluation of principals.		
CONCLUSION: Teacher evaluation of principals did have positive affects and can in the future.		
21B. NEGATIVE ASPECT OF TEACHER EVALUATION?	f	%
*Not Answered	2	0.5
*Gives teachers compliant form - not aimed at school improvement	1	0.25
*Some administrators overreact to negatives	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: The negative aspects of teacher evaluation of principals delt mostly with not liking to be criticized.		
CONCLUSION: Special training needs to be provided for both teachers and principals for teacher evaluation of principals to be accepted and not feared.		

	f	AVE.
22. HOW MANY TIMES A YEAR ARE YOU EVALUATED BY THE STAFF?	5	1.25
ANALYSIS: 100% of respondents were evaluated at least once a year by the teachers.		
CONCLUSION: Respondents agreed that a once a year evaluation by the teachers was adequate.		

	f	%
23. SHOULD TEACHER EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS BE MANDATED IN SCHOOLS?	f	%
a. yes	1	0.25
b. no	3	0.75
WHY OR WHY NOT?	f	%
*Gives opportunity to grow together	1	0.25
*Information needs to be well received to produce results - may be very negative if not in perspective	1	0.25
*Some staff don't have a clue about the role of the principal - information then superficial - less meaningful	1	0.25
*Not Answered	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: 75% of respondents agreed that teacher evaluation of principals should not be mandated in schools.		
CONCLUSION: 75% of respondents viewed the outcome of mandated teacher evaluation of principals as being		
a possible negative if teachers and principals were not trained regarding the evaluation process.		

	f	%
24. IS THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL EVALUATED BY THE STAFF?	f	%
a. yes	1	0.25
b. no	1	0.25
c. sometimes		
*Not Answered	2	0.5
ANALYSIS: 25% of respondents indicated the assistant principal was evaluated by the teachers.		
CONCLUSION: It was usually only the principal who was evaluated by teachers.		

25. ARE OTHER ADMINISTRATORS EVALUATED BY THE STAFF?	f	%
a. yes	1	0.25
b. no		
c. some		
*Not Answered	3	0.75
WHO? BY WHAT GROUP?	f	%
*Not Answered	3	0.75
*Vocational Director	1	0.25
ANALYSIS: 25% of respondents indicated other administrators were evaluated by teachers.		
CONCLUSION: It was usually only the principal who was evaluated by teachers.		
*Indicates answers given by respondents to open-ended questions or additional comments given to forced-choice questions.	f	%

Survey Questionnaire B
Conclusion: Composite Summary

1. **QUESTION:** How many years have you worked . . .
   CONCLUSION: Respondents being evaluated by teachers were experienced building administrators.

2. **QUESTION:** How many years have you been evaluated by teachers?
   CONCLUSION: Respondents were evaluated by teachers for the majority of their tenure as a building principal.

3. **QUESTION:** Who created the form currently used by teachers for your evaluation?
   CONCLUSION: The data shows that being evaluated by teachers was not the idea of the individual respondents.

4. **QUESTION:** If you, the principal, created the form, were teachers asked for their input as to what questions they would like to ask?
   CONCLUSION: Data did not confirm if teachers were involved in the creation of the evaluation tool in responding school districts.

5. **QUESTION:** Did you ask the classified staff for their input?
   CONCLUSION: Creation of the evaluation tool was a group effort in several school districts.

6. **QUESTION:** If teachers created the form, were you asked about which questions you would like included on the form?
   CONCLUSION: Data did not confirm if school administrators were involved in the creation of the evaluation tool in responding school districts.

7. **QUESTION:** Did teachers involve classified staff in the development of the evaluation form?
   CONCLUSION: Data did not confirm if classified staff were involved in the creation of the evaluation tool in responding school districts.

8. **QUESTION:** If a group of people were involved in developing the evaluation form, how did that process occur?
   CONCLUSION: Evaluation tools were not created by a single person. Therefore, a variety of ideas and feedback goals could be on the evaluation tool.

9. **QUESTION:** How were the questions on the form deemed as necessary questions?
   CONCLUSION: Evaluation tools were best analyzed via group process.

10. **QUESTION:** What kind of questions are included on the evaluation form?
CONCLUSION: Different questioning techniques were used to evaluate principals.

11. **QUESTION:** Are you asked to do any kind of self-evaluation?
CONCLUSION: As with Survey A, self-evaluation was not considered a necessary part of an evaluation by most school districts.

11A. **QUESTION:** If so, what kind?
CONCLUSION: Respondents who answered this question engaged in a self-evaluation process that considered a variety of principalship duties and responsibilities.

11B. **QUESTION:** Even if you are not asked to do a form self-evaluation, do you do one each year?
CONCLUSION: While many participating school districts did not require self-evaluation, many of the respondents believed it was important and did it anyway.

11C. **QUESTION:** What kind of self-evaluation do you do?
CONCLUSION: School administrators are interested in completing self-evaluation tools.

12. **QUESTION:** Why was the evaluation form created?
CONCLUSION: 75% of participating school administrators were interested enough in the concept of self-evaluation to have created a self-evaluation tool.

13. **QUESTION:** Who completes the evaluation form?
CONCLUSION: In several schools, evaluation skills of the staff were deemed acceptable enough to be a part of the principal's evaluation.

14. **QUESTION:** How is the form distributed to the faculty and staff?
CONCLUSION: Evaluation tools are best distributed in a less formal manner.

15. **QUESTION:** Does the person completing the form identify him/her self on the form in any way?
CONCLUSION: The anonymity of evaluation tools allowed respondents to answer with honesty and without fear of retribution.

16. **QUESTION:** Who compiles the information?
CONCLUSION: Evaluation data is best compiled by a variety of people.

17. **QUESTION:** Is the information shared with people outside of the principal's office?
CONCLUSION: By sharing evaluation data, principals showed willingness to accept constructive criticism.

18. **QUESTION:** If the information is shared, with whom is it shared?
CONCLUSION: School administrators indicated a willingness to share collected data with a variety of people in the school district and community.

19. **QUESTION:** Has the evaluation improved relationships between you and your staff?
CONCLUSION: Teacher evaluation of principals can help improve relationships between principals and teachers.

20. **QUESTION:** Is there a process to review the evaluation form?
CONCLUSION: The evaluation tool was reviewed and changed when necessary.

20A. **QUESTION:** What is the review process?
CONCLUSION: The review process fits the need of the school district.

20B. **QUESTION:** Why is the form not reviewed?
CONCLUSION: Data did not confirm any information about this question.

21. What has been the most . . .
   A. **QUESTION:** positive aspect of teacher evaluation?
   CONCLUSION: Teacher evaluation of principals did have positive affects and can in the future.

   B. **QUESTION:** negative aspect of teacher evaluation?
   CONCLUSION: Special training needs to be provided for both teachers and principals for teacher evaluation of principals to be accepted and not feared.

22. **QUESTION:** How many times a year are you evaluated by the staff?
CONCLUSION: Respondents agreed that a once a year evaluation by the teachers was adequate.

23. **QUESTION:** Do you think some type of teacher evaluation of principals should be mandated in all school districts?
CONCLUSION: 75% of respondents viewed the outcome of mandated teacher evaluation of principals as being a possible negative if teachers and principals were not trained regarding the evaluation process.

24. **QUESTION:** Is the assistant principal(s) evaluated by the staff?
CONCLUSION: It was usually only the principal who was evaluated by teachers.

25. **QUESTION:** Are any of the other administrators in your building evaluated by the staff they are supervisors of?
CONCLUSION: It was usually only the principal who was evaluated by teachers.

PART 3

A PROCESS MODEL FOR TEACHER EVALUATION
OF
EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

The process model for teacher evaluation of school administrators designed for purposes of this project, should be a multi-stage process, as detailed below:

Step 1: The creation of the evaluation instrument should include representatives from all groups that will be evaluating, evaluated, or using the data as an information source. These groups must agree on what the purpose of the evaluation tool is at the beginning of the process, in order to formulate questions that are meaningful and will accomplish the purpose of the tool. This representative group must agree on how many times a year the evaluation tool will be used. The group must also agree on how the evaluation tool is to be distributed, collected, and the data compiled. Finally, the representatives must agree on whether or not the the compiled data is to be shared outside of the evaluation team, and what data are to be shared and with whom. These steps are necessary at this level so that evaluation procedures in each building will be consistent.

Step 2: Annually, both teachers and administrators (and any others who are evaluating school administrators) would attend the same inservice training class defining what the school district means by evaluation. This inservice should emphasize the idea that teacher evaluation of school administrators is not to be used as an attack upon the administrator, but as

a resource to help the administrator do his/her job better by improving in certain areas or by continuing the same methods in other areas. This class should also explain that teacher evaluation of school administrators is only a part of the official evaluation of the the school administrator being evaluated. (Preferably, there would be three parts to official evaluation: superintendent evaluation of the school administrator, school administrator self-evaluation, and teacher evaluation of the school administrator.) The inservice should be held one week before evaluations are to take place. Anyone who completes an evaluation form must attend; if the person does not attend, he/she cannot complete an evaluation form.

Step 3: Prior to the teacher evaluation, the school administrator would have a conference with the superintendent. The conference would focus on what the school administrator anticipates the teacher responses to questions asked might be and why. This would allow the administrator to voice any concerns about possible negative data in advance, and help the superintendent to gain fuller understanding of survey results.

Step 4: Evaluation tools are distributed one week after the inservice meeting detailing evaluation procedures. A time limit is established for completing and returning survey instruments.

Step 5: Evaluation data are compiled.

Step 6: The evaluated school administrator would again confer with the superintendent to discuss the actual results of the evaluation. Any areas of concern would be discussed. The goal is for the superintendent to help the principal design solutions or formulate plans to help the school administrator improve his/her performance in the areas of concern.

Step 7: Evaluation data are shared in the manner agreed upon.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this project was to design and develop a process model for teacher evaluation of administrators. To accomplish this purpose, a review of current literature regarding evaluation of school administrators was conducted. Additional information from randomly selected school districts regarding evaluation of administrators was obtained and analyzed. Information from selected school districts regarding involvement of teachers in the process of administrator evaluation was also obtained.

Conclusions

Conclusions reached as a result of this project were:

1. Administrators should be evaluated using a well-defined, positive system that promotes growth, allows for mistakes and second chances, while at the same time recognizing and acknowledging effective performance.

2. Administrators should be evaluated using criteria that are job specific, site specific, and based upon goals set by the administrator in a self-evaluation process.

3. Administrators should be evaluated by teachers because faculty members have consistent daily contact with the administrator and usually are most affected by administrators decisions.

<u>Recommendations</u>

As a result of this project, the following recommendations have been suggested:

1. To allow for mistakes while recognizing and acknowledging effective performance, a comprehensive means for evaluating administrators should be developed.

2. To align administrator evaluation with the state of Washington essential goals, evaluation criteria should be both job and site specific.

3. Provisions should be made to include teachers annually in the process of administrator evaluation.

4. School districts seeking ways to develop an instrument for the evaluation of administrators may wish to adapt material from the models which were the subject of this project for use in their school districts, or undertake further research in the area of administrator evaluation by teachers to meet their unique needs.

REFERENCES

Bailey, G. D. (1984). Faculty feedback for administrators: a means to improve leadership behavior. NASSP Bulletin, 1, 5-9.

Buser, R. L. & Banks, Jr., F. A. (1984). The why, what, how, and by whom of evaluating principals. NASSP Bulletin, 1, 1-4.

Egginton, W. M., Jeffries, T. S., & Kidd-Knights, D. (1988). State-mandated tests for principals-a growing trend? NASSP Bulletin, 4, 63-71.

Herman, J.J. (1988). Evaluating administrators-assessing the competencies. NASSP Bulletin, 72, 5-10.

Herman, J.J. (1991). Evaluating the performance of administrators: the process and the tools. NASSP Bulletin, 12, 79-87.

Herman, J.J. (1993). Administrator supervision, evaluation, and performance pay. NASSP Bulletin, 77, 89-94.

Marlow-Inman, L. & Atkinson, J. (1993). Evaluating school administrator performance: perceptions of teacher, principals. NASSAP Bulletin, 77, 87-90.

Murphy, J. & Pimentel, S. (1996). Grading principals. Phi Delta Kappan, 74-81.

Prince, J. (1987). Performance-based evaluation of school principals: a feedback design to support effective schools. ERS Spectrum vol. 5 no. 1, 38-46.

Rammer, R. A. (1991). How the literature on administrator evaluation relates to actual practice. NASSP Bulletin, 12, 73-78.

Reitzug, U. C. (1991). Administrator competency: its status for the '90s. NASSP Bulletin, 12, 65-71.

St. John, W. D. (1991). Comprehensive performance evaluation includes evaluation of administrative team. NASSP Bulletin, 12, 89-95.

Thomas, C. & Vornberg, J.A. (1991). Evaluating principals: new requirements, directions for the '90s. <u>NASSP Bulletin, 12,</u> 59-64.

Weller, Jr., L. D., Buttery, T.J., & Bland, R. W. (1994). Teacher evaluation of principals: as viewed by teachers, principals, and superintendents. <u>The Journal of Research and Development in Education, 27, 2,</u> 112-117.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY A

EVALUATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

SURVEY A
Evaluation of School Administrators

Directions: Fill in the blanks or circle the answer(s) that are the most appropriate for you.

1. How many years have you worked . . .
   a. in the field of education? _____
   b. as a building principal? _____
   c. as the principal in your current building? _____

2. Who evaluates you?
   the superintendent   the assistant superintendent   other_____

3. Who evaluates the majority of the principals in your school district?
   the superintendent   the assistant superintendent   other_____

4. How many times per year are you evaluated? _____

5. What main categories comprise your evaluation?
   a. _____
   b. _____
   c. _____
   d. _____
   e. _____
   other _____
   _____

6. How is the information about you and your job performance collected for the evaluation?
   a. sporadic visits throughout the year
   b. single day observation
   c. all contacts throughout the year used as observation references
   d. complaints from the parents about my school are used as references
   e. positive feedback from the parents about my school are used as references
   f. no set guidelines for collecting the information
   g. I am not sure how the information for my evaluation is collected

7. Are you asked/required to set goals for your school before the school year begins?
   Yes   No   Sometimes

8. If you are asked to set goals for your school, please explain the process used and give examples of some of the goals you have set.

_____
_____
_____
_____

9. Are you asked to do a self-evaluation?   Yes   No

   A. If so, what kind _____

_____

   B. Even if you are not asked to do a formal self-evaluation, do you do one each year?   Yes   No

      What kind of self-evaluation do you do? _____

_____

_____

10. Do you involve teachers in your process of self-evaluation?
    Yes   No   Sometimes

11. Why or Why not?

_____
_____
_____

12. What do you think has been / could be the most . . .
   A. positive benefit from having the teachers evaluate you?

_____
_____
_____
_____

   B. negative consequences that come from having the teachers evaluate you?

_____
_____
_____
_____

13. Who do you think should do the evaluation of you?
    (Circle as many as you want. Multiple circles will show you want a diverse group of people evaluating you.)

    superintendent   assistant superintendent   teachers
    parents   school counselors   students
    others _____

14. How often do you think you should be evaluated? _____

15. What categories do you think should comprise your evaluation?

    a. _____
    b. _____
    c. _____
    d. _____
    e. _____
    other _____
    _____

16. How would you like the information for your evaluation to be collected?

    a. sporadic visits throughout the year
    b. single day observation
    c. all contacts throughout the year used as observation references
    d. complaints from the parents about my school used as references
    e. positive feedback from the parents about my school used as references
    f. no set guidelines for collecting the information
    g. other _____
    _____

17. Should you be required to set goals for your school?   Yes   No
    Please explain your answer _____
    _____
    _____

18. Should you be required to do a self-evaluation?   Yes   No
    Please explain your answer _____
    _____
    _____

Please use the other side of this paper for any comments you would like to make.
Thank you,
Marla Caviness

APPENDIX B

SURVEY B

TEACHER EVALUATION
OF
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

SURVEY B
Teacher Evaluation of School Administrators

Directions: Fill in the blanks or circle the answer(s) that are the most appropriate for you.

1. How many years have you worked . . .
   a. in the field of education? _____
   b. as a building principal? _____
   c. as the principal in your current building? _____

2. How many years have you been evaluated by teachers? _____

3. Who created the form currently used by teachers for your evaluation?
   me, the principal   teachers   superintendent   school board
   classified staff   the principal before me   community   parents
   others (specify) _____

4. If you, the principal, created the form, were teachers asked for their input as to what questions they would like to ask?
   Yes   No   Some

5. Did you ask the classified staff for their input?   Yes   No   Some

6. If teachers created the form, were you asked about which questions you would like included on the form?
   Yes   No   I was not here when the form was created

7. Did teachers involve classified staff in the development of the evaluation form?
   Yes   No   Some   Do not know

8. If a group of people were involved in developing the evaluation form, how did that process occur?
   series of meeting open to anyone

   department chairpersons created the form

   department chairs created teacher portion of form

   professional firm employed to create the form

   department chairs took info from department meetings to committee

   series of meetings by a selected committee

   principal lead meetings

   other _____

26

9. How were the questions on the form deemed as necessary questions?

    I decided if the question would be meaningful

    professional firm employed to create the questions

    a combination of principal and teacher

    teachers decided

    superintendent

    committee consisting of _____

    other _____

    _____

10. What kind of questions are included on the evaluation form?
    Open-ended   Closed   Both types of questions

11. Are you asked to do any kind of self-evaluation?   Yes   No
    A. If so, what kind _____

        _____

        _____

    B. Even if you are not asked to do a formal self-evaluation, do you do one each
        year?   Yes   No

    C. What kind of self-evaluation do you do? _____

        _____

        _____

12. Why was the evaluation form created?   (circle as many as needed)
    I wanted it   teachers wanted it   school board implemented it
    superintendent wanted it   classified wanted it   parents wanted it
    Other _____

    _____

13. Who completes the evaluation form?
    Teachers only   Classified only   Teachers and Classified

14. How is the form distributed to the faculty and staff?

    Faculty meeting   Form placed in the teachers boxes

    Directly handed to each person   Department meetings

    Individual conferences

    Other _____

15. Does the person completing the form identify him/her self on the form in any way?

    by position (e.g. teacher)   by name   optional   no identification

16. Who compiles the information?

    the principal   the assistant principal(s)   superintendent   school board

    selected staff   other _____

17. Is the information shared with people outside of the principal's office?

    Yes   No   Sometimes

18. If the information is shared, with whom is it shared?

    teachers   all the staff   superintendent   school board   parents

    community   other _____

19. Has the evaluation improved relationships between you and your staff?

    Yes   No   Some   Made it worse

    Other_____

    _____

    _____

20. Is there a process to review the evaluation form?   Yes   No

    A. What is the review process? _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

20. B. If it is not reviewed, please explain why. _____

_____

_____

_____

21. What do you think has been the most . . .
A. positive benefit from having the teachers evaluate you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. negative consequences that come from having the teachers evaluate you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. How many times a year are you evaluated by the staff? _____

23. Do you think some type of teacher evaluation of principals should be mandated in all school districts?   Yes   No

Why or why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Is the assistant principal(s) evaluated by the staff? Yes   No   Sometimes

25. Are any of the other administrators in your building evaluated by the staff they are supervisors of?   Yes   No   Some
If so, who and by what group? _____

_____

Please use this space for any comments you would like to make.
Thank you, Marla Caviness

29