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PREFACE

In September 1966, nearly four-hundred school districts in Ohio and Illinois opened their doors for the school year with a superintendent different from the one who was in office the previous September. In Ohio this event took place in county districts, local districts, exempted village districts, city districts, and in the newly formed joint vocational districts. The situation in Illinois was much the same with new superintendents taking office in the elementary, secondary, and unit level districts. In each of these instances, the board of education of the district had the legal responsibility for actually selecting and contracting the services of the superintendent.

The intent of this study is to explore and depict the extent to which these boards made use of the services of educational consultants from outside their districts to aid and advise them in the process of recruiting and selecting their respective superintendents.
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Two closely related sets of conditions serve as the frame-work around which this study has been developed. The first concerns the literature and practice related to the selection of a superintendent of schools by a board of education. The second has to do with the phenomenon of educational consultants being employed by the public schools to aid and advise in certain areas. One of these areas in which consultants are seemingly taking a more active part is the recruitment and selection of superintendents.

In the first of the two areas, the literature of public education has been insistent upon the importance of the selection of a superintendent. Bortner maintains, "A school board performs no function more important than the selection of a chief executive officer to administer its schools."¹ McKinney states, "Probably

the most important function of the board of education is the selection of its chief executive officer, the superintendent of schools. "2

In a recent book on the subject of school boards and their functions, Goldhammer emphasized the position that "... the most important single responsibility of a board is the selection of a superintendent of schools to act as executive officer of the school board in the administration of the community's educational program."3

Another position emphasizing the importance of this task is expressed in the literature of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). In the thirty-fourth yearbook of The Association it is stated, "Boards of education are finding that their number one function is that of selecting a capable superintendent and making him the executive officer of the board."4 They further suggest that boards consider making use of outside lay or professional help in determining the qualifications for the superintendency. As a final emphasis to the basic position on the importance of


supertendency selection, The Association adds, "There are those who sagely contend that a school board can accomplish no more important task than the selection of a top administrator for its school system."^5

A somewhat different point of reference to the importance of the selection process is expressed by Carlson. In speaking about the matter of change and change agents as they relate to the executive in an organization, he presents his concept of the critical nature of the selection of a superintendent as follows:

It has often been said that the most important function of a school board is the selection of a superintendent. The data (from his study) indicate that extended knowledge of the individual characteristics of the candidate is not necessary for the prediction of the central pattern of the way in which the successor will relate to the organization. This brings new meaning to the importance of the function of the school board. In that differences in the performance of outsiders are predictable on the basis of their origin, the school board is at least in the position to determine whether the school system is to change in some way or is to maintain itself and firm-up what exists.  

When Carlson's comments are related to those previously cited, it becomes evident that the importance of executive selection is recognized as a task for boards of education which could

---

^5Ibid., p. 171.

^6Richard O. Carlson, Executive Succession and Organizational Change, Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1962, pp. 81-82.
have specific meaning about the level of growth and progress achieved in a school district.

These comments are illustrative of the general opinion surrounding the importance attached to the selection of public school superintendents by the educational community which feels that administrative leadership in the schools is closely associated with the overall progress of that organization in meeting its stated goals. When the present environment of public education is considered, e.g., concern for a wide range of curricular patterns, teacher militancy, racial unrest, national influences in curricular and fiscal matters, and the traditional problems of local financing, the importance of the selection of the top executive for a school district becomes even more critical.

The second area around which this study has been developed is the influence of individuals and groups from outside the established structure of the school district into planning at the local level. For purposes of this study, these individuals and groups will be called "educational consultants."

Public schools have not been completely free from the influence of other governmental or non-governmental organizations. School districts have conducted their affairs within the realm of a broader county or state educational system. With the recent
increase of federal interest and involvement in education and the concomitant association of other aspects of federal activity such as the civil rights bills on educational affairs, school officials have been faced with still another sphere of influence within which they must operate.

School officials have, however, long used persons and groups from outside the school organization to participate in many aspects of the planning and operation of the school program. School-oriented architectural firms and educational planning units from colleges and universities have been retained by boards of education, often at the suggestion of administrators or teachers, to help plan a school building that best reflects the educational philosophy of the district. The same type of situation exists with regard to curriculum consultants. College and university professors are familiar co-workers with public school teachers in attacking curricular problems in a local school situation.

With such activities as collective negotiations with teachers and staff and the development of a relationship with federal funding agencies becoming a prominent part of the current educational scene, school officials have found new situations which justify the use of educational consultants. As the actual bargaining process takes place, each participating group has occasion to draw upon
the experience of representatives from outside the district. Teachers look to their professional association; boards of education use the services of their professional groups or employ a legal firm to help them develop a bargaining position.

In addition, university professors are playing a dominant role in working with school districts involved with various aspects of federally funded projects. Their assistance can be evidenced in activities ranging from proposal development to establishing an implementation and evaluation system for a funded project.

These two phenomena, the selection of superintendents and the role of educational consultants in the schools, are the basic concepts around which this study has been structured. The joining of these topics into a research problem comes mainly from the writer's observations of each process and remarks in the literature concerning the need for research about recruitment and selection of school administrators.

In a paper prepared for The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) on selecting candidates for training programs in educational administration, McIntyre makes the point that "UCEA studies project that during the period 1966-1976, for example, 17,700 secondary principals, 7,800 assistant superintendents, and 3,400 superintendents will be needed to fill newly
created posts and to replace those vacating positions in the public schools. "\(^7\) The key point of his paper, however, is that in view of the magnitude of the selection activity, "There is need for considerable research concerning the recruitment of school administrators."\(^8\)

The problem of developing a sound base upon which to develop adequate selection programs for school administrators is also spoken of by Anderson. After reviewing the overall problem, he concludes that "Meaningful research in the areas of selecting and recruiting educational leaders is sadly missing from the professional literature."\(^9\)

From the researcher's observation of the recruitment and selection process for school superintendents, there are several factors which support the need for this particular study. First, as will be shown in Chapter II, "Review of Relevant Literature," there has been virtually no research on the recruitment-selection

---


\(^8\)Ibid., p. 3.

topic as related to educational consultants. However, by observing how boards of education search for superintendents, it seems clear that a study of the status and impact of the consultants should be made.

In addition, if effective research on this topic is to be done, these studies ought to be evaluated on the basis of the strategies followed in the recruitment and selection of a superintendent compared with that individual's effectiveness. However, before such studies can be carried out, baseline data need to be collected from which hypotheses and problems can be generated for subsequent testing. The intent of these studies should be to assess the involvement of educational consultants on the recruitment and selection of superintendents and the impact of this relationship on the quality of administrative leadership in school districts.

Statement of the problem

Because of what seems to be an increase in activity in the recruitment and selection of superintendents by boards of education with the help of consultants, and the absence of research literature on this topic, it is the intent of this thesis to study the existing relationships between boards of education and consultants in searching for a superintendent of schools and to make recommendations based on the resultant findings.
Objectives of the study

The overall objective of this study has been to gather data depicting the conditions related to educational consultants and their role in the recruitment and selection of superintendents for the 1966-1967 school year in Ohio and Illinois public school districts.

Specific objectives to be accomplished were to depict

1. The extent and scope of the occurrence—how often consultants were used, what kinds of districts used them.

2. The nature of the occurrence—the cost of the services, the number of consultants involved, the other consultative services used in the schools.

3. The functions performed by the consultants—the arrangements handled by consultants, the services provided to boards, the length of time consultants worked with boards, the procedures followed by consultants in working with applicants.

4. The impact of the consultant's services on the

---

recruitment and selection process--the most important services rendered.

5. The assessment of the consultant's services--the degree of satisfaction expressed by boards in the services rendered.

6. The consultants as a group--their backgrounds, their experience relating to their functioning as consultants.

Scope of the study

Because of the current paucity of the literature and data on this topic, the objectives selected for the study represented sources of information which could serve as the base upon which testable hypotheses might be developed. In preparing the research design, several related variables were rejected because they seemed inappropriate to the objectives of the project at its present level.

The first of these exclusions was the part taken in the recruitment and selection of superintendents by individuals who already have a legal relationship to the board, such as county superintendents and state department of education personnel. The intent of this study is to investigate only situations where individuals or groups from outside the district who have no legal relationship to the management of that school district are invited
and retained by the board of education to aid in the recruitment and
selection of a superintendent.

A second area which was considered for inclusion but was
subsequently rejected was that of the activity of college and univer-
sity placement offices. These units were considered as service
sources which could be drawn upon by boards and typically did not
involve the activity of any particular individual and thus the use of
such an office was not interpreted to be a "consultative" activity.

It should be added, although, that placement officials who were re-
quested to serve as consultants by a board were considered for the
study. It was assumed in these instances the facilities of the office
which the individual represented would become available to the
board which had retained the services of the director.

The third variable which was rejected concerned the candi-
dates for the superintendencies and their relationship to the
consultants. This study pointed directly at the association of con-
sultants to the board of education and the variable of the superintendent,
his views of the process, or the effects on him, was rejected.

The overall and specific objectives of the study were accepted
because they represented crucial areas to the development of prob-
lems which could be tested subsequently in other research efforts.
The acceptance and rejection of potential variables in the study is
one dimension of the research. The other factor of scope is the limits within which the research was conducted.

Data were obtained by mailed questionnaire and thus represent extensive rather than intensive research. The data were drawn from Ohio and Illinois boards of education which had been involved in employing a new superintendent for the 1966-1967 school year. There is no evidence that the number of superintendents employed for this year was in any way atypical or typical for these two states. Consequently, the data generated in this research effort should be considered in terms of their sources and the conditions of their development when used in defining broader elements of the problem.

Significance of the study

American education is going through a period in which a variety of pressures are affecting the direction of thought and activity. One of the major areas in which there is much discussion is that of leadership in the schools. At present, it appears that the main contenders for the prime leadership role are the boards of education, teachers, and administrators. Persons observing this phenomenon from a distance might also add the general public and state and national government.
In view of the fluid environment in which the chief administrator of a school district will have to function, the overall question of his selection may be directly related to how well he functions in the schools. The intent of this study is to obtain and present data as it is concerned with the influence of educational consultants working with a board of education in searching for a new superintendent. In the absence of hard data, the goal is to produce a base of knowledge from which viable problems and research hypotheses can be generated. It is anticipated that the base knowledge developed and the various types of explicit data drawn from other efforts will offer fresh insights into the influence and effect of educational consultants in the selection of top school administrators.

**Definition of terms**

**Educational consultant**—An individual or group invited by the board of education to function in an advisory role in the recruitment and selection of a superintendent for the schools of the district. Typically, educational consultants are from outside the school district and receive a retainer for their services.
Design of the study

This study was designed as a descriptive survey of the extent to which educational consultants participate and function in the recruitment and selection of school superintendents. Its need at this time is dictated by the seemingly rapid increase of activity in the relationship between consultants and boards of education in superintendent recruitment and the absence of data on this phenomenon. It is anticipated that the outcome of problem seeking data collection technique will be the generation of concepts which can be tested in subsequent research efforts.

The population for the study was the public school districts in Ohio and Illinois in which a new superintendent was employed for the 1966-1967 school year. In Ohio, these districts were identified in the Supplement to the Education Directory for 1965-1966 which listed all new administrators in the state for September, 1966. The identification of the districts in Illinois was supplied by the Research Division of The Illinois Association of School Boards.

The plan of the study was to collect information by mailed questionnaire about the use of outside advisory services in their recruitment and selection activity from the nearly four-hundred districts in the two states which had employed a new superintendent
for the 1966-1967 school year. This initial stage of activity was classed as Phase I of the study effort.

Phase II consisted of identifying the districts from the Phase I respondents which had employed the services of educational consultants in their recruitment-selection. These districts then received a second questionnaire designed to provide an assessment of the relationship between the consultants and the boards of education.

Phase III, which was also conducted by mailed questionnaire, was directed specifically at the consultants identified from the Phase I instruments. These individuals were requested to respond to items directly related to their association with school districts in a consultative capacity.

In all cases, the instruments and the letters which accompanied them were field-tested with educational administrators, professors of education, university administrators, and advanced graduate students in education. In addition, appropriate follow-up activity was carried on to acquire sufficient data to meet the expressed objectives of the study. The data were hand processed to arrive at a frequency count and a percentage of responses for each item on each instrument.
The study was intended to be descriptive, therefore no hypotheses were tested. The problems suggested in the final chapter can serve as "spin-off" leads to additional research efforts which might tend to explain the multiple insights revealed in these initial data.

Chapter II will serve as the point at which the literature dimension of the study was developed. The intent of the chapter is to present those parts of the literature considered by the researcher to be relevant to the study topic. Where items speaking directly to the topic were not available, relevant literature was collected and reviewed for background purposes.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

The literature related to educational consultants and the recruitment and selection of public school superintendents can be classified into several different categories. The first is the general area of the importance of boards of education conducting the search for a superintendent in an orderly and structured manner. This literature, usually written by board of education members and published in board-related journals, encourages those involved in selecting a new superintendent to take steps to remove prejudicial and other items based on partiality from the entire selection process.

More than three decades ago, Kirk\textsuperscript{1} made a plea for board of education members to follow a systematic and fair plan when selecting a superintendent. He felt strongly that the typical selection process was too often carried out in a haphazard

\textsuperscript{1}H. H. Kirk, "Securing the Superintendent," The American School Board Journal, 86 (April, 1933), pp. 22-23.
atmosphere which could have dire results for the overall welfare of the district. Luderman,\(^2\) McKinney,\(^3\) and Meissner\(^4\) all supported this basic position developed by Kirk but added the idea of boards developing standards for the position and the new administrator to serve as guides for the selection process.

These four examples are illustrative of the obvious importance of boards of education following sound procedures when seeking a new top administrator of the school district. In addition, these views are representative of a total attitude generally expressed by board of education members which rests heavily on a "board-centered" approach to recruitment; a view which tends not to be concerned with the impact of others from within or from outside the district on the selection process.

The second category of related literature is the reports of instances where superintendents have been hired by boards of education. These reports are most often found in journals published


for a board-oriented audience and relate situations where superintendents have been employed both with and without the services of consultants.

The first area in this second form of literature is specifically concerned with those situations where consultants were not involved. An article describing a strong board-centered selection situation builds a case for centralizing the entire search and selection activity within the board's structure. A position is taken that the board should control the various elements of selection "... rather than attempting to stem a flood of applicants from agencies, friends, or schools."

It obviously is the feeling of such a board that its selection process should be very tight and uncomplicated as possible. The quoted article made the point that selection is a board-centered function which should not be affected by outsiders.

In reporting on the selection in his district, Hagman suggested that a five-step program developed by the board could serve as a model for selection in other districts. He proposed the following sequence of events to be considered in the selection of a superintendent:

1. Establish policy, plan procedures, and assign responsibility.

2. Initiate and carry out the search for candidates.

3. Sift candidates.

4. Interview.

5. Elect.

While this plan is directed toward a board-controlled and dominated selection situation, it does represent one of the first instances where ordered selection steps have been presented in the literature. The detail and rationale of this process is somewhat attenuated but the outline does offer a degree of structure for the overall search process.

A report by Mundt about recruitment and selection process followed by a Minnesota board is illustrative of how a major city district faced the problem of securing a new superintendent. Given notice early in the school year that the incumbent superintendent intended to retire at the close of the year, the board embarked on a program involving the sifting of over seventy applicants. The board sought general advice from the Minnesota commissioner of education on alternative selection processes but developed its

structure without other outside advice. The key factor which
guided the board in its recruitment and screening of candidates
was a list of tangible and intangible qualifications which they felt
the superintendent should possess. These were:

Tangibles -

1. Age range in the area of 45 to 55
2. Indication of proven administrative experience
3. Educational background—preference for a Ph. D.
4. Married man with a family
5. Classroom experience so he can identify with teachers
6. Good health
7. Strong in curriculum development
8. Offices, affiliations, and distinctions in educational work and community

Intangibles -

1. A man who has ability to stand alone and make decisions
2. A man who has humility; who recognizes his limitations
3. Compassion and understanding; a peacemaker
4. One who has imagination and foresight, but is also realistic
5. Ability to take criticism and pressure
6. One who can represent the school district to the public
7. A man who has the ability to interpret the place of the school program in the community
8. A man who appears to have the ability to grow
9. A man who has some good common sense
10. A man who is strongly dedicated to public education
11. A man who has the ability to offer constructive criticism
12. Proven high moral and ethical standards

The emphasis on board initiative in the overall process was stressed in a report concerning the selection activity carried out by an Illinois board of education. However, after the screening and selection had been accomplished, the board stated its feeling about the most crucial factor of all in selecting a new superintendent as being "... finding a man who can get the job done in 'your' community." This statement, as indefinite as it is, perhaps is the most direct comment on what should guide a board in its selection task. When all other potential selection criteria have been suggested, this one is perhaps the most essential.

A description of the operational relationship between a board of education searching for a superintendent and educational consultants was provided in the late 1930's by Jewell. He explained how an Oregon board of education used three consultants to screen applicants for the superintendency and eventually recommended a

8 __________. "How to Hire the Right Superintendent for Your District," School Management, 10 (April, 1966), pp. 94-98+.
group of six or seven for final interviews by the board. The individual elected to the superintendency was from the group suggested by the consultants.

A unique report of how consultants assisted a board of education in selecting a superintendent was presented by Reals. As a result of learning that several other boards of education in major cities had used consultants in their search for a superintendent, the St. Louis board employed three university presidents to assist in the recruitment and selection program. The function of the group, which was identified as an "advisory committee," was to recommend six candidates for final interviews before the board of education. The key element here was the decision to use consultants because the board was faced with charges of "politics" in the operation of the schools. This relationship of the selection process and consultants to the political structure of a city is important because it is a dimension of the consultanship usually not found in the literature.

Boards of education have often turned to groups other than educational consultants for advice in selecting a superintendent. These groups most often serve on a voluntary basis and thus

10 Willis Reals, "St. Louis Names a Superintendent," The Nation's Schools, 25 (June, 1940), p. 51+.
receive no remuneration for their services. Ganders\textsuperscript{11} described such a situation in his report of the way a New York board of education solicited the advice of a citizens' committee to help determine what type of individual would best serve as superintendent of the school district. Faculty committees in two Pennsylvania school districts served in an advisory role to their boards of education in searching for their superintendent of schools. In both these instances, reported by Waller\textsuperscript{12} and Miller\textsuperscript{13} faculty groups, at the invitation of the boards of education, met applicants. In each case, the person who was employed by the board of education received a positive assessment from the teachers. Although the boards made the final decision, these two reports stress that the views of the teachers were a factor in their choice.

The introduction of professors of educational administration into the process of advising boards of education in the

\textsuperscript{11}Harry S. Ganders, "Citizens Help Choose a Superintendent," \textit{The Nation's Schools}, 36 (July, 1945), pp. 28-29.

\textsuperscript{12}Raymond L. Waller, "Selecting a Superintendent," \textit{The Nation's Schools}, 42 (February, 1951), pp. 63-64.

\textsuperscript{13}Charles S. Miller, "Faculty Committees Rate Candidates in Selecting a Superintendent," \textit{The Nation's Schools}, 56 (August, 1955), pp. 40-42.
selection process was mentioned in an article by Smith\textsuperscript{14} in the late 1950's. Because of the board's concern over the problem of making an accurate assessment of the applicants, a panel of prominent educators in school administration from Columbia, Harvard, and New York University was selected to serve as a screening committee. The group received credentials and applications and suggested candidates to receive final interviews with the board of education.

A second example where professors of educational administration took part in the recruitment and selection of a superintendent was found in Immel's report of the search activity of an Ohio board of education in the early 1960's. A group of three consultants was retained by the board of education to assist in the development of a statement on the basic qualifications for the position, to develop a written examination on hypothetical school management questions, and to take part in the assessment of applicants. As with other previously discussed cases, it was the board of education that made the selection of the superintendent. However, it is interesting to note the characteristics which the board felt each candidate should possess to meet the special needs

\textsuperscript{14}George C. Smith, "How We Chose Our Superintendent," \textit{The Nation's Schools}, 62 (October, 1958), pp. 72-73.
of the district since the consultants had a part in their development.

The list is as follows:

1. He must place educational leadership above managerial responsibility.

2. He must have demonstrated skill in dealing fairly with staff and employees.

3. He must delegate authority wisely.

4. He must be aware of the trends in education and recommend ideas to the board.

5. He must develop a strong curriculum and strong extracurricular program without allowing one to interfere with the other.

6. He must have skill in offering sound professional advice to the board.

7. He must have skill in developing and operating budgets.

8. He must accept constructive criticism and suggestions.

9. He must be a good public relations man, and be skilled in enlisting the support of the entire community.

10. He must be a forceful speaker, have a pleasing personality and be interested in civic welfare.

11. He must have the ability to work with people from all walks of life.

12. He must have at least two years of graduate, professional preparation in school administration. A doctorate is preferred.
13. He must have been a superintendent of a school system of at least 125 teachers for at least five years or assistant superintendent in a larger system.

14. He must be married. Preferred age between 35 and 50 years.

15. He must be in good health and must submit to a physical examination at board expense. 15

These items were partially based on what the board identified as "weak spots" in the district which should receive special attention from the new superintendent. The consultants worked with the board closely in the identification of these weak areas and in translating them into qualifications for the superintendency.

Although the out-going superintendent cannot be considered as a consultant in the context of this study, Huggett 16 described a situation in which the services of the incumbent were used by the board in its search for his replacement. The superintendent had indicated that he would not return the next school year. The board of education began its search with the intention that the out-going superintendent would receive and screen all applications.


He was to evaluate credentials on the basis of qualifications developed by the board and then turn over the selection activity to them when his task was completed.

The third area of related literature is the conceptual framework around which it is suggested the public schools develop their association with educational consultants. The point of this literature is that before consultants are contacted, it must first be determined (1) if they are needed, (2) what they are to do, and (3) if the consultants are, in fact, qualified to perform the required task for the employing body.

Savage suggests nine ways in which maximum benefit can be obtained by use of consultants in the schools. Although these points were directed toward administrators, they can also apply to boards of education considering the use of consultants in the recruitment and selection of a superintendent. The suggestions by Savage are:

1. Be certain that you are ready for help before you seek it.

2. Seek the assistance of a consultant qualified to help you with your problem.

3. Ask for the consultant's services in advance of the time you need them.

4. Give the consultant specific information about your situation and needs.
5. Specify the kind of help that you want the consultant to give.

6. In planning with the consultant, give him information about the activities you believe should be carried out during his visit.

7. Set sufficient time for the consultant's visit.

8. Evaluate the consultative service that you receive.

9. Move forward after the consultant leaves. 17

A precaution was offered by Savage about the use of consultant services. He noted simply that "... speeches are not consultative service." 18 This statement implies that the consultant's efforts must be in the form of working with a board or staff rather than just telling them how a particular job should be done.

The American School Board Journal builds the case for consultants to be well acquainted with the situation in which they are working. It is noted that "Such matters as local politics, the character of the population, the economic situation, and finally the ability of the school board and its staff to put a broad


18 Ibid.
scheme into operation over a period of years cannot be over-
looked. "19 The reasoning behind this position is expressed as
"The value of all consultant service is in the intrinsic correct-
ness and workability of the recommendations and proposals."20
When consultants work with a board in the recruitment and
selection of a superintendent, their efforts can and will be
partially evaluated in how well the superintendent performs on
the job in a school district.

A terse guide for educators concerning the working re-
lationship with consultants was found in the literature of the
business world. Tilles, in discussing the role of the consultant
in business, makes a point that has application for educators who
propose to use consultants. He states:

For it is a fact that if a client fails to get what he wants
from a relationship with a consultant, it is much more
likely to be an indication of his own lack of sophistication
in the art of being advised than a reflection on the com-
petence of the adviser. 21

____________________
19 "Employing Consultants," The American

20 Ibid.

Seymour Tilles, "Understanding the Consultant's Role,"
pp. 87-99.
This statement is a re-emphasis of the idea that the advisee must be willing to be advised if the consultative process is to be effective.

The AASA suggestions about the topic of consultants and the schools can serve as a guide to administrators and board members alike. The AASA noted that "The job is to match up the special qualifications of a consultant to the special demands of a particular problem in a particular setting."\(^\text{22}\) This delineation of the framework within which consultants and boards should function is essential to this paper since it requires that the use of consultants should be conducted with specified goals for all participants.

The fourth major area of related literature is how consultants and boards of education should coordinate in the recruitment and selection of superintendents.

Both Wright and Reeder suggest that boards should seek advice from a wide range of sources when searching for a new superintendent. Wright states: "Boards should utilize the services of specialists in education, college and university placement bureaus, outstanding citizens of the community and teachers in

the selection of the school system's chief administrator."²³

Reeder suggests that "...the board should obtain suggestions from all competent sources possible; it alone has the responsibility of making the final selection, ..."²⁴ These comments have value in that they encourage boards to use resources other than their own membership in the search for a superintendent. However, they offer little direction as to how the boards are supposed to work with those from the outside or how the decision-making process of the board of education might be affected by such outside influence.

A definite approach to the use of consultants in the recruitment-selection process was drawn from a list of seventeen steps suggested by Exton. The fourth step in her list of employment procedures for boards to follow is:

4. Employ a Professional Consultant.

The board needs assistance in this job of developing plans to locate candidates, in screening and evaluating evidence about candidates, and in reviewing


responsibilities of a superintendent in order to decide the relative emphasis on competencies it should expect from a new superintendent.  

Her identification of tasks which could be performed by consultants provides a structure within which a board might identify the role consultants should have in a recruitment-selection situation. She adds that the consultant should be someone who has been involved in the preparation of administrators; someone who would be able to search for candidates, not wait for them to appear.  

Bortner reports on a selection pattern in which professional committees, usually made up of professors, are used to assist and advise boards of education as they search for a superintendent. He recommends the professional committee approach for the following reasons:

First, it places the selection of a superintendent on a professional level.

Second, it helps prevent individual or group pressures on the board.

Third, it may help foster good staff morale by reducing the likelihood of internal chicanery or bickering.

---


26 Ibid.
Fourth, it removes the physical center of deliberations and interviews from the board offices.

Fifth, it helps relieve the board from a time-consuming task.

Sixth, it capitalizes on the training and experience of professional educators.²⁷

Bortner's position places much of the "political and buffer" activity of selection with the consultants and not the board. His suggested steps have implications for operations which would place the assessment of candidates in the area of consultant activity and not that of the board of education. While most people advocating the use of consultants in the selection process would not place this type of political responsibility on an outside group, there may be situations where such action is quite appropriate if the board is to function in an atmosphere where political overtones exist in its decision making.

The profession's attitude on the question of consultants in the recruitment and selection of superintendents is partially expressed in an AASA statement taken from a document developed to assist boards in selecting a chief administrator for their schools. The AASA notes, "The selection of a chief school

administrator should be a well thought out, systematic process."\textsuperscript{28} To this they add, "In developing specifications for the job, school boards often utilize consultants from outside the community."\textsuperscript{29}

Although these two statements are not particularly controversial, they do receive support from Reynard, who has written directly on the question of activity which might be followed by consultants. He identified consultants as one of the resources available to boards as they search for a superintendent and specified that:

Consultants can be helpful in developing the job specifications, in evaluating graduate credits shown on credential forms and in making the preliminary screening... Consultants should not be expected to do more than advise in the selection process. The board alone must make the final selection.\textsuperscript{30}

Reynard's comments provide the nearest resemblance to a "job description" for consultants which was found in the literature.

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p. 7.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{30} Harold E. Reynard, Selecting the School Administrator, Columbus: The Ohio School Boards Association, 1962, p. 7.
\end{flushright}
A succinct and direct approach to the justification of the use of educational consultants in the recruitment and selection of superintendents was made by Gavin Pitt. His comments are important because he represents a management consultant firm and has extensive experience at the operational level of the consultantship. He noted that in searching for top-level people in administration, many of the traditional sources of candidates are not as productive as before. According to Pitt, suggestions from individuals in the field or even the college placement offices have their limitations. He summarizes his thinking in favor of using consultants as follows:

Under intense pressure to find administrative leadership for their expansion programs, boards of directors in business and industry have often retained consultants to recruit and select qualified people for executive positions. There is now a similar recognition on the part of educational boards that the chances of making a successful selection of an educational administrator are greatly enhanced when such consultants are utilized. True, this is an extra cost; yet, how much more costly for any enterprise is the hiring of the wrong executive. 31

Pitt suggests that the consultant develop the job description and statement of personnel qualification, initiate the search for candidates, receive applications, interview interested persons,

and make recommendations to the board relative to the most qualified candidates. 32 He concludes by stating:

In addition to their responsibility in determining policy, boards of education and trustees have an equally important obligation in the selection of a college or university president, a superintendent, principal, business manager, or departmental chairman. Since an institution reflects its leadership, it is imperative that every effort be made to assure that the best qualified candidates are selected for key positions throughout the organization. 33

The position taken by Pitt reflects a consultant's views about his role in the recruitment and selection process. It also indicates an operational program which identifies tasks to be performed by consultants if they are to be of service to educational institutions.

The profession's role in the recruitment and selection of administrative personnel receives attention from Ellena and Iannaccone and Border. Referring to various strategies a board could use when searching for a superintendent, Ellena suggests, "Many boards of education have found it helpful to ask their state department of education, the state association of school superintendents, or selected individuals in colleges or universities to

32Ibid., pp. 30-31.

33Ibid., p. 31.
assist them in identifying qualified people. ″34 While he notes that
the state associations of superintendents could be of service to a
board, the literature is devoid of references to either state or
national associations offering assistance in this area.

Iannaccone and Border follow Ellena's lead and suggest that
there is value to using the profession's resources to assist a board
in identifying a new superintendent. It is their position that "The
profession's experience for decades, with the problem of selecting
superintendents, has been available to the public for years. It is
readily obtainable by any school board which wishes to treat the
selection in anything other than an offhand manner."35

These last two statements represent a position that pre-
viously has not received much attention in the general literature
of superintendent recruitment or in the publications of the pro-
fession. The concept of administrators' associations being involved
in the selection has not been put into practice, but it could be the
representation of an emerging role for the profession in the future.

34 William J. Ellena, "Selecting a Superintendent." The

35 Laurence Iannaccone and Pauline H. Border, "Selecting the
School Superintendent: the School Board's Greatest Responsi-
bility," The American School Board Journal, 149 (October, 1964),
p. 25.
A recent statement pertaining to the value of consultants was presented by McCarty in early 1967. He pointed out that current practices for selecting educational administrators seemed haphazard in light of the present demands on the position. In view of his recognition of the problem of executive selection, he proposed a recruitment-selection process based on the following principles:

1. The process of selection proceed promptly. A slow selection makes the faculty jittery and creates needless tension. In fact, an educational program can fall to pieces if unnecessary delays are permitted. Speed and care are not antithetical.

2. Representation from the faculty should be included at all stages of the selection process. An evaluation of a prospective candidate is of only partial validity if it does not include, along with the option of the board members, that of the colleagues with whom he will have to work.

3. The board should determine the contemporary needs of the school system, draw up a job description of the duties expected of the new administrator, and develop specific criteria by which each candidate will be screened.

4. At this point in time a team of two or three experienced and reputable educational consultants should be employed to manage the routine administrative details involved in securing nominations, processing applications, and screening out the patently unfit. The energy of the board

---

members should be retained for a careful study of a 'limited' number of persons.

A thorough study, including telephone queries and field visits, should be made of how each 'final' candidate has performed in other assignments similar to the position open for appointment.

5. If these procedures are followed the choice should become obvious, but don't be too sure. 37

The literature reported thus far has been supportive of boards using outside aid in the recruitment and selection of a superintendent. There are, however, two examples of articles prepared by board of education members which register opposition to the consultantship concept. Bliss and Dittman both argue that for a board to delegate even a part of the selection function to others is to relinquish its legal responsibility to the patrons of the school district. Bliss expressed the attitude that the board should retain all leadership in the recruitment-selection activity and suggested an eight-step selection process. These are:

1. Announce the vacancy
2. Prepare specifications
3. Request names from colleges
4. Communicate to each person
5. Review applications
6. Select and interview

37 Ibid., p. 7.
7. Narrow down
8. Select and appoint

Dittman developed a "board-centered" position on recruitment and selection by identifying three specific reasons why superintendents should be selected entirely as the result of board action. She argued that consultants should not be employed because (1) they do not have to work with the superintendent during the period of the contract, (2) they are not legally responsible to the public for the selection, and (3) they do not have an understanding of the full history of the district.

Although there is not much "anti-consultant" literature, these two articles do represent views that must be given recognition by those concerned with the consultanship in education.

Dittman's remarks could serve as a guide to a recognition of concerns that might be held by board of education members about consultants in the crucial business of the recruitment and selection of a superintendant.

---


The final area of literature about this topic is the research, although it is limited, which has been done on the central point of this study. In a 1957 sampling of school administrators on the question of how a superintendent should be selected, the following data were obtained.

In response to the question: "Should the selection and employment of a superintendent be solely the responsibility of the school board?" the replies were--

Yes. . . 75%  No. . . 24%  No Opinion. . . 1%

To the question: "Should the school board seek outside expert counsel in setting up procedures and qualifications for filling the position of superintendent?" the replies were--

Yes. . . 75%  No. . . 19%  No Opinion. . . 6%

The third question, "Should the wishes and attitudes of citizens with regard to the employment of a superintendent be reflected in any way either through a citizens committee or in some similar form?" brought these replies--

Yes. . . 44%  No. . . 47%  No Opinion. . . 9%

The final item: "Should teachers have any part in the selection or hiring of a superintendent?" resulted in the following--

Yes. . . 25%  No. . . 69%  No Opinion. . . 6%

40

The responses of these superintendents reflect a desire for boards to seek advice and counsel when searching for a superintendent, yet there is a decided feeling against either citizens and especially teachers having a voice in this process.

The lack of direction on the problem of outside influence is reflected in the paucity of research done on the topic. Manwaring discussed studies that have been done in the area of superintendent selection and noted that the reports "... have surveyed procedures used by boards of education, traits sought by boards of education, factors associated with success as a chief school administrator and professional training and experience desired by boards of education." Griffiths makes a companion statement about the research in this area with his analysis that as of 1954, about seventy-five dissertations had been written on the topic of selection. However, the reference literature does not recognize a treatment of the relationship of educational consultants to the recruitment and selection process.

---


Further evidence of the absence of hard data on the topic is found in a study by Baker reported in the *Administrator's Notebook*. From data which were drawn from the replies of 1,049 superintendents and board of education members in thirteen states concerning the selection process for administrators, he concluded that:

School board members seldom regard the selection of a superintendent as an opportunity to involve teacher and community groups in clarifying what kind of a leader is needed to develop what kind of an educational program.  

The authors of the report on the Baker study indicate that "Of the school board members participating in the study, only 5 percent said that they made some use of citizens advisory committees or consulted teacher groups in connection with the selection of superintendents."  

From the facts isolated in the study, Baker did recommend a fourteen-point selection process for boards which included the use of outside influence in the overall recruitment and selection activity for superintendents.  

---


44 Ibid.

45 Ibid.
Summary

A review of the relevant literature points up several key factors. First, there is no research literature which speaks directly to the question of this study from which data can be drawn to develop specific or baseline types of studies. Second, there are several parts of the literature which identify critical areas in which research can be done. These have served both as a basis for much of the rationale of this study and as a guide to the instruments designed to gather data.

Chapter III is the discussion of the direction received from the literature in the development of the research design utilized in the study.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Organization of the chapter

The intent of this chapter is to present the methodology followed in the conduct of the survey. Attention will be given to the basic planning and consideration of strategy options, the conceptual and factual development of each of the three distinct data collecting phases of the study, the various activities followed in the survey process, and the treatment of the data generated in the research effort.

Initial planning

A basic problem concerning the establishment of contact with boards of education and superintendents had to be resolved before major design activity could take place. The employment of a new superintendent of schools is an important event in a school district. In most instances the decision by a board of education is well received and highly supported; in others, it is perhaps the most emotionally charged action a board might
take during an entire year. The impact of such a choice can be felt in a positive as well as a negative way by the professional staff of the schools and the community. To recognize that the researcher would have little, if any, direct knowledge about the circumstances surrounding the employment of a particular superintendent, it was decided in the development of the study that contacts with the schools and consultants would be built around mechanisms and procedures that had the quality of "legitimatizing" the research effort. It was recognized by the researcher that if any participant in the study--the superintendent, board of education members, consultants--was threatened by the project, the entire effort could be unproductive.

The project centered around two basic elements: boards of education and consultants. Thus, it was clear that the data gathering activity had to point directly at these two groups. After considering the commitment to legitimatizing the study and the role of boards of education and consultants, several basic strategies evolved which had impact on the design of the study. Although the superintendent was not to be solicited for data pertaining to his employment by the board of education, it was felt that he should be informed about the research effort and be a major influence in drawing the board of education into participation.
This step was critical because it recognized the protocol problems which could arise in a study involving data collection from individuals in highly sensitive positions. If the support of the superintendent's office could be brought to the study in terms of eliciting board of education participation, a severe roadblock to obtaining data would have been avoided early in the research effort.

The second matter which received attention before design decisions were finalized concerned which member or members of boards of education would be asked to supply data. It was possible to request that either all members of boards supply information or that the data source be limited to selected board members. Because the study was being conducted at the end of the 1966-1967 school year, it was quite probable that the membership of many boards might have changed from the time when the superintendent had been selected in the spring or summer of 1966. At the same time, it was safe to assume that in nearly all cases the current president of the board would have been a member when the superintendent was selected in 1966. It would be unusual for a person to be elected president during his first year on the board of education. By considering these aspects of the current board membership, it was decided that entrance to the board would be from the superintendent to the current president. The instructions
to this individual would direct him to pass the study materials to
the person who was president when the superintendent was selected
if he was still a board member or to have another member, possibly himself, complete the questionnaire. The only membership
requirement for a respondent was that he must have been a board
member at the time the study was conducted and have been a
member when the superintendent was selected. This strategy was
developed to maintain the protocol element and generate data from
a respondent closely associated with the selection of the superinten-
tendent.

A third factor to be resolved prior to the finalization of
the study design was the process by which the consultants would be
identified. One option was to draw from the boards of education
which had used consultants, the names of the individuals they had
retained; another was to request a group of specialists in school
administration to nominate individuals currently serving as con-
sultants in the public schools. The former of these options was
selected because it would make possible a comparison of responses
to similar questionnaire items between boards and the consultants
they had employed. Since the number of consultants was unknown
at this time, it was decided to structure the instruments so the con-
sultants would be identified by the boards who had employed their services.
Once these basic matters were resolved, the data collecting mechanisms were conceptualized into three phases. The data, which were to be collected by mailed questionnaire, were to be drawn from the boards of education in Phase I and Phase II; from the consultants in Phase III of research effort.

PHASE I

Selection of the Ohio Sample

The task to be accomplished in this phase was to identify boards of education and consultants who had been jointly involved in the recruitment and selection of school superintendents for the 1966-1967 school year. Because of the absence of literature to guide the researcher toward selecting one population as opposed to another, it was decided that the prime source of data would be the Ohio school districts in which a new superintendent had been employed for the 1966-1967 school year. Since the potential yield from this population was a completely unknown factor, it was also decided to tentatively select a second population which could be brought into the study if the Ohio data proved insufficient in quantity. The decision to activate the secondary data source would be made only after the Ohio portion of the study had been completed and the results had been assessed.
The first operational stage of Phase I was to identify the Ohio school districts in which a new superintendent had been employed for the 1966-1967 school year. The original plan for accomplishing this task was to secure copies of the 1965-1966 and 1966-1967 educational directories for Ohio in which all districts in the state were listed and identify the eligible districts by comparing the listing of superintendents for the first year as opposed to the second. Those districts which had a new superintendent for 1966-1967 would comprise the group which would be the sample for the Ohio portion of the study. Upon initial investigation, this approach was immediately rejected because the 1966-1967 directory was not yet available. A new system for producing the directory from computer print-outs was being developed and final publication of the document had been delayed.

Since this first approach was unproductive, the second plan was to contact the Ohio School Boards Association (OSBA) based on the possibility that they might have an up-to-date listing of the districts where new superintendents had been employed. The only assistance The Association could offer was a print-out of their current mailing list of member board of education presidents. This source had to be rejected as completely inappropriate because it in no way identified eligible boards of education. It was not even
adequate for a statewide mailing by the researcher because it included only member boards. Another unproductive aspect of this listing was that in the metropolitan areas there were a number of mailings which went to the same city but did not identify the district represented.

The third attempt to identify the eligible districts was made with the Department of Education, State of Ohio. The first contact with this source had been rejected earlier because of the unavailability of the 1966-1967 Educational Directory. However, liaison was re-established to probe other possible sources of the required data. It was disclosed that The Department had published in late 1966 a Supplement to the 1965-1966 Educational Directory which listed all new administrators in the state for the 1966-1967 school year. A copy of the document was secured and it revealed that for the school year in question (1966-1967) 10 county superintendents, 83 local superintendents, 21 city superintendents, and 9 exempted village superintendents had been employed. The Supplement did not show, however, the superintendents in the newly formed joint-vocational school districts. Contact was established with the Division of Vocational Education in the Department of Education and a listing of these districts was obtained. A review of the information revealed that of the districts in existence at the time, eight
superintendents were new for the current school year. During the course of collecting these data, six additional new superintendents were identified, bringing the total number to 137.

Instrumentation

With the identification of the 137 school districts and superintendents constituting the Ohio sample, attention was directed toward the development of instruments to secure data relating to the objectives of the study. Since Phase I was to serve as the preliminary data collection stage, the instrument for this portion of the study was identified as the Preliminary Information Record (PIR). In terms of the objectives of the study and the plan to phase the data collection, this instrument would serve to draw data dealing with: (a) the conditions surrounding the employment of the superintendent, (b) the recruitment process followed by the board of education, and (c) the names of consultants, if used, invited to participate in the overall recruitment-selection process by the board of education. The data from the final item of this list would identify the sub-sample of boards which would be tested in Phase II of the study and the consultants who would be contacted in Phase III.

The PIR was conceptualized as the instrument to gather the basic data concerning the employment circumstances surrounding the employment of the 137 new superintendents in Ohio and
identify those whose employment was affected by the involvement of educational consultants with the board of education. In general, the instrument was to generate data from these boards about the following variables:

1. The respondent to the instrument.

2. The conditions surrounding the employment conditions for the superintendent--the reason the opening developed, the salary and contract conditions for the new administrator, his professional background.

3. The recruitment process followed by the board.

4. The general use of consultants in the district and especially in the selection of the superintendent.

5. The degree to which the boards assess the strengths of the superintendent with the needs of the schools.

6. An identification of consultants and others who assisted the board in the recruitment and selection of the superintendent.

The original activity in the development of this instrument was to collect a "laundry list" of items related to the overall objectives of the study and the specific goals established above.

To develop the instrument into a viable document, it was at this point and at subsequent stages of development subjected to review by a panel which conducted the pre-test reliability check.
Pre-Testing the Preliminary Information Record (PIR)

The pre-test plan for this instrument was structured to draw upon the talents of a selected group of individuals who could offer substantive comments regarding the content and format of the questionnaire. The group invited to participate in this phase of the study by the researcher was composed of four professors of education, a university business official, and seven advanced graduate students in education. The instrument was also reviewed by two school superintendents and a board of education president at several stages of its development. The function of the panel was to react to drafts of the instrument in terms of format, content, and language. The members acted independent of each other and presented their comments to the researcher as individual respondents.

The PIR (see Appendix A) was finalized from a compilation of the review panel's responses to a succession of three drafts of the questionnaire. The instrument was built around thirty-one fixed-alternative and open-end items. At the suggestion of a panel member, the fixed-alternative items were numbered on the "0 through 9" scale to permit the data to be treated with a computer program if it was deemed essential to the analysis when the data

---

were collected. As will be explained later, the data were not handled by computer but received hand tabulation and analysis by the use of an automatic calculator.

The items on the PIR were grouped to provide data about:

1. The respondent to the instrument and his position with the board of education.

2. The superintendent turnover rate in the district.

3. The employment conditions in terms of salary and contract related to the employment of the new superintendent.

4. The professional background of the new superintendent and his current educational status.

5. The overall procedures followed by the board in the recruitment and selection process.

6. The outside assistance received by the board in its search for a new superintendent and an identification by name and address of these individuals.

One of the critical items on this particular instrument was No. 29 which was designed to identify the sub-sample of districts that used educational consultants. The item was constructed to draw from the respondents an identification of all types of outside assistance the board received while the superintendent was being recruited and selected. The responses to parts:

3) University professors(s) employed by the Board
4) Management consultant firm employed by the Board
5) Private teacher/administrator placement agency, and
6) Professional Associations such as the OSBA or OASA (specify)
were the sources of the guiding data for Phase II of the study. The implication of the use of any of these individuals or groups was that a retainer could have been paid and thus the incident was pertinent to the study.

Part of item 29, "County superintendent," was rejected since there was a legal relationship which could be traced to this individual in the recruitment and selection of superintendents in local districts in Ohio. There was no reason to assume that a retainer was involved in these cases.

The second part, "Citizen committee approved by the Board," was also rejected as a source of Phase II direction since these would be cases of voluntary involvement and thus did not have the same process stature as in cases of invitational service.

Part three, "College or university placement office," was also rejected since these were, by tradition, agencies used by boards of education and did not imply the use of a fee. However, in cases where placement directors were named as consultants by the board respondent, these were considered eligible situations for Phase II.
Development of Phase I Strategy

With the completion of the Phase I instrument, the Preliminary Information Record (PIR), attention was directed toward the strategy for approaching the new superintendents and their boards of education for participation. Since the superintendents were in their first year of service, particular attention was given to the image of the study. It had previously been decided that the superintendents' involvement in the study would be held to a minimum and that the prime data source would be the boards of education. It was also established that the entire Phase I data collection process would be carried out by mailed questionnaire with the boards of education.

The plan that evolved established the flow of material to the school districts in Ohio as follows:

All material would be mailed directly to the superintendent as identified in the Supplement to the 1965-1966 Educational Directory. A letter to the superintendent would be included explaining the study and the degree to which he would be expected to participate (see Appendix A). A post card for the researcher was attached to the letter which, when returned, would indicate that the study material had been delivered to the board of education president. The material for the board of education presidents consisted of the PIR, a letter to the board president describing the study, (see Appendix A), and a stamped, return envelope.

The rationale behind the strategy was that it kept the researcher informed of the status of his inquiry into any one
district and made it possible to establish follow-up procedures at any point in the data flow. When the superintendent returned the post card, he identified the board of education president by name and address. If the PIR was not received by a predetermined date, follow-up could be made with the board of education president. If the card was still not returned, follow-up was conducted with the superintendent. Additionally, the inclusion of all materials seemed to make it less possible for the superintendent to refuse participation. If he could inspect the material to which the board member was responding, there would be less threat involved and thus less chance of refusal. Regardless of the circumstances, if the superintendent decided to block "entree" into the district, he could do so with or without all the study material.

The incorporation of these ideas into cover-letters was accomplished by the researcher drafting statements to accompany the PIR and submitting them to the review panel for reactions. The letter to the superintendent was drafted with specific areas of content for each paragraph. The first section requested his assistance in the study and identified it as a dissertation effort. The second identified the purpose of the study being "... to analyze the part taken by educational consultants in the recruitment and selection of school superintendents in the state." It
was further explained how his district was selected as one for possible participation in the study. The final portion of the letter stated that the superintendent was expected to:

"(1) complete and return the attached post card to me, and
(2) give the Board president the other envelope in this mailing."

The contents of the "other envelope" to be transmitted to the board of education presidents were identified and the superintendent was invited to inspect them if he wished.

The letter to the board of education president was more extensive both in its length and content. The first two paragraphs of this letter followed the same general format and content of that for the superintendent. The statements which followed were directed to board presidents and established their role in the study. The critical factor of who was to complete the PIR was presented with the following statement:

As President of the Board, the only action which you need to take is to have a present Board member complete the attached questionnaire and return it to me. It would be preferable if the person completing this form was either the chairman of the Board's selection committee or President at the time the superintendent was selected. However, if none of the present Board members meets either of these conditions, then any other member, including yourself, who was on the Board at the time of the selection may complete the questionnaire.
The paragraph which followed established the possibility of the Phase II contact.

Several weeks after the first form is returned to me, the person who completed it will receive a second questionnaire dealing specifically with the topic of educational consultants and superintendent recruitment and selection.

These two paragraphs represent critical aspects of the relationship with the boards because they established the data source and kept the line of communication open for the second contact. The element not presented to the boards was that not all respondents would receive the second instrument. Only those who indicated the use of consultants as defined earlier in the study would be contacted. This plan left the matter of deciding which boards would participate in Phase II as the prerogative of the researcher. To allow the boards to decide whether or not they were eligible for the second stage of the study would have introduced a contaminating factor of sample selection over which there would be virtually no control by the researcher.

In the final part of the letter the researcher assured the board of education president that respondents in the study would remain anonymous in the dissertation. This action was taken to arrest their concern about dissemination of the study results.
In line with attempts to present the study to the superintendents and board presidents as a legitimate effort, the preparation of the PIR and the letters was performed by a professional printing service at The Ohio State University. The audience perceived as respondents to the Phase I materials was such that strict attention was given to presenting them a "quality" package in terms of content and actual appearance of the documents.

Selection of the Illinois Sample

The Phase I planning provided that a secondary population would be selected for testing if the Ohio data were insufficient in quantity to meet the objectives of the study. Since the prime thrust of the study was directed toward the boards which used consultants, it was hoped that more than twenty such situations could be identified in Ohio. In the presentation of the study discussed later in this chapter, it will be shown that this goal was not reached and the program to utilize the secondary population was put into action.

Planning to draw in a second population revealed that there was not any particular state which seemed more suitable for inclusion in the study than another. The factor of working with a completely unknown quantity led the researcher to select Illinois
as the second population since several individuals had mentioned that they were aware of consultative activity in the state.

From the previous experience with Ohio, it was decided to initiate the plan for identifying the districts with new superintendents for the 1966-1967 school year by attempting to draw the information from documents of the state level educational authority. A letter was dispatched to the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Illinois explaining the scope of the study and requesting suggestions about how the data might be gathered. In response, the researcher received a copy of the 1966-1967 Directory of Illinois Schools in which all the districts and their superintendents were identified. At the same time the letter indicated that the 1965-1966 directories were no longer available so a comparison of information was not immediately possible. Additional inquiries as to its availability failed to produce the earlier directory.

As a second step, an inquiry concerning the data source problem was directed to the offices of the Illinois Association of School Boards (IASB). A copy of the 1966-1967 directory was received from the Research Division in which they had marked the 255 new superintendents for the 1966-1967 school year. With this information, the search for this basic data was concluded and the introduction of Illinois into the study initiated. The
Phase I letters and instrument developed for Ohio were modified to reflect Illinois information and the same overall study strategy followed for these school districts.

PHASE II

The task to be accomplished in this portion of the study was to gather data by questionnaire from the districts in Ohio and Illinois which indicated in Phase I that the services of educational consultants had been used in the recruitment and selection of their superintendent. The purpose the instrument developed for Phase II was to probe the operational relationship which existed between these boards and the consultants and to assess the value of this association from the perspective of the board of education respondents.

Selection of the sample

The Phase II sample was composed of twenty-one Ohio boards of education and thirty-one from Illinois which indicated in item 29 of the PIR that educational consultants had been utilized in the recruitment and selection of their superintendent for the 1966-1967 school year. A precise report of the district types represented in this group will be found in Table 7 of Chapter IV.
Instrumentation

Because the thrust of this part of the study was toward the board-consultant relationship, the variables which guided the instrumentation centered around the identification of the particulars of this association and an assessment of the value of the services as perceived by the boards of education. Specifically, the instrumentation conceptualized around the variables of:

1. The cost to the board of education for the services of the consultants.
2. The services provided to the consultants by the board.
3. The ways in which liaison between the consultants and the board was established.
4. The contractual and salary recommendations made to the board by the consultants.
5. The special techniques employed by consultants to aid in the selection process, e.g., testing.
6. The degree to which individuals other than the consultants participated in advising the board on recruitment and selection of the superintendent.
7. The extent to which consultants have been used by these boards since the superintendent was selected.
8. The services performed by the consultants.
9. An assessment by the board of education members of the merit of these services in the overall recruitment and selection process.
10. An indication of the possibility of using consultants again for superintendency recruitment and selection.
Pre-testing the instrument

A part of the strategy of Phase II was that it should be responsive to Phase I data concerning the use a board of education made of consultants in its recruitment and selection of a superintendent. Therefore, the instrument and its accompanying letter (see Appendix B) were developed concurrently with the PIR and its supporting material.

The pre-testing of the instrument followed the same basic pattern as with the Phase I material. The researcher developed several drafts of the instrument and submitted them to the instrument review panel for comments. Since this item was received by them along with the PIR, the panel was in a position to react to the two items as a unit.

Because the variables guiding the development of this instrument had been identified in the general conceptualization of Phase I, the role of the panel was to assist the researcher in refining the language of the questionnaire so it would point directly toward the purposes of the study. In their action, the panel reinforced the plan for using fixed-alternative and open-end questions as being the item design by which the data were to be collected.
Development of Phase II Strategy

The details concerning how this phase of the study was to be conducted were fixed in the early stages of Phase I. The board of education presidents were informed in the letter accompanying the PIR that they would receive a second questionnaire within several weeks after the first was returned to the researcher. The letter which accompanied the Phase II instrument was brief and identified the instrument as a part of the study with which the board respondent had previous contact. The statement in the letter extended appreciation for the assistance which had been given and promised an abstract of the study when it was completed.

As with the Phase I materials, those for Phase II were prepared with attention to their appearance and professional qualities. A total of twenty-five fixed-alternative and open-end items were used. The entire Phase II "package" was submitted in draft form to the panel for final assessment before it was printed and sent to the boards of education.

PHASE III

The task to be accomplished in this portion of the study was to collect by mailed questionnaire data concerning the association between the boards of education which used consultants from
those consultants identified by the board of education respondents
in Phase I. The data were to probe into the operational relationship
between these boards and the consultants and to present an
assessment from the consultants' viewpoint of the value of this
service.

Selection of the sample

The identification of the sample was made from items
Nos. 29 and 31 on the Preliminary Information Record. Upon
complete analysis of the PIR returns from Ohio and Illinois, it
was established that there were fifty-one individual consultants
identified by the responding boards of education. Visual inspection of their names and addresses revealed that most of them were
classified by title and address as being university professors;
several others were noted to be school superintendents or professional association officials. Detail about this group is reported
in Chapter IV.

Instrumentation

The instrument developed for this portion of the study, the
Consultant's Report Form, was closely related to the Phase II
questionnaire both in its intent and content. The major difference
between them was that the Phase II instrument was designed to
gather data from boards of education respondents while that for Phase III was developed for application to the consultants. In both cases, many of the items on the instruments were drawn from the same concepts. The individual items were, however, worded to best relate to a board of education member or consultant as being the respondent.

The variables around which this particular questionnaire was developed are as follows:

1. The experience and training of the consultants.
2. The extent to which the consultants served as an adviser to boards of education in the area of this study as well as in other realms of school activity.
3. The ways in which the consultants typically established their liaison with the boards of education.
4. The basis upon which the consultant's fee was determined.
5. The amount of time the consultants work with boards in a recruitment-selection program.
6. The techniques followed by consultants in the recruitment-selection activity.
7. The services consultants expect to be provided by the boards of education.
8. The areas in which the consultants make recommendations concerning the employment conditions of the superintendent.
9. The extent to which consultants invite others to take part in the recruitment and selection program.
10. The services performed by the consultants.

11. The consultants' assessment of the value of the services they perform.

12. The consultants' views concerning the long-range implications of their presence in the arena of superintendent recruitment and selection as related to the superintendency, the professorship, and to boards of education.

Pre-testing the Consultant's Report Form

The pattern for pre-testing the Phase III instrument and accompanying letter was the same as in the two preceding phases of the study. From experience gained in the development of the PIR and the Phase II instruments, and their content, the Consultant's Report Form was constructed to permit an analysis of responses to similar items on the Phase II forms. Twelve of the twenty-four items on the Phase III document were directly related to items on the Phase II forms and to three items on the PIR.

A draft of potential items for the instrument was developed and submitted to the review panel. From their responses to the format, language, and substantive content of the questionnaire, a twenty-four item instrument was constructed around the suggested variables. Of this group of twenty-four items, twenty were fixed-alternative and the remaining were open-end. An attempt was made to structure these items in a manner which would
produce the most effective data possible to relate to the variables for this instrument.

**Development of Phase III strategy**

Phase III was a crucial part of the study because it represented the "closing of the circle" in the basic concept of the project. The Phase I and Phase II data were drawn from boards of education. Phase III was at the other end of the consultant-board of education spectrum and thus the data from this source were equally as vital.

The plan for this part of the project was to present a packet of material to the consultants which would encourage participation by making the purpose of the study relevant to their interests and activities while at the same time minimizing any aspect of "prying" into their personal activities. As a strategy to draw data from this sample, the cover letter (see Appendix C) was constructed to convey six separate concepts. The first paragraph identified the study as being a dissertation and gave the name of the researcher's doctoral adviser. The second and third paragraphs summarized the activity that had already taken place in Phase I and Phase II. Paragraph four requested the participation of the consultant in the study. The fifth assured the consultant
that the data would be disseminated through professional channels and that the anonymity of the respondents would be preserved.

As had been done with the boards in Phase II, the consultants were promised an abstract of the study findings for their files. The final paragraph requested general comments related to the study in addition to those specifically requested on the instrument.

The same preparation pattern for the materials was followed as previously. All materials were printed professionally; a self-addressed, stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire was included in the mailing.

Conduct of the survey

Phase I

In early June, 1967, one-hundred thirty-seven packets of Phase I material were mailed to the superintendents in Ohio who were new to their current position for the 1966-1967 school year. These packets contained the cover letter and return post card for the superintendent and the cover letter, Preliminary Information Record, and return envelope for the board of education presidents. Within twenty days, responses had been received from ninety-one superintendents in the form of returned post cards or PIR questionnaires returned by board of education members. On the
basis of this initial return, forty-six Phase I follow-up packets were prepared and sent to the non-responding superintendents. These packets were identical to the first mailing except that a follow-up letter (see Appendix A) was used as a cover statement for the mailing. From this initial follow-up activity, an additional twenty-nine responses were received which brought the total response level from superintendents to one-hundred twenty, or nearly 88 per cent of the potential total.

At this point it was observed that the districts indicating the use of consultants were clustered almost exclusively in the city school districts. In order to capitalize on a prime source of data, personal letters were dispatched to the three city superintendents who had not previously responded to the first two inquiries. This personal contact produced two additional responses which brought the total number of participating districts to one-hundred twenty-two--an 89 per cent response level from superintendents.

Twenty days after the initial mailing of material to the superintendents, fifty-four PIR's had been returned by members of boards of education. Thirty-eight follow-up packets were sent to the non-responding board presidents as identified by the superintendents. This first follow-up produced an additional twenty-one PIR instruments. With the original fifty-four returns, twenty-one
from the first follow-up to boards, and twenty from the first follow-up to the superintendents, a total of ninety-five PIR statements were received. In keeping with the pattern evolved for contacting the superintendents, personal follow-up letters were sent to three board of education presidents in the city school district group who had not responded to previous contacts. This technique brought one additional response, raising the PIR total to ninety-six, or 78 percent of the one-hundred twenty-two participating districts.

A preliminary analysis of the PIR responses to item No. 29 concerning the assistance boards received in selecting their superintendents disclosed that twenty districts used consultants as defined within the realm of the study. Three weeks after the Phase I activity had been concluded, one additional response was received which also indicated the use of consultants. Because the total response to this particular item on the PIR was not greater, plans were set in motion to include the secondary state, Illinois, in the study to develop additional inputs. The same procedures and materials were utilized as for Ohio except that the reference to "Illinois" was substituted for "Ohio" on all letters and instruments.

In mid-July, two-hundred fifty-five packets were prepared for Illinois and mailed. Twenty days after the initial mailing, one-hundred fifty follow-up packets were sent to those superintendents
from which no response had been received. Forty-four follow-up packets were sent to the non-responding board of education presidents who had been identified by the superintendents.

A preliminary analysis of the item No. 29 responses on the PIR was made and it was shown that the instances of board-consultant cooperation on the employment of a superintendent were taking place in Illinois districts with twenty-five or more teachers. It was not appropriate to follow the "type of school district" analysis as in Ohio because the Illinois districts are classified as elementary, secondary, or unit whereas nearly all Ohio districts are unitary. On the basis of this initial lead to the source of productive data, a second major follow-up was developed and sent to the twenty-eight boards which had not responded and to the thirty-one superintendents in districts of twenty-five or more teachers where there had been no response. The final follow-up activity involved the use of personal letters to the fourteen boards which had not responded. The final tabulation of the PIR returns from Illinois showed that one-hundred forty-three PIR instruments had been obtained from the one-hundred eighty-three districts where superintendents had indicated a willingness to participate in the study. This represented a rate of return of 78 percent, almost identical to the figure exhibited in Ohio.
Phase II

From the returns on the PIR questionnaires sent to the Ohio superintendents, it was determined that twenty boards had used the services of educational consultants when the superintendent was employed. Later, an additional district was added to this list based on a late PIR return. In mid-July, packets containing the Phase II instrument and cover letter were sent directly to the board respondents to the PIR.

Initial returns on the Phase II instrument were received from fourteen districts. A fifteenth return was rejected because the respondent indicated that consultants had not participated to the extent implied in the Phase II documents. Follow-up packets containing all the original materials along with a special letter were directed to the non-respondents. Two additional returns were received and within two weeks a second set of follow-up materials was sent out. Personal letters accompanied all follow-up mailings in this phase of the study. At the conclusion of the follow-up activity, a total of seventeen of the twenty-one districts considered as potential contributors had responded to the Phase II instrument. One additional instrument was returned several weeks after the Phase II collection period had been closed and thus was not tabulated.
In Illinois, thirty-one boards of education indicated that consultants had been used in the recruitment and selection of their superintendent. As with Ohio, Phase II packets were sent out in groups as PIR returns indicated consultant activity in districts. Twenty-one returns were received and judged acceptable. One additional return was rejected because the respondent elected not to supply data. Follow-up forms were sent to the non-responding boards and an additional two returns were obtained. A second follow-up was sent to the remaining boards. Twenty-four usable responses were received from Illinois boards of education. This number, added to the seventeen from Ohio, made a total of forty-one boards, or 78.8 per cent of the Phase II sample, from which data were received and tabulated.

**Phase III**

Phase III was the final data collecting portion of the research effort. In early September, 1967, Phase III packets containing the Consultant's Report Form and the cover letter were mailed to the fifty-one consultants identified on the PIR returns. Within two weeks, twenty-six had been returned and follow-up materials were prepared for the non-respondents. The first follow-up contained a personal letter to each non-respondent.
and copies of all materials previously sent. This procedure produced a total of eleven additional responses and made a total of thirty-seven respondents, or 72.8 percent of the sample, to this instrument. The non-respondents were represented by several individuals whose mailing addresses were incorrect and could not be up-dated, two who were out of the country, and several whose identifications read as if they were members of the community rather than consultants who had been employed by the board of education.

Treatment of the data

The data collected in the three phases of the study were of two types. The first was objective data collected by fixed-alternative items and the other was narrative information collected by the use of open-end items on each questionnaire.

The fixed-alternative items were designed to generate data about the dimensions of the board-consultant association as identified by the variables considered in the study. The original format of the items provided for computer treatment of the raw data on an established program. However, when the data had been collected, the researcher was advised that because of the current load of work in the computer centers at the University, time
could be gained by applying hand tabulation techniques to the instruments. On the basis of this advice, the data were hand tabulated by item and the frequency of response to each part of the items recorded. At this point an automatic calculator was used to determine the percentage of the total response to the parts of each item. The data derived by this technique were the same as would have been produced by the computer program being considered.

The responses to the open-end items were treated by an item analysis of the narrative statements. Specific areas were established for the content of these responses by the structure of the items and it was possible to classify the responses with regard to their relevancy to the intent of the question.

The sequence of data presentation was conceptualized to show the responses to individual items as well as to utilize the technique of comparing similar items which appeared on two separate instruments. The detailed presentation of the data will be made in Chapter IV--Findings of the Survey.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

Organization of the chapter

The organizational base of this chapter is the data which were collected in the three phases of the study. The Phase I instrument, the Preliminary Information Record (PIR), was applied to nearly four hundred boards of education in Ohio and Illinois which had employed a new superintendent for the 1966-1967 school year. From the two-hundred thirty-nine replies to this instrument, a 60.7 per cent response, data were gathered about the conditions related to the employment of the superintendents which isolated the Phase II and Phase III samples.

Phase II consisted of collecting data from the boards of education which had employed the services of educational consultants in their search for a superintendent. A total of fifty-two boards indicated the use of consultants; replies were received from forty-one boards, which represented a 78.8 per cent response. The intent of this phase of the survey was to probe the operational
relationship which existed between the consultants and the boards of education.

Phase III of the survey consisted of collecting data from the consultants who had been identified in Phase I as being the consultants who assisted the boards (Phase II) in their search for a superintendent. Fifty-one consultants were involved in this portion of the study; replies to the Consultant's Report Form were received from thirty-seven of the group, or 72.8 per cent of the sample. The basic intent of this portion of the survey was to investigate the association and interaction between the consultants and boards of education as perceived by the consultants.

The presentation of the data from three phases was structured around the objectives of the study. As stated in Chapter I, these are outlined as follows:

1. The extent and scope of the occurrence.
2. The nature of the occurrence.
3. The functions performed by the consultants.
4. The impact of the consultant's services on the recruitment and selection processes.
5. The assessment of the consultant's services.
6. A description of the consultants as a group.
In addition to these guiding objectives, the general conditions related to the employment of the superintendents involved for 1966-1967 were also investigated. An attempt was made to identify some of the factors surrounding the employment environment faced by the superintendents and the profile of the individuals employed by the boards of education.

**Background information**

A part of the data which had a direct bearing on the research study deals with the superintendencies in the study, the information relative to the position, and the individuals employed for the 1966-1967 school year. The importance of these findings to the research effort is the way they serve as background material about the phenomenon under investigation.

A basic question investigated was the circumstances surrounding the need to replace the superintendent in the districts included in the study. In Phase I, the board respondents were asked to identify the factor which brought about the need to appoint a new superintendent for the 1966-1967 school year. The replies of the 237 respondents are shown in Table 1.
TABLE 1
CIRCUMSTANCE WHICH BROUGHT ABOUT NEED TO APPOINT NEW SUPERINTENDENT FOR 1966-1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>(N=237)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous superintendent retired</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous superintendent resigned to take a position in another district</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous superintendent resigned to enter industry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous superintendent resigned to enter graduate school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous superintendent resigned to go into college teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous superintendent did not have his contract renewed by the Board</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented here reveal that the major reason for the superintendencies being open is the wish of the incumbent to take a position in another district. The least mentioned factor was the intention of the superintendent to enter private industry.

The same respondents in Phase I were asked about the conditions associated with the employment of the new superintendent and some basic matters about the individual who was employed. The following four tables present those responses.
### TABLE 2

**NUMBER OF WRITTEN APPLICATIONS RECEIVED FOR SUPERINTENDENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>(N=230)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 10</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents also reacted to an item concerning the source of the applications. Two-hundred twenty-four replied to the question: "Did any members of the school's staff make written application for the superintendency?" Of the respondents, 123, or 54.9 per cent replied in the negative, and 101, or 45.1 per cent indicated that applications were received from within the district. While the margin is not wide, it does indicate that applications tend to originate from outside districts as opposed to coming from the current staff.

This trend was reinforced by the responses dealing with the status of the superintendent prior to taking the position in
question. Two-hundred twenty-eight board members responded to the question: "Was the person employed as superintendent from the district staff or from outside?" Seventy respondents, representing 30.7 per cent of the total replies, indicated that the superintendent was from the district staff and the remaining 158, or 69.3 per cent, noted that the superintendent was from outside the district.

A further indication of conditions surrounding the employment of the superintendent was revealed by responses concerning whether or not the superintendent was employed or attending graduate school in the state the year prior to coming to the district. In 195 cases (84.4%) the board members answered "Yes"; a "No" reply was made in the remaining 36 responses.

These three segments of data point out that the superintendents were mainly from outside the districts but did have their experience within the state just before coming to the district under study.

The general experience background of these superintendents within the educational community are as follows:
The conclusion drawn from these findings is that nearly all administrators had prior educational experience, and in these cases, more than five years of experience before becoming a superintendent. At the same time, it is noted that more than 75 per cent of the superintendents had some experience as an administrator before taking the superintendency.

The educational level of this group provided further insight into their background.

**TABLE 3**

**SUPERINTENDENTS' EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Total Experience (N=237) (%)</th>
<th>Experience As an Administrator (N=238) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>19 8.0</td>
<td>73 30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>67 28.3</td>
<td>79 33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>92 38.8</td>
<td>35 14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>27 11.4</td>
<td>10 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more years</td>
<td>31 13.1</td>
<td>11 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No previous experience in education</td>
<td>1 .4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No previous experience as administrator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30 12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The educational level of this group provided further insight into their background.
In investigating the occurrences under which these superintendents were employed, these findings established that more than 90 per cent of the superintendents held the Master's degree. Their immediate past occupational experience is presented in the following table.
TABLE 5

POSITION HELD BY NEW SUPERINTENDENT PRIOR TO ASSUMING SUPERINTENDENCY IN DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>(N=239)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent in another district</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or coordinator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary principal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary principal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary teacher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University graduate student</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of these data reveals that none of the Ohio superintendents were elementary teachers before assuming the superintendency. The twenty instances reported were all from Illinois where the number of elementary districts dominate all others. From these data it seems that the clearest path to the superintendency is to have already been a superintendent or to be closely associated with central office or secondary level
administration. In only a few instances (13%) were the superintendents chosen from the teaching faculty.

One measure of the success of the selection system might be established by whether or not the superintendent planned to remain in the district for the 1967-1968 school year. Board members indicated that in 91.8 per cent of the cases reported, the superintendent would be in the district the second year; only 7.3 per cent of the superintendents were leaving. The extent to which conclusions can be drawn from these responses is yet uncertain. However, responses to the question concerning overall superintendent "turnover" in the districts could serve as additional data for the topic.

Two-hundred thirty-seven board members responded to the question: "How many superintendents has the district had since 1956, including the person employed for the 1966-1967 school year?" as follows:
TABLE 6

NUMBER OF SUPERINTENDENTS IN DISTRICT
SINCE 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>(N=237)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With almost 98 per cent of the respondents indicating that the district had five or fewer superintendents, and 54.9 per cent noting from three to five superintendents, it seems clear that while nearly all the new superintendents were expected to be in their district for the second year, it was probable they would not experience a long tenure in the top administrative position in the district in question.

Extent and scope of the occurrence

The data collected on the PIR about the use made of consultants by boards of education was designed to "trigger" Phase II and Phase III of the study. Item No. 29 on the PIR (see Appendix A) asked the board respondents to identify consultative aid the board received in the recruitment and selection of the superintendent.
While a wide range of choices was available, the key parts of the item were sections No. 3, No. 4, No. 5, and No. 6. Responses to these sections implied the board had invited the participants to take part in the search for the superintendent and raised the possibility of a retainer being paid by the board of education. From the two-hundred thirty-nine responses to this item, twenty-eight indicated that university professors had been employed by the board, none stated that a management consultant firm had been retained, five boards noted the use of a private teacher/administrator placement agency, and twenty-three referred to receiving assistance from a professional association. The fifty-six replies represented 23.4 per cent of the total Phase I responses and were used as the basis for Phase II and Phase III of the study. Four of the fifty-six were discarded because of insufficient information concerning the individual who assisted the board.

Table 7 reveals the type of district responding to the PIR in each state and the number of consultant-using districts reported by each district type on the PIR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type and State</th>
<th>Respondents (N=239)</th>
<th>Retained Consultants (N=52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempted Village</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint-Vocational</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there was no planned attempt to isolate the characteristics of the districts which used consultants as compared with those which did not, it was noted that thirteen of the twenty-one Ohio districts which used consultants were the city type. Since there is not a similar classification of district type in Illinois, a review of the support information in the Directory of Illinois Schools pointed out that except for two instances all the districts had a professional staff in excess of twenty-five teachers and in several cases the
faculties numbered in the hundreds. The most important fact revealed by this table concerns the extent to which consultants were used by school districts in the search for new superintendents. The fifty-two cases reported by boards of education represent more than 20 per cent of the total number of responding districts which selected new superintendents. Realizing that this group was concentrated in city districts in Ohio and the larger districts in Illinois, the point becomes clear that the distribution of this phenomenon has limitations both in number and scope.

A second portion of the data was concerned with the general use of consultants in school districts and especially the extent to which this use was applied to the matter of personnel recruitment and selection. The board respondents reacted to an item concerning the use of consultants in various situations. Table 8 reports the responses to this question.
### TABLE 8

**EXTENT TO WHICH CONSULTANTS FROM OUTSIDE THE SCHOOL DISTRICT HAVE BEEN RETAINED DURING PAST TEN YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>(N=292)*</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Recruitment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Development (in-service)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Services</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Building Needs Studies</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Reorganization Studies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants have not been used by the Board</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Several respondents indicated consultant use in more than one area which accounts for the N being in excess of the total responding districts to the PIR.

The replies to this item established that the school building program exceeds all other areas in the extent to which outside assistance is sought by boards of education. However, it should be realized that "Architectural Services" will be a high frequency item since this is typically required by law in a building program.
On the other hand, the "School Building Needs" response does represent a voluntary activity by a board of education and is the second most frequently mentioned activity on the list.

In pursuing this line of thought at the Phase II level of activity, essentially the same set of items was placed before the boards except that several parts of the question were restructured and the time factor in the item related to consultant use since the superintendent for 1966-1967 had been employed. The responses to the item are reported by Table 9.

**TABLE 9**

**EXTENT TO WHICH CONSULTANTS FROM OUTSIDE THE SCHOOL DISTRICT HAVE BEEN RETAINED BY THE BOARD SINCE SUPERINTENDENT WAS EMPLOYED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>(N=59)*</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Recruitment (including a superintendent for 1967-1968)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Programs for Professional and/or Non-Certificated Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Business Management Study</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Building Needs Study</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Study</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Survey of the District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Negotiations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants have not Been Employed by District Since Superintendent was Hired</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Several respondents indicated consultant use in more than one area which accounts for the N being in excess of the total districts responding to the Phase II instrument.
The major conclusion drawn from a comparison of the data on Table 8 and Table 9 is that the area of school plant is the major aspect of school activity where outside consultants are used. The question to be probed from these findings is the extent to which a "ripple effect" in consultant use is developed when the service is used by a board in one or more areas. This could serve as a basic question upon which the area of consultative influence on board of education decision-making patterns could be investigated.

Nature of the occurrence

A point of investigation related to this objective of the study was the ways in which boards of education established contact with consultants and especially how the initial suggestion or idea to seek out the services of consultants originated. In Phase II, the question was raised concerning the source of the original suggestion to use consultants in the recruitment and selection of the superintendent. The findings are reported in Table 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>(N=38)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-Going Superintendent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member From Another District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent From Another District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers From the District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens From the District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Association Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor or Placement Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings point out that board members are the prime source of the influence to use consultants. The question of how the association between the board and the consultants was actually established follows the same pattern as the source of the thinking to make use of consultative service. Table 11 reports the responses of board members in Phase II to the question of how the boards contacted consultants; Table 12 reports responses from the consultants to the same type item.
### TABLE 11

PROCEDURES FOLLOWED TO ESTABLISH CONTACT BETWEEN BOARDS AND CONSULTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>(N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Contacted Consultants</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-Going Superintendent Contacted Consultants for the Board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Official Contacted Consultants for Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants Contacted Board</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A point emerging from these findings is that the role of the out-going superintendent does not seem to be as important as that of the board of education in the selection of a successor. The consultants' responses to the same type of item reinforcing the position of the board are shown in Table 12.
TABLE 12
CONSULTANT RESPONSES TO PROCEDURE FOLLOWED TO ESTABLISH CONTACT WITH BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>(N=48)*</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Contacts Me</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Contact Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-Going Superintendent Contacts Me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Consultant Contacts Me</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University Official Contacts Me</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one pattern of contact usually followed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Several respondents indicated contact procedures in more than one area which accounts for the N being in excess of the total number of consultants in the sample.

The pattern evolved from the three previous tables identifies the process of developing the board-consultant association as being one in which the board of education is the dominant force.

There is little reason to question the legitimacy of this fact; there is reason to investigate the formal and informal decision making influence the consultants have in this climate.

One of the important dimensions of the relationship between boards and consultants was the amount of time these two groups
worked together. An item in the Phase I instrument requested the respondent to indicate the amount of time which elapsed between the point when the board knew a new superintendent had to be selected and the actual election of one of the candidates. With the collection of these responses, it was possible to ascertain the general time span which elapsed in the recruitment selection process. In order to pursue this thought further, the respondents in Phase II were requested to identify the amount of time the consultants had spent in working with the board in the search for a superintendent. In Phase III, the consultants noted the amount of time they typically worked with a board of education. The responses to these three items are reported in Table 13. From the data, it is possible to identify the time arrangements around which consultants and boards actually collaborated in the recruitment-selection activity.
TABLE 13

TIME REQUIRED IN ALL DISTRICTS (PHASE I) TO EMPLOY NEW SUPERINTENDENT COMPARED TO BOARD REPORTS (PHASE II) AND CONSULTANT REPORTS (PHASE III) OF AMOUNT OF TIME THE TWO GROUPS RELATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time</th>
<th>Phase I (N=237)</th>
<th>Phase II (N=41)</th>
<th>Phase III (N=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a month</td>
<td>38 (16.0)</td>
<td>7 (17.1)</td>
<td>11 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 months</td>
<td>61 (25.8)</td>
<td>13 (31.7)</td>
<td>7 (21.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 months</td>
<td>79 (33.3)</td>
<td>11 (26.8)</td>
<td>13 (39.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6 months</td>
<td>29 (12.2)</td>
<td>7 (17.1)</td>
<td>2 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 months</td>
<td>30 (12.7)</td>
<td>3 (7.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the Phase I and Phase II portions of the data reveals that the boards involved consultants almost as soon as the need to replace the superintendent was known. It also becomes apparent that more than half of the selections are made by the end of the fourth month after such a need is established. Additionally, as reported by the Phase II respondents, the consultants were involved with the board mainly up to the four-month period. While the report from the consultants in Phase III tends to vary somewhat at the level of two months or less, the degree of participation reported by consultants is in agreement with the Phase I and Phase II data. The fact which can be drawn is that the consultants are involved
with boards for approximately the same amount of time as the board is actively engaged in the recruitment process. This implies high priority for the board-consultant relationship since the influence of consultants is typically felt early in the recruitment stage and thus should be carefully investigated to assess its impact on the selection of the superintendent.

A key factor about the involvement of consultants and boards in superintendent recruitment and selection was the cost for the service. It was determined in planning the study that one of the crucial factors in identifying a consultant was the "invitation to serve" extended by the board and the payment of a retainer. It was quite possible for a consultant to serve without a fee being paid, but there would be no question of the formal relationship between the board and consultants if a retainer were involved.

To draw out cost information, a Phase II item requested a reply to: "What was the cost to the Board for the services of the consultants?" The responses from the thirty-three individuals who replied to the item are reported in Table 14.
TABLE 14
BOARD RESPONSES TO COST OF CONSULTATIVE SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>(N=33)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 to $600</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$601 to $900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$901 to $1200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1201 to $1500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1501 to $1800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1801 to $2100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $2100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 14 reveal that in terms of total operating budgets for schools today, the cost for consultative service is not a great expenditure for the district when it is viewed as a part of the total budget of the district.

In addition to the question of the general cost to the board for the consultant's services, the Phase II respondents and the consultants were asked to react to items about the determination of the retainer paid to the consultants. The board members were asked: "On what basis was the consultants' fee determined?" and the consultants were asked: "How is your fee determined when you
work with a board in recruiting a superintendent?" The replies to these items are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

BOARD AND CONSULTANT RESPONSES TO BASIS FOR CALCULATION OF CONSULTANT RETAINER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Determination</th>
<th>Board Response (N=35) (%)</th>
<th>Consultant Response (N=32) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per cent of Superintendent's Salary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per diem Plus Expenses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per diem Including Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Rate Plus Expenses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Rate Including Expenses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Negotiated with Each Situation</td>
<td>*N/A</td>
<td>*N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item not asked of Board Respondents

Six board members did not respond to this particular item and six consultants also declined to answer. In spite of these instances, it is important to recognize that none of the replies indicated that the superintendent's salary was the base against which the fee was calculated. In conversation with several
individuals who have served as consultants in the recruitment of a superintendent, they indicated that this practice could be considered as being unethical and suggested the "reputable" consultants would probably avoid its use.

A comparison of the responses from the two groups revealed that the most widely used technique for determining the fee structure is a base amount, per diem or a flat rate, plus expenses incurred by the consultant. The consultants' responses concerning the fee base being negotiated with each situation was not explored but would imply that an individual might adjust his fee according to the particular situation of the district involved.

Another matter relating to finances was concerned with the services the boards of education provided the consultants. These were thought of as being the aids or support systems a consultant might expect to receive when working with a board of education. The responses to items by the board respondents and the consultants about services provided by the boards and services expected by the consultants are reported on Table 16.
TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY BOARDS AND SERVICES EXPECTED BY CONSULTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Board Provided</th>
<th>Consultants' Expect to be Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>( %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Mailing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space and Equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the expectations of the consultants about the services they felt should be provided exceeded what the boards of education reported should be made available. This difference does point out the need for a clear understanding between them early in their association of the services to be provided as part of the fee structure. It is quite possible, for example, that the board of education members are responding in terms of services
they feel are provided in addition to the fee structure for the consultants and the consultants may be reporting services which are a part of the "plus expenses" portion of their retainer.

**Operational relationship of boards and consultants**

A determination of the working relationship between the boards and consultants was considered an essential part of the research since the data could establish the ways in which the two groups interacted.

In order to develop this line of inquiry, the board respondents in Phase II were asked to identify the number of consultants who actually worked with them in the recruitment of the superintendent. Table 17 reveals that in thirty-seven of the forty-one instances of consultant use, three or fewer consultants were retained by the board. In fourteen of the forty-one cases, only one consultant was used.
TABLE 17
NUMBER OF CONSULTANTS RETAINED BY BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Consultants</th>
<th>(N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a closing item on the Phase II instrument, the board members responded to an open-end question about the value of the association between consultants and boards of education. The twenty-four respondents felt that the funds expended for consultative service brought a satisfactory return. They expressed the view that the value of the relationship with the consultants was mainly in the screening of applications and credentials.

Part of the item dealt with the question: "Does it make any difference how many consultants work with the Board?" Those who responded spoke directly to the "numbers" question and indicated that three was probably the largest number which should be retained by a board. Their reasons centered around the managerial
problems which could arise if more are involved. It was of particular interest, however, that attention was drawn to the importance of having the consultative group composed of representatives of more than one college or university. Several respondents made this specific point and supported their view with the reasoning that such an approach made it possible for the board to be in contact with a more diverse group of candidates than if the consultative team was from one institution exclusively.

To arrive at a compilation of views on the same topic, the consultants were asked to respond to an open-end item pointing directly to the question of their assessment of the team approach as opposed to the single consultantship. Thirty-one of the thirty-seven consultants responded to the item and without exception supported the team concept. Their views were based on the idea of the broad coverage of the field and the value of consensus among the consultants in advising a board of education. Several noted that the team approach also could serve as a means for developing confidence with the board and the community in their recommendations. Several consultants indicated that the technique of using one consultant rather than a team did have the advantage of being less time consuming. However, this was the only advantage cited for the single consultantship and all respondents
identified the team approach as their initial preference in working with a board of education. In addition, several respondents made the point that the team should be composed of individuals representing several institutions or groups. A school board association official recommended that a team be composed of an ex-superintendent, a professor, and an association representative. The only other specific recommendation about the composition of the team was made by several professors who suggested that at least three universities be represented to provide a wide range of applicants to the board.

In order to investigate further the ways in which these consultants interacted with the boards of education, several aspects of the relationship were probed in the three phases of the study. The question of interviews with the applicants and the influence of consultants was covered by a series of items to which the board respondents in Phase II and the consultants in Phase III replied. The board members in Phase II were asked to identify the number of applicants that they requested the consultants refer to them for the final board of education interviews. The data in Table 18 indicate their responses to the item.
TABLE 18

NUMBER OF APPLICANTS BOARD REQUESTED
BE REFERRED BY CONSULTANTS
FOR FINAL INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Applicants</th>
<th>(N=40)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from this information that the boards requested to see three or more candidates for their final interviews.

The responses of the consultants as shown in Table 19 to the question: "How many applicants do you usually suggest the board have for final interviews?" makes it possible to compare their views on this point with those of the board respondents.
The major fact drawn from these two tables is the nearly complete agreement between boards and consultants concerning the number of applicants which should be involved in the final interviews. Other questions appropriate for further investigation can be drawn from activity and decisions made prior to the final interview process. How have the five candidates presented by a consultative team to a board for interviews been selected? To what extent has the selection been a cooperative venture between the board and consultants? To what extent have the consultants in effect "selected" the superintendent?
As a follow-up to the item concerning the number of applicants board members requested be referred to them by the consultants, the question was asked: "Was the superintendent you employed from the group recommended for final interviews?"

Thirty-four respondents, or 82.9 per cent of the total, indicated that they had employed the superintendent from the recommended group. In the seven instances where the board had not employed from candidates presented by the consultants, five board members declined to comment on their action and two others indicated that the candidate did not accept the position when it was offered.

A point at which board-consultant interaction could have a direct bearing on the status of the new superintendent was that of the contract issued for the superintendent's first year.

Table 20 is the report of the contractual status of all the new superintendents reported in Phase I.
TABLE 20

LENGTH OF CONTRACT FOR ALL SUPERINTENDENTS 1966-1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Years</th>
<th>(N=229)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings establish that first year superintendents almost exclusively received contracts for three or fewer years.

It is quite possible, however, that these original contract terms could have been reviewed and revised after completion of superintendant's first year in the district.

To probe the area of contract conditions for new superintendents, the consultants were asked to respond to items related to their activity on this topic. The first item concerned whether or not the consultants actually made contract recommendation as a part of their activity. Their responses are shown in Table 21.
TABLE 21.

CONSULTANT RESPONSES TO OFFERING SUGGESTIONS ABOUT LENGTH OF CONTRACT FOR NEW SUPERINTENDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>(N=34)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but only if requested to do so</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These responses point out that the consultants do view advising on the matter of contract as a part of their role and do offer advice to the boards. In nearly 80 per cent of the responses to this item, the consultants indicated that they did offer contract term advice. The only qualification was that in 17.6 per cent of the cases, advice was given only when requested by the board of education.

The board respondents in Phase II were asked to identify the consultants' suggestions about the term of the superintendent's initial contract on scale from one to more than five years. There was a provision in the item for the respondent to note if the consultants did not make a recommendation. Following the tabulation of these data, the contract terms, as described on the PIR, were then reassembled for the Phase II districts and compared with the
contract suggestions made by the consultants. This comparison is shown in Table 22.

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF BOARD REPORTED CONSULTANT SUGGESTIONS ABOUT TERM OF SUPERINTENDENT'S CONTRACT WITH ACTUAL CONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Consultant's Suggestion (N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Actual Terms of Contract (N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No suggestion made by consultants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these data it can be seen that there is some agreement at the three-year contract level between the suggestions of the consultants and the contractual facts but little agreement with the previously reported data (see Table 21) in which the consultants reported at the 80 per cent level that they typically offered contract suggestions to boards. It might be that the perception of a
suggestion or recommendation by the consultants apparently was not viewed in the same light by the board of education respondents. However, it was apparent that the boards and consultants were not widely inconsistent where recommendations by the consultants were reported by the board members. There was no attempt to establish a cause-effect relationship on this item but the influence factor could be a viable point of departure for further investigation.

Another element of the superintendent's employment conditions which had implications for board-consultant interaction was the salary the superintendent was paid his first year in the district. The consultants were asked to respond to an item, as reported in Table 23, concerning their activity in the salary area. In response to the question: "Do you usually make suggestions to the board concerning the salary range in which the superintendent should be paid his first year?" their replies were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTANT RESPONSES CONCERNING OFFERING SUGGESTIONS ABOUT SALARY FOR NEW SUPERINTENDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but only if requested to do so by the board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further probing into the influence of the consultants was made by asking the board members in Phase II to identify the salary range of the superintendent who had left prior to the 1966-1967 school year and identify the suggestions, if any, made by the consultants concerning the salary of the new superintendent. The results of these two items are reported in Table 24.

**TABLE 24**

**COMPARISON OF SALARY OF OUT-GOING SUPERINTENDENT WITH RECOMMENDATION OF CONSULTANTS FOR SALARY OF NEW SUPERINTENDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Out-going Sup't. Salary</th>
<th>New Sup't. Salary Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=41)</td>
<td>(N=41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $12,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,001 to $14,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,001 to $16,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,001 to $18,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,001 to $20,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $20,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No suggestion made</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures, as reported by board respondents in Phase II, reveal an inconsistency in the views held by the consultants and
board of education members. Earlier in Table 23 it was shown in more than 90 per cent of the instances that there was a recommenda-
tion by consultants about salary. However, the board respondents note an absence of recommendation in 43.9 per cent of their re-
ported instances. It might be, that as with the topic of contract term, the perceptions of what constituted a recommendation was unclear to the board of education members. Further study could clarify the impact of consultants in this particular area. Attention should also be given to data revealing that there were twenty-seven cases of salary reported for the out-going superintendent up to and including the $16,000 to $18,000 range whereas the consultants' suggestions as reported by the board members showed only fifteen instances in the same range.

Another element of the recruitment and selection process brought into the study was the assessment of the applicants for the superintendency. Included in this line of thought were items such as the interviews with applicants and the status of the consultants in the development of interview items, the use of written tests as a part of the evaluation process, and the methods of notifying candidates of their status in the selection process.

Data collection in this area was initiated with the board members at the Phase I level responding to items concerning the
development of the job specifications and the recruitment brochure which might have been utilized in searching for the superintendent.

The first item was directed explicitly at the job description which could have been used to guide the board in assessing various applicants--or in making some decisions about the type of person needed in the superintendency. The question, which was based on the assumption that there was a job description and that it was revised, generated the data shown in Table 25.

**TABLE 25**

**BOARD IDENTIFICATION OF PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR REVISING JOB DESCRIPTION FOR SUPERINTENDENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Job Description</th>
<th>(N=236)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-going superintendent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators in district</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job description and qualifications not revised</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No job description and qualifications for superintendency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The board members identified themselves in Phase I as the group primarily responsible for the status of the job description,
An analysis of the "Other" classification produced evidence that the consultants were involved at this point.

Another element of the boards' recruitment process concerned the development and use of a recruitment brochure as a tool for announcing the vacancy and presenting information about the district. It was anticipated that evidence in this area would, as in the case of the job description, show the presence of outside influence on the utilization of a brochure. The results of the Phase I replies are shown in Table 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOARD IDENTIFICATION OF PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RECRUITMENT BROCHURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-going superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other administrators in district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochure not used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important to note that in the instances where a brochure was used, its development was directed mainly by the board members as was the preparation of the job description. Of equal interest is that in more than half the cases reported at the Phase I level, there apparently was no attempt to employ the brochure as a recruiting technique.

In Phase II, items were developed about candidate assessment to determine the extent to which board members perceived action by the consultants. Of particular interest are the responses to the items concerning the final interview and involvement of consultants in this activity. Table 27 reveals board member responses to the question of the development of final interview questions and topics; Table 28 reports data on the responsibility for evaluating the applicants in the final interview.
TABLE 27

BOARD IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TOPICS AND QUESTIONS FOR FINAL INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Final Interview Topics</th>
<th>(N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and consultants jointly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-going superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No special topics or questions used in final interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dominant position of boards of education is established by these data. Although there were eleven instances where board respondents reported joint consultant-board action, there was also reference in more than half the instances to just board of education action.

Data about the responsibility for evaluating the candidates in the interview are presented in Table 28.
TABLE 28

BOARD IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATING APPLICANTS IN FINAL INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Evaluation of Applicants</th>
<th>(N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-going superintendent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The impact of these two tables is seen in the comparative influence of boards of education and consultants on the interviewing process. As reported by the board of education respondents in Phase II, the boards retain prime influence in this activity and receive assistance from the consultants in the development of the items for discussion in the final interview. It would appear that a viable area of further inquiry could be developed on the informal influence exerted by the consultants in the area of interviewing and candidate assessment. This same dominant posture was maintained by the boards in notifying applicants of their status in the selection scheme. The responses shown in Table 29 to the question: "Who notified the unsuccessful applicants that they
had not been selected?" further illustrated the position of the board in the overall interview process.

**TABLE 29**

**BOARD IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR NOTIFYING UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS THAT A SUPERINTENDENT HAD BEEN EMPLOYED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Notification of Unsuccessful Applicants</th>
<th>(N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board member</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-going superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board clerk or secretary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful candidates not notified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that in more than 75 per cent of the instances reported, the boards controlled this aspect of activity through their direct action or that of the board clerk.

An additional element of the area of applicant assessment open to investigation concerned the use of written tests to evaluate candidates. Since the researcher had previous experience in a testing situation, and at least one article in Chapter II made reference to this technique, it seemed that this was a useful area to
explore in terms of the process involved and the potential for board-consultant interaction.

An item was presented to the board respondents in Phase II as follows: "If used, who selected the 'paper and pencil' tests in the screening process?" The responses are in Table 30.

TABLE 30

BOARD RESPONSE TO RESPONSIBILITY FOR SELECTION OF WRITTEN TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Selected By</th>
<th>(N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and consultants jointly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written tests not used</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data reveal that the use of "paper and pencil" tests was not a widely employed practice. This item was followed by a question concerning the purpose of the written tests, if they were used, as perceived by both the board respondents and the consultants. A comparison of their replies is presented in Table 31.
TABLE 31

PURPOSE OF WRITTEN TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Board (N=40)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Consultants (N=34)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial screening of applicants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final screening prior to last interview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of superintendent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written tests not used</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings are important as a substantiation of the information in Table 30 which indicated a limited use of testing. It is revealed, that when used, tests are a part of the screening process and are not used to make the final selection. In a follow-up item to the initial question asked concerning whether or not the consultants used a written test, an item was developed to identify the nature of such a test. Of the six consultants who replied in a positive manner to the use of tests, one indicated that a standardized test was used but did not identify it by name or type. One other respondent indicated that the self-constructed instrument was utilized to match the attitudes of the applicants with those of the board of education.
Regardless of the variety of approaches to the testing question, the data gathered from the board respondents in Phase II point out that tests were not widely utilized in the cases related to this study. At the same time, it is also evident that the individuals who served as consultants to these boards did not encourage the use of testing to any great extent.

In order to pursue another dimension of board-consultant interaction, items were included on the Phase II and Phase III instruments to investigate the use of participants other than the boards of education and consultants in the recruitment and selection process. The board respondents in Phase II were asked to identify which individuals or groups, other than the consultants, took part. Their replies are shown in Table 32.
TABLE 32

BOARD REPORT OF GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS OTHER THAN BOARD AND CONSULTANTS WHO TOOK PART IN RECRUITMENT-SELECTION ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-going superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators from district other than out-going superintendent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers from district</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens from district</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator from another district</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers from another district</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association official</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university officials</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only board and consultants took part</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings point out the extent to which boards do use individuals other than the consultants in the selection of the superintendent. These same respondents were then asked to identify the source of the suggestion to seek this additional advice. Their replies are presented in Table 33.
**TABLE 33**

**SOURCE OF INITIAL SUGGESTION TO BOARDS TO SEEK ADVICE FROM INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS OTHER THAN CONSULTANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-going superintendent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators from district other than out-going superintendent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers from district</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens from district</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator from another district</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers from another district</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association official</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university officials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table it appears that the consultants represent the major source of influence on boards to use advice from other sources. Space was provided for narrative replies to the "Other" area in the question and several respondents pointed out that board of education members from other districts made the initial suggestion concerning additional participants.
As a concluding portion to this topic, the consultants were asked:

"What groups or individuals do you encourage boards to invite as participants in the recruitment-selection activity?" Their responses are reported in Table 34.

TABLE 34

CONSULTANT REPORT OF GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS THEY ENCOURAGE BOARDS TO INVITE AS PARTICIPANTS IN RECRUITMENT-SELECTION ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-going superintendent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators from district other than out-going superintendent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers from district</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens from district</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators or teachers from other district</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and university placement offices</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association officials</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not encourage boards to invite other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The replies from the consultants reveal that other than placement office service, teachers are most often suggested
as other participants. The earlier report about other participants invited by the boards (see Table 32) indicated, however, that the teachers have not been as highly regarded for interaction with the boards as recommended by the consultants.

The concluding element of data collection from the boards of education (Phase II) was drawing responses to an open-end item about assessment of the relationship between the board and the consultants. The respondents replied that they viewed the general value of the consultantship mainly in four areas. The prime value was the ways in which consultants could save time for the board by screening applications and credentials received from candidates. The screening process was regarded as such a time-consuming task, the consultants apparently made it possible for the board to have contact with only a minimum number of applicants.

The other three areas reported by the board members were concerned with the field of applicants open to a board when consultants were used, the public-relations value of selecting a superintendent if consultants were used, and the development of a professional relationship between the board and consultants. Several board members indicated that they had made professional contacts with the consultants on other school-related problems since the superintendent had been employed.
As a closing stage to the data collection from the consultants, they also were asked to reply to an open-end item about their role in critical situations in the recruitment-selection process, e.g., final interviews, and the impact the consultantship could have on the superintendency, boardmanship, and the professorship. While the respondents, except in several instances, did not directly answer the question, their replies were consistent. They felt that the final decision on the superintendent selection must be left to the board; additionally, they supported the idea that the use of consultants should result in a "better" type of superintendent being selected by the boards because of the educative value to the board members of making use of the consultants' services.

The assessment of consultants' service

One of the most important elements of conducting this study of the consultantship was the value placed on the specific services performed by consultants. To develop a base for this line of inquiry, a listing of services or activities which might typically take place in the recruitment and selection of a superintendent was developed and then applied to the board respondents in Phase II and the consultants in Phase III. The item used in Phase II was: "Check
the following areas in which the consultants actually performed a service. The Phase III respondents were asked: "Which services do you usually perform as a consultant in superintendent recruitment and selection?" The responses to these two items are reported in Table 35.

**TABLE 35**

SERVICES PERFORMED BY CONSULTANTS AS REPORTED BY BOARD MEMBERS AND CONSULTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Board Responses</th>
<th>Consultant Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of list of qualifications for the superintendent</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request credentials from placement offices</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request nominations from educators in the field</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary screening of applications and credentials</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary interviewing of applicants</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking references of selected applicants</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending letters and forms to applicants</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in final interviews</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending one applicant to board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting home school district of selected applicants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to this list of services reveal that the major consultative service to boards is in the area of the development of qualifications for the superintendent and securing and evaluating
credentials. The consultants were shown to have only minimal formal contact with the applicants. The informal associations which might take place between consultant and candidate were not reported as being a part of the "Other" services rendered. The response to this "laundry list" type of activity in which the consultants might engage identified the prime areas of activity usually performed but it seems that the proof of the system comes from the assessment of the value or impact of the services to the recruitment and selection activity. Table 36 is the report of responses of board members and consultants to the matter of identifying the one service considered most essential and valuable.
TABLE 36

BOARD AND CONSULTANT IDENTIFICATION OF MOST IMPORTANT SERVICE RENDERED BY CONSULTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Board Responses (N=37)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Consultant Responses (N=32)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of list of qualifications for the superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request credentials from placement offices</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request nominations from educators in the field</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary screening of applications and credentials</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary interviewing of applicants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking references of selected applicants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending letters and forms to applicants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in final interviews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending one applicant to board</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting home school district of selected applicants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The agreement between the two responding groups that the "Preliminary screening of applications and credentials" was the most frequently performed service (Table 35) and the agreement that this was the most valuable service performed by the consultants establishes the point at which the consultative service is viewed as most encouraging and supportive to the recruitment and selection process.

Another base from which to assess the entire consultantship concept is the extent to which boards feel they would make use of this type of service again in searching for a superintendent. An item was drafted for board action in Phase II in which the respondent was asked to give his view about the possibility of again using consultants. The item was designed with the full realization that its value was only in terms of the respondent's view of what might happen in a future situation. However, nearly a year or more had elapsed since the superintendent had been selected and it was reasonable to expect that judgment by the board members as to the value of the service was possible. Specifically, the question was posed as: "If the Board found itself in the position of looking for another superintendent, do you think consultants would be used again?" The responses from board members are presented in Table 37.
TABLE 37
EXTENT TO WHICH BOARD RESPONDENTS FELT CONSULTANTS WOULD BE RETAINED AGAIN IN SUPERINTENDENT RECRUITMENT-SELECTION SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Use of Consultants Again</th>
<th>(N=41)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and probably the same consultants as before</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but probably a different group of consultants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 37 reveal that the board respondents supported using consultants in subsequent superintendent recruitment situations. The two "No" respondents did not elaborate on the reason for their reply. Two of those who responded "Uncertain" indicated that they personally knew of no reason why consultants would not be used in the future but felt that the actual decision should be made by the board as a whole. The third "Uncertain" respondent did not reveal his reasons for answering as he did.

More than half the respondents offered some narrative comment concerning their reply. The positive respondents to the initial
part of the item took the position that the consultative service was helpful because it served as a vehicle for screening the total number of applicants down to a workable group and thus absorbed much of the time-consuming work for the board. An interesting aspect of these narrative comments was disclosed by an Illinois board member who recalled that at the time the superintendent was selected, three of the board members were quite new to public education. He made the point that the experience with the consultants was valuable for identifying a suitable group of applicants, but also served as good "in-service" education for the entire board, and especially the new members.

The consultants

A dimension of the study concerned the consultants and, in a sense, their "credentials" for serving in an advisory role to boards of education. When the potential mailing list for consultants was being developed from the Phase I returns, it was quickly seen that the major occupational area represented by this group was in college and university service. Visual inspection and overall classifying of the Phase III mailing list indicated that thirty-three of the group were associated with a college or university, two had an address which implied employment agency
status, nine represented either state or national professional associations, and seven were designated as "other" on the basis of the mailing address. Usable responses to the Consultant's Report Form were received from thirty-seven members of this group, representing a 74 per cent return of the instrument.

During the several months following closure on all data collection, three instruments were returned but were not tabulated. A visual review of these additional returns indicated that rejecting the data which had been compiled and recalculating the returns was not justified.

To obtain base information about the consultants, specific items were designed for the Phase III instrument to collect data about: (a) current occupational or professional status, (b) educational level, (c) experience as a consultant, and (d) general experience in the field of education. The instrument to obtain the data was designed to be signed by the respondent. It was the researcher's view that at this particular level of operation there was no need to jeopardize the returns from this group by coding the instrument for respondent identification. With so much of the population representing higher education, it was expected that they would be well aware of the techniques employed in survey studies for instrument coding. The value of this information was felt
most in follow-up activity rather than as a part of the detail of
the study report.

The responses to the items of the "Consultant's Report
Form" concerned with the consultants and their background are
presented in the tables which follow. Table 38 reveals the oc-
cupational status of the consultants at the time they responded
to the Phase III instrument.

TABLE 38

PRIMARY PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
OF CONSULTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Responsibility</th>
<th>(N=37)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College or university professor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university administrator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of management consultant firm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official of professional association</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table points out that twenty-seven of the thirty-seven
respondents were associated with higher education. University
officials whose titles implied placement office responsibility were
also included in this group although the majority of the respondents
did identify themselves as professors rather than administrators.
The professional association officials were from state level school-board related or teacher-related groups. It is interesting to note that although national level officials from the American Association of School Administrators were identified as consultants, they elected not to respond to the instrument. At the same time, the state administrators' associations in the two states were not mentioned as having offered any formal assistance to the boards. A "spin-off" investigation might be to identify the assistance which could be rendered to superintendents by their state and national associations when they are seeking employment.

The "Other" respondents to the Phase III instrument were both retired superintendents who had been asked by boards of education to assist in the recruitment of the superintendent. Their role was minor as was that of the out-going superintendent.

Another factor about the consultants designed to add to the data concerning their experience and "credentials" was that of their educational background. Since 73 per cent of the group was associated with college or university work, it was understandable that the doctorate would be the dominant educational level achieved by the consultants. A precise reporting of the educational level of the thirty-seven responding consultants is shown on Table 39.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>(N=37)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's +</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents who reported in Table 38 that their prime association was with college or university professorship or administration held the doctorate; the two respondents in the "Bachelor's degree" level were represented by a professional association member and an individual employed by an architectural firm who had worked with a board in their search for a superintendent.

Of more importance was the extent to which the consultants had experience as adviser to boards of education. In order to probe the question, the group was asked to respond to items about the number of years served in all forms of consultative activity and the length of time involved with superintendent recruitment and selection. The findings of these questions are illustrated in Table 40.
TABLE 40
CONSULTANTS' LENGTH OF TIME IN GENERAL CONSULTANTSHIPS AND CONSULTANTSHIP IN SUPERINTENDENT RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>General Consultantship (N=35) (%)</th>
<th>Consultantship in Supt. Recruitment &amp; Selection (N=34) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3 8.6</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>2 5.7</td>
<td>11 32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>11 31.4</td>
<td>9 26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2 5.7</td>
<td>6 17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>17 48.6</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the service in the consultantship shown in Table 40 established that consultant service in the recruitment and selection of superintendents as a comparatively recent phenomenon when related to the general consultantship. This is revealed most clearly in the "More than 15" years range where seventeen respondents indicated general level service but only four identified themselves as part of the consultantship for the superintendency. At the same time, the entire pre-ten year area shows a higher rate of activity for superintendency-related consultantship as compared to general consultative service.
Another element considered in the consultant's background was his overall professional experience. A listing of potential employment possibilities was drawn up and the consultants were asked to indicate the group in which they had actual employment experience. Table 41 is a rank order listing of the responses to this item.

**TABLE 41**

**CONSULTANTS' OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Area</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary teacher</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university professor</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or university administrator</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school administrator</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association official</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school administrator</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent or central office staff</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with management consultant firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would appear that the consultants have suitable experience as a group to effectively relate to boards of education in
the search for a superintendent. Subsequent investigations could be held to determine if there is an experience profile which serves to classify one consultant as being "better prepared" than another to work with boards of education. Questions could be investigated such as: Are there elements of a consultant's background which make one more satisfactory than another? Is public school experience an essential element of background for a consultant to be effective?

The final element of the consultantship investigated concerned the extent of their functioning as in-the-field consultants. It was felt that this information would reveal the degree to which the consultants represented a singular aspect of activity or were participants in a wider range of professional service. The device used to gather these data was an item on the Phase III instrument where consultants indicated the number of times they had been retained in a consultative situation since January, 1966. The data are reported in Table 42.
### TABLE 42
CONSULTATIVE ACTIVITY OF CONSULTANTS
SINCE JANUARY, 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultative Situation</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendency recruitment and selection</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School building needs study</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive survey of a district</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs for professional or non-professional staff</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board policy development</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional negotiations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and/or business management study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would appear that the prime activity of the group involved in Phase III was as consultants for superintendency recruitment and selection. While these findings are somewhat inconsistent with earlier data about the most widely used forms of consultative service, they do point out that the group in question seems to concentrate in the superintendency recruitment and selection area. It would be interesting to discover if there are classes of consultants who typically relate to one type of problem as opposed to another.
If this were true, the findings would have special meaning for preparation programs for professors and for staffing patterns in university departments.

Concluding remarks

The data presented in this chapter represent the information collected which relate directly to the objectives of the study. The summary of these data and their implications and related recommendations are discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Organization of the chapter

The content of this chapter relates to the substance of the survey findings reported in Chapter IV. However, the initial portion of the chapter will consist of a review of the survey process followed in the study and an assessment of its effectiveness for the research effort. The dual aspect of reporting on process and content is important since the strength of the content can be evaluated in terms of the quality of the process by which it was developed.

Process review

The problem investigated in this study was the phenomenon of educational consultants relating to boards of education in the recruitment and selection of public school superintendents. To probe the research topic, a problem-seeking descriptive survey was utilized to identify the status of the problem and provide data for the development of viable research on the topic. The research
design was comprised of three phases. The first phase was constructed to collect data about the employment procedures for superintendents and identify school districts which utilized the services of educational consultants in their search. From the Phase I findings, the researcher identified the boards which had retained consultants and the consultants these boards employed. The plan of the latter two phases was to conduct an in-depth probe into the operational relationship between the boards of education and consultants.

The research was carried out with the boards of education in Ohio and Illinois which had employed a new superintendent for the 1966-1967 school year. Data were collected by mailed questionnaire from all respondents. Data collection instruments and cover letters were reviewed by a panel of university-related educators and members of the profession in the public schools prior to dissemination.

An important element of the research technique was the utilization of the new superintendents in the project. The Phase I mailing was initially sent to the superintendents with a request that they deliver a questionnaire and cover letter to the board of education president. It was anticipated that this technique would serve the dual purpose of informing the superintendents about the
study, although they were not asked to supply data, and add a sense of legitimacy to it with the board of education presidents since they received the material from their superintendent and not directly from the researcher.

The data were treated to produce frequency and percentage figures for the responses to the items on the three instruments. This manner of treatment made it possible to analyze responses to specific questions and make comparisons between the replies to similar items by the board of education members and the educational consultants.

**Process analysis and recommendations**

A large part of the selection of strategies for conducting a research effort was couched in relating alternative plans to the problem being investigated. In view of the absence of data on the topic of this study, it seemed appropriate to use the survey method for data collection. It would be highly desirable, and is thus recommended, that subsequent investigations in this area utilize the techniques of case study, in-depth interviews, and the testing of hypotheses drawn from these data to provide more information about the existing and potential impact of educational consultants in the field of education.
Considerable attention was given to protocol in conducting the study. Board of education members were the source of two-thirds of the data; consultants provided the other one-third. The superintendents were not solicited for data but rather served as 'entree' into the school districts and the board of education presidents. This technique seemed to "pay off" in that nearly 90 percent of the boards of education responded where the superintendents indicated that they had given the board of education president the study materials. Sensitivity to keeping the superintendents aware of the existence of the study was recognized and the level of success as expressed by board response would indicate the goal was achieved.

The "phasing" concept of data collection with the board of education members and consultants was based on the idea that it was necessary to identify the sample of boards which used consultants before in-depth data collection could be effected. However, the Phase II rate of response (79%) and that of Phase III (73%) would indicate that the identification of these two steps as parts of a total schema received positive reaction from the respondents. Subsequent investigations could, however, attempt less structured data collection activity with boards of education to determine if there are techniques which are of
particular value over others in collecting data about highly sensitive activities of boards of education, e.g., the selection of a superintendent, professional negotiations.

A critical element of the study was the characteristics of the population which would be the data source. The districts which had selected a new superintendent for the 1966-1967 school year were utilized because (a) these individuals were currently in their first year as superintendent and (b) the board members would be in a position to make judgments about the service received from the consultants. If the sample had been drawn from prior years, it was quite possible that the responses of the board of education members would be adversely affected by the time span between the fact of selection and the collection of data.

The states selected represented another dimension of the research effort. Ohio was chosen because the researcher had knowledge about the state's public school situation and thus was familiar with the districts involved. However, this level of familiarity was not extended to Illinois and it was utilized as a secondary data source on the recommendation of others. In essence, the selection of the states was done on the basis of recommendations and not because of some unique element which made them more attractive for the study than others. It is
recommended, therefore, that replications of this study be con-
sidered in states where specialized conditions, e.g., profes-
sional negotiation, teacher strikes, etc., might affect the use
of consultative service by boards of education in personnel matters.
Data from these efforts might assist in the clarification of the im-
pact consultants could have on local school operations and point
out the effects of these unique conditions on local board of educa-
tion operation.

A discussion of the substance of the research findings as
related to the objectives of the study, comprises the following
portions of this chapter.

**Background information summary**

The data collected in this portion of the study were drawn
from the Phase I instrument, the Preliminary Information Record
(PIR). The information presented is classified in two main cate-
gories. The first is the conditions surrounding the need to
appoint a new superintendent; the second, the applicants for the
position.

Phase I findings revealed that in 37.1 per cent of the cases
where a new superintendent was employed, the need to make this
appointment arose because the incumbent resigned to accept a
position in another district. The second most frequently-mentioned reason (21.5%) for replacing a superintendent was his retirement. While these two facts are central regarding resignation, the board respondents also noted in 13.1 per cent of the cases that the superintendents did not have their contracts renewed.

Applications for the positions followed a pattern of thirty or fewer written applications being received in more than 80 per cent of the cases. Of all applications received, 54.9 per cent originated outside the school district and 69.3 per cent of the new superintendents came from outside the district. Although the majority of applications and individuals employed were not on the faculty of the employing district, 84.4 per cent of the new superintendents were in the state (Ohio or Illinois) the year immediately prior to taking the superintendency in question.

The superintendents employed by these districts had prior experience in education and also experience as administrators. Only 12.6 per cent had no previous experience as an administrator. More than 33 per cent had six to ten years as an administrator before taking the superintendency in the study. An additional 30.7 per cent had one to five years of administrative experience.
The report of the educational level of the superintendents revealed that only eight per cent of the group held less than the master's degree. The doctorate was held by 17.1 per cent of the superintendents.

The data about the positions held by the superintendents prior to taking the assignment for the 1966-1967 school year revealed that 32.2 per cent held a superintendency prior to being elected to the new position. The assistant superintendency was held by 15.9 per cent of the group and the secondary principalship by 15.5 per cent. Nearly all of the 11.3 per cent who held elementary principalships and the 8.4 per cent who were elementary teachers became superintendents in Illinois where there are separate elementary districts.

Superintendent tenure data revealed that in 91.8 per cent of the cases the superintendent would remain in the same assignment during the 1967-1968 school year. These data were gathered in early and late summer of 1967 so it would seem that they were accurate in their projection for the next school year.

Background information reactions and recommendations

The information reported in the "background" portion of the study has meaning for the research topic and especially for
subsequent investigations of problems revealed by the data. The reasons for the need to appoint new superintendents should be further investigated to determine if unique conditions do exist in public education which affect the voluntary tenure of a district superintendent. Items such as the following could be investigated. Does the status of professional negotiations affect superintendent tenure? Does the "climate" of the community relative to education and community involvement affect the superintendent's status? What critical incidents take place in districts which are instrumental in causing superintendents to be released? Are there significant aspects of superintendent turnover which could be influenced by the state or national administrators' associations?

Additional areas for subsequent study might be developed out of the data pertaining to the background of the superintendents employed by these districts. Studies could be initiated to test the influence of consultants and other forces outside the district on the superintendent who is employed. Can differences between the "quality" of superintendents employed by similar districts be quantified and related to the recruitment and selection procedures followed by the boards of education? What conditions prevail which lead more boards to go outside their districts for a superintendent rather than employ from the district staff?
These points suggest areas for further study on the topic of superintendent employment. Variables identified from the data can be assessed in other surveys or in experimental investigations where specific hypotheses can be tested.

Content summary

This portion of the chapter deals exclusively with the substance of the research findings related to the objectives of the study. Each part of the chapter contains a summary of the findings relative to the objectives, the researcher's views of the implications of the findings, and recommendations. A closing statement will be presented as the final item of the chapter. Each subheading for the chapter will reflect the basic concept of the objective being discussed.

Extent and scope of the occurrence--summary

An aspect of the study which prompted investigation was the extent to which the phenomenon being investigated was taking place in the public schools. Recognizing that the data presented in this report speak only for the 1966-1967 school year in Ohio and Illinois, the matter of "extent" was reported as follows.

In the two states, three-hundred ninety-three cases were identified in which a new superintendent was employed. From
this population, two-hundred thirty-nine responses were received at the Phase I level of data collection. It was ascertained that consultants had been used in fifty-two of the instances where new superintendents were employed. This represented a percentage of 22.1 of the Phase I returns. Within this group, it was revealed in Table 7 that the city school districts in Ohio utilized consultants more than any other type. The structure of districts in Illinois differed enough that a similar form of analysis of the returns was not feasible. A review of the district types did indicate that the majority of those from Illinois using consultants had at least twenty-five or more faculty members. This point is illustrative of the district type involved since there are such a great number of small elementary units in the state. In addition, most of the non-respondents to the PIR were represented by districts with a faculty of less than twenty-five members.

Another part of the "extent" question was concerned with the degree to which the use of consultants was a typical activity for boards of education. Two-hundred ninety-two respondents to the PIR noted that they had prior experience with the consultant-ship in their districts. More than 47 per cent of the responding group indicated that architectural services represented the most frequently used form of consultative service. At the Phase II
level, the boards of education which used consultants indicated that since the superintendent had been employed, the major area of consultative action was in school plant. It should be noted that in Phase I, 18.2 per cent of the respondents indicated that consultants had not been used by the boards for any purpose at all and 56.1 per cent of the Phase II respondents noted that they had not used consultants for any purpose since the superintendent had been employed.

**Extent and scope of the occurrence--implications and recommendations**

Several interpretations can be developed from the findings of this portion of the study. The "extent" factor is of interest in the research because it is data on an unknown element which prompted the undertaking of the study. There is no evidence to suggest reasons for the pattern of using consultants which was revealed, but the researcher would expect that factors such as the past experience of districts with consultants, fiscal ability, the political arena in which the schools function, and proximity to a university would affect the extent to which the consultants were utilized.

The long range implications of these findings leads the researcher to conclude that subsequent research efforts are in order to attempt a close investigation of the district types which
utilized consultants and the factors which prompted these boards of education to utilize this service. If factors making consultant use feasible were identified by district types, it might be possible to design methods of board of education instruction which would result in increased use of outside help in matters other than school plant related projects. It has become a common trend, especially in federally-funded activities, for school districts to invite consultants to serve for a variety of reasons. Efforts should be extended to identify the uses of such outside groups which are the most beneficial to the educational community.

Nature of the occurrence—summary

The data collected on this aspect of the study isolate some of the parameters of the phenomenon under investigation. A starting point for data collection was the source of the suggestion to make use of consultants in the recruitment and selection of the superintendent. In responding to an item in Phase II, the board of education members indicated that in 78.9 per cent of the cases they were the source. They also pointed out that in 10.6 per cent of the instances, the out-going superintendent originated the suggestion. These same board respondents further established that they contacted the consultants in 73.2 per cent of the cases.
This level of board of education control of the initial phase of developing a board-consultant relationship was corroborated by the consultants who indicated that in 78.4 per cent of the cases in which they worked with a board, they were contacted by the board initially concerning serving as a consultant.

The time factor in the board-consultant relationship was another element providing data about the association between these two groups. From the Phase I returns it was noted that in more than 75 per cent of the cases, not more than four months elapsed between the time a need to elect a new superintendent was determined and the actual employment. In more than 75 per cent of the situations reported from Phase II, the consultants worked with the boards for up to four months. In their Phase III replies, the consultants indicated that in nearly 95 per cent of the instances where they work with boards of education, they do so for four or fewer months.

A point of interest about the overall board-consultant relationship was the cost to the boards for the services of the consultants. The Phase II replies to an item on this point revealed that in 54.4 per cent of the cases the cost was $600 or less. In only 9.1 per cent of the districts was the cost in excess of $2100.
The circumstances under which this cost was determined received attention from both the board respondents in Phase II and the consultants in Phase III. The board members reported that the most common base on which cost was determined was per diem plus expenses. The consultants concurred with this finding by noting in 46.7 per cent of their replies that the structure under which their fee was determined was the same as that identified by the board members. Both groups noted that the formula of per diem including expenses was the second most widely method followed for calculating fees.

A part of the discussion related to the occurrence and its cost was the services provided for the consultants by the boards of education and the services the consultants in turn expected to receive. In response to a listing of potential services, the board members ranked travel (39.0%), postage and mailing (31.7%), and telephone (26.8%) as the services most frequently provided to consultants. On the other hand, when replying to the question of the services they expected to receive, the consultants ranked postage and mailing (75.7%), telephone (75.7%), and travel (75.7%) as the three services they felt should be provided for them by boards of education. Secretarial service was ranked in second position by the consultants.
Nature of the occurrence—implications and recommendations

The data presented about the nature of the occurrence was designed to relate to the framework within which phenomenon took place. Interpretation of the findings leads to the conclusion that the process of board of education-consultant interaction is one in which the boards dominate and control activity. Reports by board of education members about the initial suggestion to use consultants and the method for contacting consultants as compared with the consultants' comments about the source of their contact with boards clearly established the basis for this conclusion. However, there was no particular reason to suggest that this situation would be any different. We would expect boards of education not to relinquish their role in superintendent selection nor would consultants encourage boards to transfer this role to them. It might be interesting, however, to study the views of educators and community leaders about the influence of teacher militancy and civil rights action on the executive selection process. It could be more important for the future of education to understand the potential effect of these power blocs on superintendent selection than that of the invited consultant.

A measure of the utilization by boards of education of consultative service was drawn from the data about the time
these groups worked together. The degree to which boards and consultants related indicated that board members recognized that assistance, when it is sought, must be received early in the search process. It seems that the extent of agreement between the consultants and board members on this matter should reinforce the concept of "lead-time planning" in the use of any form of consultative assistance. The cost to boards of education for the service of consultants varied and it would be helpful for boards contemplating using consultants to make prior judgment about the quality of service they might receive for the dollars spent. It would also be important to develop a form of assessment for board-oriented, professional associations to ascertain the extent to which they could adequately provide services as a part of their support function for member boards of education. The data presented here illustrate board of education control over the use of consultants. Unless the cost for consultative service increases drastically, it would appear that this service will not become an excessive fiscal burden for boards of education.

The most far-reaching recommendation drawn from this part of the research is for the development of a cost-benefit analysis system for consultative situations. The findings of this type of effort could offer insights into the question of the immediate
and long-range value of all types of consultative service to public education.

**Operational relationship of boards and consultants—summary**

The initial data reported in this section were concerned with the number of consultants who had worked with the boards of education. The Phase II respondents indicated in 90.2 per cent of the cases, three or fewer consultants were utilized in the search for a superintendent. None of the boards used more than five consultants; only four indicated the use of four or five.

Information about the interaction between the boards of education and the consultants was developed around data reporting the stages of operational activity in the recruitment and selection program. Board respondents (Phase II) revealed that in 55 per cent of the cases they requested the consultants to refer five candidates for final interviews. In 59.4 per cent of the responses from the consultants, they reported that their typical pattern was to refer five applicants to the boards. In only one instance did the board respondent indicate a request was made to see just one candidate; none of the consultants reported that he typically referred only one or two candidates to the board. Board respondents (Phase II) reported that in 83.9 per cent of the cases they employed the
superintendent from the group referred to them by the consultants.

Two conditions receiving specific attention in the data collection were the superintendents' contract and salary conditions. From the Phase I returns of the PIR it was determined that 56.3 per cent of the superintendents received a one-year contract; 15.3 per cent a two-year contract; 25.3 per cent a three-year contract; and 3.1 per cent either a four- or five-year contract. The consultants' suggestions were that 34.1 per cent of the superintendents should receive a three-year contract; 14.7 per cent, either a one- or two-year agreement; and 4.8 per cent, a four- or five-year contract.

When replying about whether or not they typically made recommendations on contract terms, 61.8 per cent of the consultants responded in the affirmative and another 17.6 per cent replied likewise but with the qualification that the recommendation would be made if the board so requested. Negative replies to the question were made in only 20.6 per cent of the reported cases.

There was some inconsistency in the data comparing the board responses to the recommendation on contract terms made by the consultants and the actual terms of the contract which was granted. In 46.3 per cent of the instances reported (Phase II),
the respondents indicated that no recommendation was made about contract terms. The actual contract terms as reported in Table 22 showed that in 29.3 per cent of the instances reported, a one-year contract was granted, a two-year contract in 22.0 per cent of the cases, and a three-year contract for 43.9 per cent of the superintendents. The problem of inconsistency might be couched in board perceptions of what constituted a recommendation by the consultants. With nearly 80 per cent of the consultants indicating that they expected to make recommendations, it seemed highly unlikely that such action was not taken in 46.3 per cent of the cases reported in the study.

The responses from consultants about salary recommendations followed the same pattern as that on contracts. More than 76 per cent of the consultants indicated that they did make salary recommendations. An additional 14.7 per cent replied that they made recommendations upon request by the board. Only 8.8 per cent noted that they did not make recommendations. In Phase II, 43.9 per cent of the respondents indicated that salary recommendations were not made by the consultants. With only 8.8 per cent of the consultants reporting that they did not usually make salary recommendations, it seems that clarification of the nature of a recommendation is needed for both parties to
accurately determine if the consultants have made an impact in this area.

A comparison of the salary paid to the out-going superintendent and the recommended salary for the new superintendent provided data revealing several major facts. First, in 43.9 per cent of the cases as reported in Phase II, no recommendation was made by the consultants. Secondly, by comparing the salary ranges for the out-going superintendents with the cases where recommendations were made by consultants, it was shown that 34.1 per cent of the superintendents were in the $18,000 and above salary range while only 28.5 per cent of the recommendations were at this level. However, 46.3 per cent of the superintendents received salaries of $14,000 and below while only 12.2 per cent of the salary recommendations for new superintendents were in this range. Recognizing some form of "slippage" with the high number of cases where no suggestion was reported, it still indicates that at least the suggestions or recommendations for salary were nearly equal to what was paid in the higher ranges and exceeded the record of past salaries in the lower ranges.

Additional data reported on other areas of potential interaction between the consultants and boards of education. In Phase I, the board respondents revealed that they, at a 55.5 per
cent, were mainly responsible for the revision of the job descriptions used in the recruitment-selection process. However, in nearly 25 per cent of the reports, it was noted that either the job description was not revised for the search for the superintendent or the board did not have one. The same form of information was revealed about a brochure being used as a recruitment device. In 51.3 per cent of the Phase I reports, the respondents indicated that a brochure was not used. In 20.7 per cent of the replies, however, the board members identified themselves as having the prime responsibility for development of the brochure when it was utilized.

Data concerning the interview climate and the involvement of both the boards of education and the consultants were developed from the three levels of inquiry. In Phase II, the board respondents indicated in 58.5 per cent of the instances that they were responsible for the development of the topics and questions for the final interviews. The consultants were identified as performing this role in only 7.3 per cent of the reported instances; consultants and board members cooperated jointly in 26.8 per cent of the cases. Evaluation of the applicants in the interview was reported as a board responsibility at the 92.7 per cent level and at the 7.3 per cent level for consultants. No other groups or individuals were reported as being "officially" involved with assessment of the applicants.
The absence of written tests in the evaluation of applicants was reported in 80.5 per cent of the Phase II replies. When tests were utilized, both board members and consultants identified their major purpose as: "Initial screening of applicants."

"Final screening prior to last interview" was identified at the same level by the consultants but by only one board member as being the purpose for testing.

The involvement of individuals or groups other than the boards and consultants in the recruitment and selection was established from the Phase II replies. Other than the board of education and consultants, the out-going superintendent and college or university officials were most often identified as being participants.

It is possible that in some cases a college or university official was reported as an outside influence and as a consultant. However, the most frequent response was that there were no participants other than the consultants and boards of education.

Narrative comments from the consultants and board members about the consultantship revealed that board members saw great value in the consultants as a public relations device and as the means for developing a working relationship with the university community. The consultants felt that a major outcome of their influence would be the ultimate selection of "better" superintendents
although there was no elaboration on this point by the Phase III respondents.

Operational relationship of boards and consultants--implications and recommendations

The board respondents in Phase II reported that they utilized consultants in groups of three or less. Larger groups were used in less than 10 per cent of the cases reported and indicates that either the boards felt that smaller groups were most appropriate or the consultants were available mainly in smaller groups. Concern by boards over the cost of a large group of consultants might also be a factor in size of the consultative unit. On the other hand, the consultants did report in narrative form that they considered the unit of three to be optimal. It could be inferred that their influence on the size of the consultative group is probably the controlling factor. These findings imply that the unit of three or fewer consultants was the most workable from both the board and consultant viewpoint.

Board of education and consultant interaction was reported in the recommending of applicants for final interviews with the board. Both the consultants (Phase III) and board of education respondents (Phase II) indicated they considered five as the optimal number of applicants who should be invited for final interviews with
the board of education. This position seems reasonable and showed where boards and consultants did cooperate effectively. The implication of this degree of agreement is that boards would, however, have the opportunity to only relate to five applicants. If this situation were accepted as a "given," there would have to be a clear understanding between the board and consultants about the criteria to be utilized in screening candidates. Thus, there might be value in developing studies to identify the views of consultants and board of education members about the qualifications which should be exhibited by superintendents. If views differed widely on the subject, the use of consultants could be questioned on the basis that they do not represent the values held by the boards of education and community. Whether or not this might be a good climate for the use of consultants would have to be determined by the parties involved.

The data concerning involvement of consultants in contract and salary conditions provided challenging information. Consultants reported that they typically made recommendations in these areas more often than the board respondents (Phase II) indicated they were received. It appears that there was considerable "slippage" on these items in terms of identifying a true recommendation from a casual suggestion. Enough consultants indicated they
usually made such recommendation that it would seem this could be an area for case study to determine whether or not consultants do have specific impact on the employment conditions of superintendents. It might be found that consultants prefer to exercise influence in subtle ways so as not to be accused of interfering in the decision making of the boards of education.

The topic of interviewing candidates reinforced the concept of board dominance of the recruitment situation. The data revealed that board members were the prime developers of topics followed in interviews and controlled the final evaluation of applicants. These conditions would be expected, as with contract and salary, because a board could be strongly criticized if it did not have control at these points. In line with the suggested studies concerning the consultant's influence in contract and salary determinations, attempts should be made to identify the ways in which consultative influence is felt at the interview and assessment levels.

The findings concerning the status of job descriptions and recruiting brochures represent areas where consultative influence was shown to be minimal. Board members indicated they were mainly responsible for the revision of job descriptions and recruitment brochures. However, in more than half the cases reported, brochures were not used and in 25 per cent of the instances the
job description was not revised or did not exist. Allowing for some reporting problems on what constituted a job description, it still seems that good personnel practices dictate that job descriptions are important for positions at the level being considered in this study. If such written guides were not developed, there would be reason to judge that the views of the board of education might often directly conflict with those of the superintendent about appropriate role expectations of each.

The items about the formal testing of applicants revealed limited activity in this part of the recruitment and selection program. The probable reason is the absence of instruments considered suitable by consultants and boards of education. Unless attempts are initiated to review the testing field and identify materials for use, it seems that there will be little change in the current situation. It would appear that with testing being utilized in the business world, it might be appropriate for educators to investigate the availability of specific instruments for use in the critical area of superintendency recruitment and selection both at the level of induction into training programs as well as entry into the field.

The impact of individuals or groups other than the board of education and the consultants in the recruitment and selection
program was shown to be minimal. The data indicated that except for boards and consultants, the out-going superintendent was involved more than any other individual. These data could mean that neither the consultants or board of education members expressed interest in bringing others in on the selection activity. One can raise serious questions, however, as to how long this situation will prevail. With the current impact of organized teacher groups on educational policy making, the interest of civil rights pressure groups in education, and the general desire of the public to become involved in educational matters, it would appear that the operational latitude of boards might be quite different in the future. Thus, an interesting role could be proposed for the consultants. Are they a buffer between these pressure groups and the board of education or do they help the board live within the framework devised by these pressure groups? The implications for these and other questions should receive attention in considering the most appropriate role for the consultants to take as they relate to boards of education in superintendency recruitment and in other areas.

The final area discussed relative to the relationship between the boards of education and consultants was the perceived "value" of the service rendered by the consultative group. Board
respondents expressed the view that much of the value of the consultants was in their public relations impact as well as in helping save considerable time in analyzing credentials. The latter item will be discussed in the following section of the chapter but the public relations matter raises some questions. If public relations is viewed as a major contribution of the consultants, then a program for evaluating the services provided by the consultants should be initiated. There might be conditions present in the districts, e.g., the dismissal of the previous superintendent, which require special expertise of the consultants. On a long-range basis, the public relations service may be the most essential contribution a consultant can make to a board of education and community. The consultants should not legitimatize improper action by boards of education but if they assist a board in maintaining confidence with the community, then the service is vital to the well being of the school district.

Assessment of consultants' service--summary

The topic of assessment was based on the identification of the services most frequently performed by the consultants. Board respondents (Phase II) and consultants (Phase III) indicated from identical lists the services they perceived as being performed by the consultants. Board members (33) and consultants (30)
mentioned "Preliminary screening of applications and credentials" as the service most frequently rendered and the one which was of greatest value in the recruitment-selection process. The consultants also ranked "Development of list of qualifications for the superintendent" at the same rate (30) while board members identified this item as the second most frequently observed service.

Some difference was noted in "Checking references of selected applicants" where board respondents identified this item in twenty-one cases and consultants in twenty-eight. Another range of difference was seen when sixteen boards responded to "Participating in final interviews" and only eight consultants recognized this particular service.

The question about boards using the services of consultants again in superintendent recruitment and selection received a positive response in 87.8 per cent of the Phase II replies. However, in 17.1 per cent of these replies, the "Yes" was qualified with the provision that the service would probably be requested from a different group than the one which served for the 1966-1967 selection period. On the negative side, 4.9 per cent of the respondents noted that their board probably would not use consultants again; 7.3 per cent were "Uncertain" as to whether or not consultants would be utilized in search for another
superintendent. Narrative comments related to these responses revealed that the board members saw great value in consultative service in the amount of time it could save in the preliminary elements of recruitment, e.g., screening applications, requesting credentials from placement offices.

The final point relative to assessment was probed through open-end items in Phase II and Phase III about the most desirable size and composition of the consultative team. Nearly all board and consultant respondents favored the team concept and replies clustered around the number of three as the most workable group size. The only advantages listed for the single consultant was that it opened the possibility of receiving the services more rapidly than with a group and could be a factor in reducing the cost to the board of education.

Assessment of consultants' service--implications and recommendations

The replies of both the board respondents (Phase II) and the consultants indicated that the "Preliminary screening of applications and credentials" was the most valuable service rendered by the consultants. This position may have been taken by both groups since they saw it as the device by which the views of each could be most effectively implemented. Certainly the board of education
members had perceptions of what they wanted in their new superintendent; consultants had views about what qualities a good superintendent should exhibit. The most effective way for these two groups to exercise their respective attitudes is to have a mechanism for screening applicants who do not fit prescribed qualifications. Support for this view can be drawn from the fact that the consultants recognized the item of "Development of list of qualifications for the superintendent" as their second most important function. It seems clear from the findings that the consultants are relating more to the boards of education rather than the applicants. It would, however, be important to know if the consultants do interact with the applicants at an informal level so as to better assess their true impact on the quality of leadership personnel in the schools.

The most revealing data from this section indicated that boards of education expressed a high degree of willingness to utilize the services of consultants in another recruitment and selection program. It can only be surmised that the attitude is an expression of satisfaction with the service received. It should be noted, however, that these data apply only to the boards reporting a positive response and do not speak for the boards which have not used consultants. If consultative service is valuable to boards of education, efforts should be undertaken to make the
service available to more units requiring such assistance. Perhaps state level professional associations could provide service to their patrons; universities might look to their field-service role and encourage a closer working relationship between the public schools and higher education.

Board respondents (Phase II) and consultants (Phase III) indicated that the team concept of the consultanthip was the most satisfactory since it gave broader coverage from which to draw candidates and made the combined talents of more consultants available to the board of education. The implication which can be drawn from this finding is that boards should make every effort to utilize the services of teams of consultants regardless of the activity being undertaken. It can be recommended that when boards of education elect to utilize consultants, they consider the value of the service they anticipate receiving and select on that basis rather than the fee charged. If boards find that they are not able to afford the services of consultants, attempts should be initiated for the state to build in foundation program funding to assist boards. If the service is valuable, it should not be denied to boards least able to pay for it--they perhaps need the assistance more than others.
The consultants—summary

Data concerning this group were compiled from the thirty-seven Phase III instruments returned by the fifty-one consultants initially surveyed. A part of the Phase III plan was to develop descriptive data about the consultants to provide base information from which subsequent studies could be developed to assess their role and influence in the recruitment and selection of superintendents.

The data concerning their backgrounds revealed the following facts. Nearly 75 per cent were primarily associated with a college or university as a professor or administrator. More than 78 per cent of the group held the doctorate. All those who indicated an affiliation with higher education as their prime occupational setting held the doctorate. Less than 10 per cent reported only the bachelor's degree; those individuals indicated an association with professional organizations as their main occupational status.

The extent to which the respondents had experience as consultants was revealed in two portions of data. The first pointed out that 54.3 per cent had been consultants in various types of educational activity for more than eleven years. However, only 29.4 per cent indicated they had been consulting in the area of superintendent recruitment and selection for eleven years or more. The data from these two items indicated that in comparison
to the total consultative experience of the respondents, service in
the area of superintendent recruitment and selection had taken
place more frequently in the previous ten years than eleven or
more years ago.

In addition to data about the consultants' current employment
areas, information was gathered concerning their past employment
circumstances. A ranking of responses to a list of positions
showed that more consultants had prior experience as a secondary
school teacher than in any other area. The second most frequently
mentioned position was that of superintendent of schools. Ex-
perience in higher education as a professor was third. The least
mentioned employment areas were those of elementary school
administrator and assistant superintendent.

The extent to which this group performed in a consultative
role was determined by the consultants responding to a question
concerning the number of times they had functioned as a con-
sultant within the eighteen months prior to the collection of data.
Because of what might have been a lack of clarity in the item, a
quantification of the responses was not effectively achieved.
However, total responses to the item made it possible to ascertain
that consultative activity related to the recruitment and selection
of superintendents was most frequently mentioned.
The consultants—implications and recommendations

It was clear even before the Phase III instruments were distributed that the consultants were a university-oriented group. The reason for this can probably be found in the fact that the public schools have traditionally gone to the universities for assistance rather than to private firms, except for architectural services. Since the availability of outside assistance has not come from non-university related consultative units, the long range implication is that the public boards of education will continue to utilize the services of university-oriented consultants. Also, because of the degree of satisfaction expressed by the boards of education in the services already received, there does not seem to be much evidence to suggest that they should look elsewhere for professional assistance.

The qualifications of the consultants seemed clearly established by the number that held doctorates and had been consulting for the past ten years. It could be concluded that the group represented a high degree of sophistication for the task and suggests that they continue to be utilized in a consultative role by the public schools. If the main source of consultative service continues to be the universities, attention should be given to the specialized preparation of professors who might make field-service as their major activity in the institution.
General recommendations

Throughout the last two chapters, suggestions and recommendations based on the research findings have been made both on the relationship between boards of education and consultants and about items or topics suitable for subsequent research. The intent of this portion of the chapter is to present broader recommendations drawn from the data gathered in the research effort. These recommendations will, to some extent, be extensions and summarizations of the comments made in the text of the report relative to additional research efforts and specific consultative relationships which might be carried out in the public schools.

Recommendation 1

Boards of education should increase their efforts to utilize the services of educational consultants in areas including and in addition to the recruitment and selection of administrative staff. The data presented in this study indicate that consultants can serve to bring new insights into problem areas as well as function to save valuable time for the boards in planning their decision making pattern.
Recommendation 2

Efforts should be made by boards of education and consultants to develop and test the effectiveness of consultative teams composed of educators and individuals from outside the profession. Tradition has dictated the consistent use of university professors as consultants; serious thought and action should be made to utilize expertise from outside the profession on various problems related to education.

Recommendation 3

Replications should be made of this study to determine if there are factors present in other states or regions which make the utilization of consultative aid for superintendency recruitment and selection a more or a less accepted procedure. Factors such as legal restraints on expenditures of public funds, the strength of state school board associations, and the level of teacher militancy might be elements which could affect the status of the activity.

Recommendation 4

Longitudinal studies should be initiated to assess the effects of consultative assistance. Do the boards which use consultants seem to obtain "better" superintendents than those who do not?
Are there marked advantages from a public relations point of view, or others, which become apparent after a period of time if consultants are used? Can some form of quantification be developed to show whether or not superintendents employed where consultants are involved are better qualified than in other situations in similar districts?

Recommendation 5

The next logical step in the area of the consultanship and superintendent recruitment and selection is to conduct studies determining the influence of the consultants at critical decision making points. On-site case studies would probably be the most appropriate technique for the collection of relevant data. Data from such efforts would aid in the evaluation of the influence of the consultants, especially in critical decision making situations.

Recommendation 6

A topic suggested in the data on consultants concerned their status in a broader professional field. Nearly all the consultants were associated with a college or university. Substantial problems can be drawn from the impact of the consultanship on the professorship. Studies should be initiated to clarify the extent to which the consultanship can be seen as a
field service responsibility of the profession. Is there evidence to suggest that consultanthip activity by a professor either enhances or detracts from his teaching function in the university? Are there ethical questions relative to a professor functioning as a consultant, e.g., should a placement officer who has information about positions function as a paid consultant? To what extent is this form of service being extended to all school districts by the universities in a state?

Recommendation 7

An important concept drawn from the impact of consultants on boards of education is their effect on boardmanship. Analysis of the influence of consultants at critical decision making points could provide base data for development of information about the role of boards of education and the potential for a changing role because of their presence. The following questions could serve as a point of departure for such an investigation. If, as the data from this study would suggest, the consultants virtually select the entire group from which the boards of education choose the superintendent, has the board actually exercised its moral duty to the patrons of the school district? Have the conditions of modern public education become such that the "part-time"
board member is no longer a defensible concept? Does adequate policy development for school activities now require that a board of education be represented by individuals with more of a commitment to the position both in terms of their interest and actual ability to serve in the position?

Recommendation 8

Investigations should be made of methods and instruments for applying formal written testing in the selection process. There is no assurance that this is a workable or even realistic approach to selection. However, the question should be investigated to provide information to boards and consultants.

Recommendation 9

In-depth studies should be initiated to assess the reasoning of boards of education about the use of consultants. There was some indication in the data that the service was seen as a valuable public relations tool for a board. It would be well to determine if the use of consultants did receive the support of the district patrons and was perceived mainly as a public relations device by the boards of education.
Recommendation 10

Subsequent studies concerning the utilization of consultants should investigate the districts which use these services. Efforts should be directed toward identifying the characteristics of these units to ascertain if there are factors present in them which tend to influence the utilization of consultants. It would seem that special attention should be given to matters such as the wealth of the district, the character of the school district patrons, the size of the district, past experience with consultants, the conditions surrounding the need to replace the superintendent, and other similar factors. If it can be determined that the use of consultants is a valuable activity and that there are variables which make it probable for one district to use outside assistance as opposed to another, then data from these efforts could be used to develop rationale for more action by state level or national units to assist districts in securing the consultants' services. Proper utilization of consultative help might prove useful in developing patterns of equal opportunity for public school children.

Concluding remarks

As we seek to secure effective educational leadership for public education there are various factors which need to be
considered. In the current climate of public education, administrators who restrict their activities to "maintenance" functions are not effectively meeting the challenges of the present times. In the environment in which public education exists today, the administrator must exercise his maintenance role in the school district but also has to serve as an effective change-agent in the educational enterprise. No one element of training or selection is going to introduce this dual concept into the operating philosophy of every administrator. However, if the schools are ever to establish a position on the "cutting edge" of our society, concentrated efforts must be made to place the most competent individuals in administrative positions at all levels in education. This study was conceived as an attempt to present information which could have a bearing on executive leadership in the schools. The data presented here were generated by people who have experienced the effects of consultative service. The analysis of the findings has been made by the researcher with the expectation that they can serve as significant baseline data for more explicit research efforts on the topic.
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Follow-up letters
Dear Superintendent:

I am writing to you, along with more than one hundred other superintendents in Ohio, to request your assistance on a dissertation study I am conducting at The Ohio State University. My adviser for this project is Dr. W. Frederick Staub, Professor of Educational Administration.

The purpose of the study is to analyze the part taken by educational consultants in the recruitment and selection of school superintendents in the State. Since, according to the records of the Department of Education, you are new to the district this school year ('66-'67), your district is one that has been identified for possible participation in the study.

The only assistance needed from you in the project is to:

(1) complete and return the attached postcard to me, and
(2) give the Board president the other envelope in this mailing.

The envelope you give to the Board president, which you are invited to inspect, contains a:

(1) letter to the president explaining the study and requesting his cooperation, and a
(2) questionnaire which can be returned to me in the same, stamped envelope.
Thank you for your attention to this letter. I hope to hear from you soon and receive your cooperation on this project.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University

PET:gjb

Attachments

(Adjustments in wording were made for Illinois superintendents.)
Facsimile of post card sent to superintendents

Date __________________________
The Board president has received your project materials.
His/Her name, home address & telephone is:

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Home telephone __________________________

Supt. signature __________________________

School Dist. _____________________________ Co. ___________________________
Initial Letter to Ohio and Illinois Board of Education Presidents

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio

Dear Board of Education President:

Your superintendent has consented to pass along to you this material which is part of a dissertation study I am conducting at The Ohio State University. My adviser for this project is Dr. W. Frederick Staub, Professor of Educational Administration.

The purpose of the study is to analyze the part taken by educational consultants in the recruitment and selection of school superintendents in Ohio. Since, according to the records of the Department of Education, your superintendent was new to the district either immediately prior to or during the 1966-67 school year, your Board is one of more than a hundred being invited to take part in the study.

As President of the Board, the only action which you need to take is to have a present Board member complete the attached questionnaire and return it to me. It would be preferable if the person completing this form was either the chairman of the Board's selection committee or President at the time the superintendent was selected. However, if none of the present Board members meets either of these conditions, then any other member, including yourself, who was on the Board at the time of selection may complete the questionnaire.

Several weeks after the first form is returned to me, the person who completed it will receive a second questionnaire dealing specifically with the topic of educational consultants and superintendent recruitment and selection. Each of the questionnaires, the one you have now and the one that will follow, can be completed in about fifteen minutes.

At the completion of the study, the participating Boards will receive an abstract of the findings which can be of assistance in later recruitment and selection activities.
I wish to assure you that the intent of this study is only to gather information about the relationship of consultants to the recruitment and selection of superintendents in Ohio for the 1966-67 school year. While there are no embarrassing or prejudicial items on either form, the respondents and specific Boards taking part in the study will remain anonymous in the dissertation.

Please feel free to share this information with the other Board members and the professional staff of the district. I will appreciate your attention to this request and continued cooperation in the study.

Thank you for your assistance.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University

PET:gjb
Attachment

(Adjustments in wording were made for Illinois Board of Education presidents.)
Phase I Questionnaire

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION RECORD

Check (✓) or fill in the appropriate answer to each question. Make just one (1) response to each question except where more than one answer is requested.

Disregard the numbers to the left of the spaces for your check-marks; these will be used in the data processing program of your answers.

1. Name of district ____________________________________________________

2. County in which district office is located ______________________________

3. Type of district.
   (Ohio)  (Illinois)
   0) Local 0) Elementary
   1) County
   2) Exempted Village 1) Secondary
   3) City
   4) Joint-Vocational 2) Unit

4. Name and home address of the person completing this form.
   Name _____________________________________________________________
   No. & Street ___________________________________________________________________
   City __________________________, (Ohio) Zip Code ______ (Illinois)
   Home Telephone ____________________________ (area code) (number)

5. Your present position on the Board of Education
   0) President
   1) Vice-president
   2) Member, but not president or vice-president
6. Your years of service on the Board.

0) _____ 1-2 years
1) _____ 3-4 years
2) _____ 5-6 years
3) _____ 7-8 years
4) _____ 9 or more years

7. Your position on the Board at the time the superintendent for the 1966-67 school year was selected.

0) _____ President of the Board
1) _____ Chairman of the selection committee but not president
2) _____ Board member but neither "0" nor "1"

8. How many superintendents has the district had since 1956, including the person employed for the 1966-67 school year?

0) _____ 1
1) _____ 2
2) _____ 3 to 5
3) _____ 6 or more

9. How much time elapsed from when the Board knew a new superintendent was going to have to be appointed until the selection was actually made?

0) _____ Less than a month
1) _____ 1 to 2 months
2) _____ 3 to 4 months
3) _____ 5 to 6 months
4) _____ 7 or more months

10. What length contract did your 1966-67 superintendent receive?

0) _____ 1 year
1) _____ 2 years
2) _____ 3 years
3) _____ 4 years
4) _____ 5 years
11. In which of the following salary ranges was your superintendent paid during this first contract year (66-67)?

0) Less than $10,000
1) $10,000 to $13,000
2) $13,001 to $15,000
3) $15,001 to $17,000
4) $17,001 to $19,000
5) $19,001 or more

12. Which one of the following circumstances brought about the need to appoint a new superintendent for the 1966-67 school year?

0) Previous superintendent retired
1) " " " resigned to take a position in another district
2) Previous superintendent resigned to enter industry
3) " " " " " graduate school
4) Previous superintendent resigned to go into college teaching
5) Previous superintendent did not have his contract renewed by the Board
6) Other (specify) ____________________________

13. Was your 1966-67 superintendent employed in an (Ohio) (Illinois) school district or attending graduate school in (Ohio) (Illinois) the year prior to coming to your district?

0) Yes 1) No

14. How many actual written applications were received from candidates for the superintendency?

0) Fewer than 10
1) 10 to 30
2) 31 to 50
3) 51 to 70
4) 71 or more
15. Did any members of the school's staff make written application for the superintendent?

0) _____Yes  1) _____No

16. Was the person employed as superintendent from the district staff or from outside?

0) _____From the district staff  1) _____From outside the district

17. What position did your new superintendent hold immediately before coming to your district?

0) _____Superintendent in another district  1) _____Assistant superintendent
  2) _____Supervisor or coordinator  3) _____Secondary principal
  4) _____Elementary principal  5) _____Assistant principal
  6) _____Secondary teacher  7) _____Elementary teacher
  8) _____University graduate student
  9) _____Other (specify)

18. How many years of experience in education did your superintendent have when he was employed?

0) _____1 to 5 years  1) _____6 to 10 years
  2) _____11 to 15 years  3) _____16 to 20 years
  4) _____21 or more years  5) _____No previous experience in education

19. How much of this time (#18) was as a school administrator?

0) _____1 to 5 years  1) _____6 to 10 years
  2) _____11 to 15 years  3) _____16 to 20 years
  4) _____21 or more years  5) _____No previous experience as an administrator
20. What was your superintendent's educational level at the time he was employed?

0) _____ Bachelor's degree
1) _____ Bachelor's +
2) _____ Master's degree
3) _____ Master's +
4) _____ Specialist's certificate
5) _____ Doctorate

21. Will your 1966-67 superintendent be in the district as superintendent for the 1967-68 school year?

0) Yes
1) No (explain) ____________________________________________
2) Uncertain (explain)_____________________________________

22. What are considered by the Board to be your superintendent's two strongest areas? Rank your answers 1 and 2.

0) _____ Board-superintendent relations
1) _____ Public relations
2) _____ Curriculum development
3) _____ Finance and business management
4) _____ School buildings
5) _____ Relationships with teachers
6) _____ Relationships with non-certificated staff
7) _____ Pupil discipline
8) _____ Other (specify) _____________________________________

23. Who was mainly responsible for revising the job description and qualifications for the superintendency used in hiring the person for the 1966-67 school year?

0) _____ Board members
1) _____ Out-going superintendent
2) _____ Other administrators in district
3) _____ Teachers in district
4) _____ Other (specify)____________________________________
5) _____ Job description & qualifications not revised
6) _____ No job description & qualifications for superintendency
24. Who was mainly responsible for the development of the descriptive brochure of the district used in the recruitment activities?

0) _____ Board members
1) _____ Out-going superintendent
2) _____ Other administrators in district
3) _____ Teachers in district
4) _____ Community groups (specify) ____________________________
5) _____ Other (specify) ____________________________
6) _____ Brochure not used

25. What was the total cost paid by the Board for applicants to visit the district?

0) _____ $1 to $100
1) _____ $101 to $300
2) _____ $301 to $600
3) _____ $601 to $900
4) _____ $901 or more
5) _____ No costs paid by Board

26. For how many of the applicants was a visitation made to the home community and school district by Board members or others?

0) _____ 1 applicant
1) _____ 2 applicants
2) _____ 3 applicants
3) _____ 4 applicants
4) _____ 5 applicants
5) _____ No visitations made by anyone
27. In considering hiring a new superintendent for 1966-67, what two particular aspects of the total school operation did the Board feel the new person should best be able to take care of above all others? Rank your answers 1 and 2.

0) Board-superintendent relations
1) Public relations
2) Curriculum development
3) Finance and business management
4) School buildings
5) Relationships with teachers
6) Relationships with non-certificated staff
7) Pupil discipline
8) Other (specify) ___________________________

28. During the past ten years, in which of the following areas have consultants from outside the district been actually hired by the Board for service on a short-term or long-term basis. (more than one response possible)

0) Personnel recruitment
1) Personnel development (in-service program)
2) Architectural services
3) School building needs studies
4) Administrative reorganization studies
5) Curriculum development
6) Board policy development
7) Other (specify) ___________________________
8) Consultants have not been used by the Board
29. What consultative services did the Board make use of in the recruitment and selection of the superintendent for the 1966-67 school year? (more than one response possible)

0) _______ County superintendent
1) _______ Citizen committee approved by the Board
2) _______ College or university placement office
3) _______ University professor(s) employed by the Board
4) _______ Management consultant firm employed by the Board
5) _______ Private teacher/administrator placement agency
6) _______ Professional Associations such as the OSBA or OASA (specify)
7) _______ Other (specify)
8) _______ Consultants not used by the Board

30. List the name and address of individuals, firms, professional association officials, etc. you checked in the previous question.

A. ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________

B. ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________

C. ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________

D. ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________
   ______________________
31. Please add any comments concerning this study.

Thank you for your assistance.

Philip E. Tieman  
Center for Vocational & Technical Education  
The Ohio State University  
980 Kinnear Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

BE CERTAIN YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL THE QUESTIONS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE FORMS -- RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED ENVELOPE.
Follow-up Letter to Superintendents

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio

Recently you received a set of material dealing with the dissertation I am writing at The Ohio State University.

The items in the mailing, a cover letter and post card to you and a brief questionnaire for the Board president, were designed to elicit information from the Board concerning their use of educational consultants when you were employed for the superintendency of the district. As of this date, the post card indicating that the study forms have been received and processed has not been returned to me. On the chance that the original mailing might not have reached your desk, I am enclosing a duplicate set of the material for your use.

Since I am approaching the final stages of the project, it will be helpful if you can return the post card within a few days so I will know that the Board president has the questionnaire.

Even if the Board did not use the services of educational consultants when you were employed for the 1966-67 school year, the information reported back to me can still be a valuable contribution to the study.

Thank you for your attention to this letter. I hope to receive your aid in this project.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Recently your superintendent gave you a set of material dealing with the dissertation study I am conducting at The Ohio State University.

The material was designed to elicit information from the Board concerning the use of educational consultants in the recruitment and selection of the superintendent for the 1966-67 school year. As of this date, the project records show that the questionnaire delivered to you by the superintendent has not been returned to me. On the chance that the original questionnaire has been misplaced, I am enclosing a duplicate and another return envelope for your use.

Since I am now approaching the final stages of this project, it will be helpful if you can return the questionnaire within a few days. Even if the Board did not make use of the services of consultants when the superintendent was employed for the 1966-67 school year, the information you report can still be a valuable contribution to the study. When the final report is prepared, I will send an abstract of the findings for the Board's files.

Thank you for your attention to this letter. I hope to receive your aid in this project.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Second Follow-up Letter to Superintendents

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio

Dear

During June and July you were contacted several times concerning the dissertation I am writing at The Ohio State University on the topic of educational consultants and the recruitment and selection of public school superintendents. Your district is one of more than one hundred in Ohio and two hundred in Illinois selected for participation in the study because a new superintendent was selected for the 1966-1967 school year. I do apologize for making this present contact, but I would like to include the data from Akron in the study along with that from the other city districts.

Realizing that your time is limited, I am enclosing a full set of the materials from the study so you will have complete information about the project.

I am looking forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your time and effort in considering this request.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Dear

During June and July you were contacted several times concerning the dissertation I am writing on the topic of educational consultants and the recruitment and selection of superintendents. Your district is one of more than one hundred in Ohio and two hundred in Illinois selected for participation in the study because the Board did employ a new superintendent for the 1966-67 school year. I do apologize for making this present contact, but I would like to include the data from New Lexington along with that of the other city districts in the study.

Realizing that your time is limited, I am enclosing a full set of the materials from the study so you will have complete information about the project.

Although I am seeking a response to the enclosed questionnaire, a very important element of a study such as this is the reasons why people do not participate. If you choose not to take part in this project, it will be helpful if you could make a brief note of your reasons and send it to me in the stamped envelope.

I am looking forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your time and effort in considering this request.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
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Phase II Cover Letter to Board Respondents

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio

Recently you returned a questionnaire to me which dealt with the matter of educational consultants and the recruitment and selection of your superintendent for the 1966-67 school year.

As was indicated in the letter which accompanied the first questionnaire, I am now asking you to respond to the enclosed form which investigates in depth the relationship of the Board to these educational consultants in the selection of your superintendent. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope is available for your convenience.

Since this project is approaching its conclusion with this current phase of activity, I wish to express my appreciation to you and the Board members, along with the superintendent, for the assistance which has been provided to me in this study. When the dissertation is completed, I will send you an abstract of the findings for the Board's files.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
Phase II Questionnaire

A SURVEY OF EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANTS AND THE
RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENTS

INSTRUCTIONS: Check (✓) one answer to each item except where more than one response is requested.

1. How many consultants worked with the Board in the recruitment and selection of the superintendent?
   0) 1
   1) 2
   2) 3
   3) 4
   4) 5
   5) More than 5

2. What was the cost to the Board for the services of the consultant?
   0) Less than $300
   1) $300 to $600
   2) $601 to $900
   3) $901 to $1200
   4) $1201 to $1500
   5) $1501 to $1800
   6) $1801 to $2100
   7) More than $2100

3. On what basis was the consultants' fee determined?
   0) % of superintendent's salary
   1) Per diem plus expenses
   2) Per diem including expenses
   3) Flat rate plus expenses
   4) Flat rate including expenses
   5) Other (specify)
4. Check the services listed below which the Board provided the consultants. (more than one response possible)

0) ___ Secretarial
1) ___ Printing
2) ___ Postage and mailing
3) ___ Office space and equipment
4) ___ Telephone
5) ___ Travel
6) ___ Lodging
7) ___ Other (specify) __________________________________________
8) ___ None of the above

5. Who initially suggested that the Board use consultants?

0) ___ Board member
1) ___ Out-going superintendent
2) ___ Board member from another district
3) ___ Superintendent from another district
4) ___ Teachers from the district
5) ___ Citizens from the district
6) ___ Professional association official - School Bds., etc. (specify)
7) ___ University professor or placement officer
8) ___ Consultant
9) ___ Other (specify) __________________________________________

6. After the Board decided to use consultants, how was the initial contact established with them?

0) ___ Board contacted consultants
1) ___ Out-going superintendent contacted consultants for the Board
2) ___ University official contacted consultants for the Board
3) ___ Consultants contacted Board
4) ___ Other (specify) __________________________________________
7. How long did the consultants work with the Board in searching for a superintendent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0)</td>
<td>Less than a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>1 to 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>3 to 4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>5 to 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>More than 6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How many applicants did the Board request the consultants to recommend for final Board interviews?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>More than 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Was the superintendent you employed from the group recommended for final interviews?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>No (explain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What was the consultants' suggestion concerning the term of the superintendent's contract?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0)</td>
<td>1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>4 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>More than 5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>No suggestion made by consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. What was the consultants' suggestion concerning the salary the superintendent should receive his first year?

0) Less than $10,000
1) $10,000 to $12,000
2) $12,001 to $14,000
3) $14,001 to $16,000
4) $16,001 to $18,000
5) $18,001 to $20,000
6) More than $20,000
7) No suggestion made by consultants

12. If used, who selected the "paper and pencil" tests in the screening process?

0) Board
1) Consultants
2) Board and consultants jointly
3) Other (specify)
4) Written tests not used

13. If a written test was used, which of the following best describes its purpose?

0) Initial screening of applicants
1) Final screening prior to last interview
2) Selection of superintendent
3) Other (specify)
4) Written tests not used

14. Who notified the unsuccessful applicants that they had not been selected?

0) Board member
1) Out-going superintendent
2) Board clerk or secretary
3) Consultants
4) Other (specify)
5) Unsuccessful candidates not notified
15. What groups or individuals other than the Board and consultants took part in the overall activity related to the recruitment and selection of the superintendent? (more than one response possible)

0) Out-going superintendent
1) Administrators from district other than out-going superintendent
2) Teachers from district
3) Citizens from district
4) Administrator from another district
5) Teachers from another district
6) Professional association official - School Bds. Assn., Supts. Assn., etc. (specify)
7) College or university officials
8) Other (specify)
9) Only Board and consultants took part

16. Who initially suggested that the individuals or groups noted in #15 should take part in the recruitment-selection activity?

0) Out-going superintendent
1) Administrators from district other than out-going superintendent
2) Teachers from district
3) Citizens from district
4) Administrator from another district
5) Teachers from another district
6) Professional association official - School Bds. Assn., Supts. Assn., etc. (specify)
7) College or university officials
8) Other (specify)
9) Consultants
17. What was the salary of the superintendent who left prior to the 1966-67 school year?

0) Less than $10,000
1) $10,000 to $12,000
2) $12,000 to $14,000
3) $14,001 to $16,000
4) $16,001 to $18,000
5) $18,001 to $20,000
6) More than $20,000

18. In what capacity have consultants, either those involved in the hiring of the superintendent or others, been employed by the district since the superintendent was put under contract?

0) Personnel recruitment (including a superintendent for 1967-68)
1) In-service programs for professional and/or non-certificated staff
2) Finance and business management study
3) School building needs study
4) Curriculum study
5) Comprehensive survey of the district
6) Board policy development
7) Professional negotiations
8) Other (specify)
9) Consultants have not been employed by district since superintendent was hired

19. Who was mainly responsible for the development of the topics and questions used in the final interview with the applicants?

0) Board members
1) Consultants
2) Board and consultants jointly
3) Out-going superintendent
4) Other (specify)
5) No special topics or questions used in final interview
20. Who was mainly responsible for rating or evaluating the applicants in their final interview?

0) ____ Board members
1) ____ Consultants
2) ____ Out-going superintendent
3) ____ Other (specify) __________________________________________

21. Check ( ) the following areas in which the consultants actually performed a service. (more than one response possible)

0) ____ Development of the list of qualifications for the superintendent
1) ____ Requesting credentials from placement offices
2) ____ Requesting nominations from educators in the field
3) ____ Preliminary screening of applications and credentials
4) ____ Preliminary interviewing of applicants
5) ____ Checking references of certain applicants
6) ____ Writing and sending letters and forms to applicants
7) ____ Participating in final interview
8) ____ Recommending one applicant to Board
9) ____ Other (specify) __________________________________________

22. From the items you checked in #21, indicate the number of the ONE service which the Board considered the most important contribution made by the consultants.

____ # of most important contribution by consultants

Explain your answer: __________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________
23. From the total list in #21, indicate the number of the ONE item which the Board felt the consultants could have rendered their most significant service.

# of item where most significant service could have been given

Explain your answer: ________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

24. If the Board found itself in the position of looking for another superintendent, do you think consultants would be used again?

0) ____ Yes, and probably the same consultants as before
1) ____ Yes, but probably a different group of consultants
2) ____ No
3) ____ Uncertain

Explain your answer: ________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
25. Please add any general comments concerning the association between the Board and the consultants. Do you feel that the service is worth the money spent? Why? Does it make any difference how many consultants work with the Board? Why? Etc.

Thank you for your assistance
Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
Phase II Follow-up Letter

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio

During July and August you have been contacted several times with regard to the dissertation I am writing at The Ohio State University on the topic of educational consultants and their role in the recruitment and selection of public school superintendents.

I do apologize for making this additional contact but I would like to be able to include the data from your district in the study. Even if the Board did not make use of educational consultants when the superintendent for 1966-67 was employed, the information requested in the enclosed forms can still be a valuable contribution to the study.

Realizing that your time is limited and that for some reason the previous mailings may not have reached your desk, I am enclosing a full set of the study materials for your review.

Thank you in advance for your assistance on the project.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
Second Follow-up Letter

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio

Dear

Several weeks ago you returned a questionnaire to me indicating that (consultant's name) had been used as consultant when (superintendent's name) was employed as superintendent for the 1966-67 school year. In response to this fact, I sent you a second form requesting more details concerning the ways the Board and the consultant worked together in the recruitment and selection of the superintendent.

I am now in the final phase of this study and would like to be able to include the data from (name of district) in the final report. By completing the enclosed form and returning it you can be of valuable assistance in this project.

Thank you for your assistance. I hope to hear from you in the near future.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Appendix C

Phase III Material

Cover letter to consultants
Consultant's Report Form
Follow-up letter
I am writing to request your assistance in the dissertation study I am currently developing at The Ohio State University. The project deals with the matter of educational consultants and their role in the recruitment and selection of public school superintendents. Dr. W. Frederick Staub, Professor of Educational Administration, is my doctoral adviser.

The first phase of the study, which is now complete, was conducted by mailed questionnaire with the nearly four-hundred Boards of Education in Ohio and Illinois where a new superintendent was employed for the 1966-67 school year. Data were gathered about the districts, the superintendents, the general use of outside consultants by the districts, Board perceptions of "how well" the superintendents are doing, and whether or not educational consultants were employed by the various Boards when their superintendents were hired. From these data I have identified the districts where consultants were used and the names, including yours, of the professors, professional associations and their officials, and the management consultant firms retained by the Boards.

Phase II, now in progress, involves contacting the Boards which used consultants with a second instrument designed to probe the operational relationship which existed between them and the consultants when the superintendent for 1966-67 was finally selected.

Phase III, where I am requesting your participation, is directed toward the consultants identified in Phase I. The enclosed questionnaire was designed to investigate some of the attitudes and activities which illustrate how these various consultants relate to the Boards they advise in superintendency recruitment and selection programs.
Your response to the enclosed instrument will be handled as professional information. The findings will be reported in a manner such that it will not be possible to identify any one set of responses with an individual. Upon completion of the study in late 1967 or early 1968, each participating consultant and Board will receive an abstract of the findings for their files.

I would appreciate your participation in the project and the addition of any comments or impressions you might have of this effort.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Phase III Questionnaire

CONSULTANT'S REPORT FORM

Complete the following questions by checking (✓) or filling in the appropriate answer to each item. Give only one response to an item except where more than one answer is requested.

1. Name _________________________________________________________

2. Your primary professional responsibility?
   0) ___ College or university professor
   1) ___ College or university administrator
   2) ___ Member of management consultant firm
   3) ___ Official of professional association (specify title & assn.) ___________________
   4) ___ Other (specify) ____________________________________________

3. Your highest educational level?
   0) ___ Bachelor's degree
   1) ___ Bachelor's +
   2) ___ Master's degree
   3) ___ Master's +
   4) ___ Doctorate

4. Years you have served as a consultant in the schools (all forms of consultative activity)?
   0) ___ 1 - 3
   1) ___ 4 - 6
   2) ___ 7 - 10
   3) ___ 11 - 15
   4) ___ More than 15
5. Years you have worked with Boards of Education in the recruitment and selection of superintendents?

0) ____ 1 - 3
1) ____ 4 - 6
2) ____ 7 - 10
3) ____ 11 - 15
4) ____ More than 15

6. Number of years your primary professional responsibility has been in each of the following areas.

0) ____ Elementary teacher
1) ____ Secondary teacher
2) ____ Elementary school administrator
3) ____ Secondary school administrator
4) ____ Assistant superintendent or central office staff
5) ____ Superintendent
6) ____ College or university professor
7) ____ College or university administrator
8) ____ Professional association official
9) ____ Associated with management consultant firm

7. Number of instances in which you have functioned as a paid consultant in the schools since January, 1966?

0) ____ Superintendency recruitment and selection
1) ____ Curriculum development
2) ____ In-service programs for professional or non-professional staff
3) ____ School building needs study
4) ____ Board policy development
5) ____ Professional negotiations
6) ____ Finance and/or business management study
7) ____ Administrative reorganization study
8) ____ Comprehensive survey of a district (as an individual or part of a team)
9) ____ Other (specify) _______________________________
8. How is your initial contact usually established with a Board which is recruiting a new superintendent?

   0) _____Board contacts me  
   1) ____I contact the Board  
   2) ____Out-going superintendent contacts me  
   3) ____Another consultant contacts me  
   4) ____College or university official contacts me  
   5) ____Other (specify) ___________________________  
   6) ____No one pattern of contact usually followed

9. From your experience during the past two years, in which two areas do Boards seem to want their new superintendent to have his greatest skill?  Rank your reply 1 and 2.

   0) _____Board-superintendent relations  
   1) ____Public relations  
   2) ____Curriculum development  
   3) ____Finance and business management  
   4) ____School plant planning  
   5) ____Associations with teachers and others on professional staff  
   6) ____Associations with non-certificated staff  
   7) ____Pupil discipline  
   8) ____Other (specify) ___________________________

10. In which two areas do you personally feel superintendents should have their greatest strengths?  Rank your reply 1 and 2.

   0) _____Board-superintendent relations  
   1) ____Public relations  
   2) ____Curriculum development  
   3) ____Finance and business management  
   4) ____School plant planning  
   5) ____Associations with teachers and others on professional staff  
   6) ____Associations with non-certificated staff  
   7) ____Pupil discipline  
   8) ____Other (specify) ___________________________
11. In general, how much time do you spend on a "consultative case" in superintendent recruitment and selection?

0) _____ Less than a month
1) _____ 1 to 2 months
2) _____ 3 to 4 months
3) _____ 5 to 6 months
4) _____ More than 6 months

12. How is your fee determined when you work with a Board in recruiting a superintendent?

0) _____ Based on percent of superintendent's salary
1) _____ Per diem plus expenses
2) _____ Per diem including expenses
3) _____ Flat rate plus expenses
4) _____ Flat rate including expenses
5) _____ Other (specify) ______________________________________
6) _____ Base negotiated with each situation

13. If used, which of the following best describes the purpose of written tests you administer in superintendent recruitment and selection programs?

0) _____ Initial screening of applicants
1) _____ Final screening prior to last Board interviews
2) _____ Selection of superintendent
3) _____ Other (specify) ______________________________________
4) _____ Written tests not used

14. If a test is used, describe it.

0) _____ Standardized test (identify by name) ________________________
1) _____ Self-constructed test designed for local situations
2) _____ Written tests not used
15. Which of the following services do you expect to be provided by the Board when you assist in recruiting a superintendent? (more than one response possible)

0) ______ Secretarial
1) ______ Printing
2) ______ Postage and mailing
3) ______ Office space
4) ______ Telephone
5) ______ Travel
6) ______ Lodging
7) ______ Other (specify) _________________________________________
8) ______ None of the above

16. How many applicants do you usually suggest the Board have for final interviews?

0) ______ 1
1) ______ 2
2) ______ 3
3) ______ 4
4) ______ 5
5) ______ More than 5

17. Do you usually make suggestions to the Board concerning the salary range in which the superintendent should be paid his first year?

0) ______ Yes
1) ______ No
2) ______ Yes, but only if requested to do so by the Board

18. Do you usually make suggestions to the Board concerning length of contract the superintendent should receive?

0) ______ Yes
1) ______ No
2) ______ Yes, but only if requested to do so by the Board
19. What groups or individuals do you encourage Boards to invite as participants in the recruitment-selection activity? (more than one response possible)

0) Out-going superintendent
1) Administrators from district other than the out-going superintendent
2) Teachers from district
3) Citizens from district
4) Administrators or teachers from other districts
5) College and university placement offices
7) Others (specify)
8) I do not encourage the Boards to invite other participants

20. Do you suggest the use of a rating form in the recruitment-selection process?

0) Yes (include representative sample with return)
1) No
2) Yes, but only when requested to do so by the Board

21. Which services do you usually perform as a consultant in superintendent recruitment and selection? (more than one response possible)

0) Development of a list of qualifications for the superintendency
1) Request credentials from placement offices
2) Request nominations from educators in the field
3) Preliminary screening of applications & credentials
4) Preliminary interviewing of applicants
5) Checking references of selected applicants
6) Sending letters and forms to applicants
7) Participating in the final interviews
8) Visiting the home school district of selected applicants
9) Other (specify):
22. From the areas you checked in Item 21, indicate the number of the ONE service you consider to be the most important contribution a consultant can make in assisting a Board to recruit and select a superintendent.

____ # of most important contribution

Explain your answer:

23. Some consultants work by themselves with Boards while others usually function as part of a team in superintendency recruitment and selection. What are your feelings about the strengths and weaknesses of each approach?
24. I would appreciate your comments concerning the consultantship in superintendency recruitment and selection. What part should consultants take in key situations such as the review of credentials and the final Board interviews? What do you see as the long-range implications of this type of activity on the nature of the superintendency? on Boardmanship? on the professorship?

Thank you for your assistance,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Phase III Follow-up Letter

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Columbus, Ohio

Earlier this month I sent you a mailing which contained a cover letter explaining the dissertation I am writing at The Ohio State University and requesting that you assist in the study by completing the questionnaire which was included with the letter. As of the above date, the project records show that the questionnaire has not been returned.

On the chance that with the rush of activity during September the initial mailing did not reach your desk, I am enclosing a second set of items for your review and action.

Since I am now in the final phase of the study, I would appreciate receiving your responses so they can be added to the data which has already been collected.

Thank you for your attention to this request. I hope to hear from you in the near future.

Very truly yours,

Philip E. Tieman
Center for Vocational & Technical Education
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