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A SURVEY OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR BASKETBALL COACHING IN OHIO'S HIGH SCHOOLS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Only in recent years has systematic research been done in the area of evaluation of athletic coaching staffs. Winning has been the criteria by which judgment was passed. In most cases today, this is still the number one priority. The coaches themselves seem to accept this view.

Only a few researchers have ventured to look into a means of objectively evaluating coaches. Two of the more prominent examples of those that have attempted to tackle this problem are Arthur Gallon, at the University of California and Joseph Palmieri, at the College of DuPage. Their efforts have led some public schools to try to duplicate the systems used by universities and apply it at the high school level. The purpose of this study is to expand this research and relate it specifically to the high school level.

Colleges and universities have tried to face this problem through research, suggestions, and examples. Their efforts have not always been accepted by the high school administrators. The public school systems on the other hand, have an opportunity to use the techniques and knowledge gained from other studies and
develop their own evaluation systems. This research will establish a more educationally sound system of evaluation. A system of evaluating athletic department personnel by means of a comprehensive and educationally oriented system.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is to investigate the evaluation systems used in the high school athletic departments in Ohio. This is to be done by conducting a survey of Ohio's high school athletic departments. This survey will aid in the development of new concepts for the evaluation of coaches by tying together existing fragments of ideas. From this data, an example of an evaluation model will be constructed.

The Sub-Problem

The question of evaluating basketball coaching staffs can not be considered without first understanding the sub-problem of: What is the role of the coach in the high schools in Ohio? Therefore, this research will look at the coach's role in the communities' setting. A consensus of high schools will be developed that deals specifically with the question: What roles do our coaches now have?

Need for the Study

Traditionally, the evaluation of basketball coaches has been haphazard at best. Outside the institution, coaches are judged on their winning percentage. Inside the institution, coaches are judged by a variety of systems.
The modern coach has become, in many instances a frustrated figure in the complex and troubled educational world. Confusion, concerning his or her role, insecurity and changing values have created situations that have led to the abuse of coaches and students, student rebellions and even firings.

The coaching profession has undergone tremendous change in recent years. Many complex forces have affected the role of the modern coach. George Ziegenfuss, professor at San Diego State College has suggested that the effects of the "hippie movement," the Vietman war, the militant groups, Title IX legislation, student's rights, women's rights, and the changing values of society all have had their effect on athletics and the roles of coaches.

The coach in today's society obviously must reassess his role, if he is to survive this change. Don Veller points out that some have chosen to leave coaching altogether, while others have tried to endure. Because of this, the educational community must reassess their means of evaluating their coaches. The fact that so much change is taking place, in areas like teacher evaluation, student evaluation with competency-based testing, and the communities evaluation of the entire school system has forced coaches and administrators to question more closely their evaluation system. Coaches no longer should expect to be hired and fired as teachers and coaches by the same


standards upon which they have been judged in the past. Hopefully this research will enlighten athletic departments and athletic administrators as to alternative methods of evaluating their basketball staffs, and spur them to seek more progressive systems of evaluation.

Historically, according to J. Dallas Shirley,³ associate professor at George Washington University, the traditional image of the coach had a tremendous effect on what was expected of him. The coach of the 1950's was viewed as someone in complete authority, who was never questioned. He set rules on everything from haircuts to dating. The coach of this time had a prestigious role and many times was set above the rules and the rest of the school. He was presumed to have complete knowledge and respect in all areas of his program. If he said run, the players asked, "How long?" According to Reuben Frost,⁴ the coach provided leadership to the school and community in many ways. Not only was he a coach, but many times he was involved in community projects and organizations. Very seldom do the coaches of the 1970's relate to their jobs in this fashion. Coaches today, can not be packaged so neatly.

Further complication of this issue is the publicity that the term "Due Process" has received in the school systems, from teacher associations and school administrators. Even

³Shirley, J. Dallas, "Profile of An Ideal Coach," JOHPER, May 1966, p. 59

though coaching as a profession is changing, this author believes that it is somewhat safe to say that the rights of coaches, in regards to coaching, have not always been dealt with fairly. The term "Due Process" according to the National Education Association definition published by the Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals,\(^5\) refers to the procedures which must be followed in dealing with any adverse action that is brought against an individual by his employer.

Teachers currently are receiving due process from school systems, in most cases. Examples of this can be found in almost any issue of teaching journals. A November 11, 1976 statement by the Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals reviewed the rights of student-athletes when being dismissed from a team. This statement says, "Remember, due process has the following elements:

1. Prior knowledge of the rules and possible penalties.
2. Written notification of the intended action, stating the reasons.
3. An opportunity for the student to have a hearing to state the other side of the story.
4. Provisions for an appeal."\(^5\)

The coach as a teacher has a part in all of this, but as a coach he has none. This author wonders why so many groups in education have a voice in evaluation while coaches do not. The answer, in this writer's opinion, is because of the change in coaches' roles and the resulting lack of understanding that administrators have in this area.

Because the coaching profession has changed so drastically in recent years, the evaluation, philosophy and goals of the profession must also change. Coaches are accepting positions and school officials are offering positions with entirely different expectations. The expectation of developing athletic finances, expanding programs and the development of educational values can not be exhibited in a win-loss record. No longer is community pressure taken lightly. No longer are roles so easily agreed upon by either party. Therefore, no longer can the standard of a win-loss record be the only criteria for evaluation of a coach.

It is anticipated that the findings of this study will be useful to superintendents, principals, athletic directors, and basketball coaches themselves, to aid school districts in developing a more positive approach to evaluation.

Objectives of the Study

Currently athletic departments are plagued by many of the same accountability problems that education in general is facing. Over spending, a lack of a quality product and a lack of quality coaches are but a few examples of the problems faced by athletic departments. The end product of this research will aid in the development of new concepts for the evaluation of coaches by athletic departments. These new concepts will help athletic departments defend their budgets, attract quality coaches, and produce a higher quality team.

The realistic objectives of this study therefore are:

To develop a model of the role or roles of basketball
coaches within one of the three classifications of competition, by surveying athletic departments in Ohio.

To ascertain, by surveying athletic departments in Ohio what evaluation system or systems are now being applied to basketball coaching staffs in secondary education, at the three classifications of competition.

To provide an evaluation system to act as a model for athletic departments, who are endeavoring to establish an equitable means of evaluation, relating to basketball coaching staffs.

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

1. It is assumed that the school districts selected will be an accurate representation of the school districts in Ohio.

2. It is assumed that the respondents will answer the questionnaire honestly.

3. It is assumed that there will be few female respondents. With the overwhelming majority of males now holding athletic director positions, it is therefore a factor that cannot be controlled. Because of this lack of female input, a natural bias may result.

4. It is assumed that there may be differences between the philosophy, evaluation, and goals of the schools within the various classifications. If this occurs it would necessitate an alteration in the final evaluation model for each classification.
Limitations

Basically this study will be limited in three basic areas. They are:

1. The author's lack of accessibility to reliable records within athletic departments.

2. The application of data to institutions outside of the state of Ohio. It is difficult to say whether the results will be valid for schools outside of this population.

3. The responses may be limited by the ability of the coaches to answer the questionnaire. Some respondent's association with the particular athletic department in question, may limit his ability to answer the questionnaire. Also, a respondent may not have the necessary background from which to make a quality answer.
Definition of Terms

The following terms will be defined as follows for the remainder of this study, unless otherwise noted.

1. The term Evaluation, is used in the general sense, meaning the total evaluation process. Included within this meaning are the processes of evaluation by administrators, coaches, and student-athletes for contract renewal and staff development.

2. The term Administration, is taken to mean the administration, within the school that is directly responsible for the athletic department.

3. The term Secondary Education refers to high schools which include grades nine through twelve.

4. The classifications of competition in Ohio have been set by the Ohio High School Athletic Association. They are Class A, Class AA, and Class AAA.

   A Class A high school is any school that has less than 198 boys in grades ten through twelve. A Class AA high school is any school that has 199-404 boys in grades ten through twelve. A Class AAA high school is any school that has more than 405 boys in grades ten through twelve. Due to the system that the Ohio High School Athletic Association uses to classify schools, a school may be Class A for the boys and Class AA for the girls. To solve this problem all schools will be treated as if there are only the boys classifications.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study deals primarily with the role of the modern basketball coach and the evaluation process in the secondary school setting. The role of athletics in general has undergone an evolution. According to Leonard, "In small communities with large high schools, the situation is that high-school football and basketball teams may well provide the town's major entertainment." In today's culture this is not always true. This element of entertainment in the community is only one aspect of the role of coaching in that community.

Much has been written concerning the behavioral expectations of coaches in our society.

Basically, five images of coaches exist in the opinion of Thomas A. Tutko and Jack W. Richards. "They are:

1. The Traditional Coach - These coaches are the ones who are left over from the 1950's. They are few in number and even less in demand. They are characterized by a strong belief in discipline, use punitive measures and often are cruel and sadistic in nature. They do, however, have the ability to be highly organized.

2. The Nice-Guy Coach - This coach has been a reaction to the traditional coach. He is the opposite type, usually well-liked. His philosophy is that of being very flexible almost to the point of appearing weak. Experimentation is a major characteristic.

---

3. The Intense or Driven Coach - This type of coach evolved as a result of the pressures of modern coaching. Many times this style lacks composure in tight situations. He is very demanding and is constantly pushing his players. If he fails, it is taken personally.

4. The Easy-Going Coach - This coach appears lazy, but in reality, he just isn't taking things seriously.

5. The Business-Like Coach - This type of coach is fast becoming a trend of today. With the change of roles of a coach, many coaches are forced almost to look at coaching in this manner. He may be characterized by placing a major emphasis on out-thinking his opponent. To do this, he must be up-to-date in all phases of the game. He approaches the game in a calculating manner and will do almost anything to win. Generally his players feel like they are pawns and have a lack of spirit."

Within these five general types of behavior many smaller and less easily categorized roles develop. A review of the various coaching journals clearly demonstrate the many sub-roles of the modern coach. Articles can be seen each month on coaching philosophy, program evaluation, budgeting and finances, facility planning, the coach as an educator and the coach as a person involved in the production of public entertainment. These roles are handled as an extension of how the community sees their coach. How the coach responds, is his reaction to his leadership roles and coaching style.

These five images of coaching have evolved in recent years, but they do not necessarily describe the leadership role that modern coaches provide. There have been many attempts at describing the role of leadership. Early attempts started by limiting what takes place to definitions, traits or principles. These approaches obviously did not accurately describe what

was taking place, so the concept of leadership roles was expanded to styles, duties and group interacting. From this period concepts like that of Tutko and Richards became popular. More recently, a situational approach was achieved by Philip E. Gates, Kenneth H. Blanchard and Paul Hersey, where by the total environment of the leader needed to be studied to deliver successful leadership. It is now suggested by these same researchers, that an organizations' philosophy, goals, and evaluation system be specifically examined in order to be able to understand what a particular person's role is, in that organization. In order to use a situational approach to analyzing the role of the coach an understanding of the environment in which he operates is important.

A coach's evaluation, in this author's opinion is based on winning and losing and in many cases that is the only criteria for his success or failure. Suggestions made by researchers are mostly overlooked. Massengale suggests because of this unique position that the coach holds, within the academic community, he is often set apart from everyone else. "This unique position occupied by coaches in the academic bureaucracy has isolated them from their peers and created for them a game


with decidedly non-academic rules. This subculture in which coaches find themselves demonstrates different ways of thinking, feeling and acting. They have different values and life-styles."10

"The teacher-coach usually perceives his main, and occasionally his only responsibility as coaching and winning."11

How did coaches get to be this way? According to Massengale, they are a product of the American athletic system. Coaches usually come from the ranks of past players, which naturally carry attitudes of their past coaches. At the roots of this problem is the fact that the academic community has an open opposition to this coaching subculture. Massengale believes this hostility only reinforces the subculture role of coaches. Because of the isolation, coaches look at themselves as "professional coaches" and therefore, develop little loyalty to the rest of the academic world.

This major split between educators and coaches allows for little common ground of understanding between the two groups. The educators do not understand coaches and coaching, and therefore are forced to evaluate them only on community approval and in essence, winning. Because educators do not understanding coaching, coaches have accepted winning as a means of evaluation, even though they know that a good coach can still lose. From the coaches' side, coaches who function on their ability to make instant decisions can not understand why the academic


community takes, what seems like forever, to make decisions concerning their programs. These factors added to the polariza-
tion of the two groups cause the coach to accept and maintain separate roles from the academic community.

This trend towards polarization of coaches and educators has caused many problems both for coaches and for the educational system as a whole. Massengale suggests that coaches as a group, regardless of academic background are aggressive in nature, with little concern for non-coaching problems. Most teacher-coaches ignore teaching advances while they seldom miss an issue of their favorite sports magazine. Their rationale is that coaches are seldom fired for their academic reputation.

Coaches strengthen the isolation between educators and coaches by displaying open opposition to the academic community. Separation is maintained and anyone from the academic crowd dare not come in.

Coaches also have problems relating because, "Coaches are often formally educated in the field of physical education." Due to the nature of physical education instruction, in which understanding activity often replaces books as a medium for learning, there is a lack of understanding between instructors of textbook related courses and physical education instructors.

---

12Kenyon, Gerald S., "Certain Psychosocial and Cultural Characteristics Unique to Prospective Teachers of Physical Education," Research Quarterly, March 1965, pp. 105-112
In order to be an effective coach one must be concerned with many qualities. According to Dallas, Ziegenfuss, and Martin, a successful coach is like being a successful general and requires that one possess a number of personal abilities. First of which, he must have a sound knowledge of the game. Each year coaches spend much time and money attending clinics for the very purpose of keeping abreast of recent changes and innovations. Secondly, he must be able to critically evaluate himself, his players, and the game. Total dedication to this position is a necessary attribute. A third quality is that he must be dedicated not only to winning, but to the idea that he must maintain professionalism and integrity. A coach is in a highly visible position that requires both of these qualities. A fourth quality is that a good coach has to be enthusiastic toward his job and players. A weakness in this area may restrict his players and himself from reaching their potential. A fifth quality is that a coach must be able to establish discipline and maintain it. Discipline is the factor that tends to bring out the educational values claimed by athletics. These values have been part of the rationale for athletics in our educational system.

Finally an area that is overlooked when discussing the qualities of a good coach is the ability to view winning and

13 Shirley, J. Dallas, "Profile of An Ideal Coach," JOHPER, May 1966, p. 59


15 Martin, John, "An Examination of the Leadership Behaviour of Soccer from Division I and Division III," (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1979)
losing in its proper perspective. It is something that can help to maintain a coach's sanity, while at the same time give his players a good character model.

It became obvious to this writer, that there is an absence within the literature, of any statements which equated good coaching to only one factor, winning. All of the literature that was reviewed by this author, mentioned a combination of the previously discussed factors. Winning was only one aspect of the total criteria involved in being a good coach.

Existing Evaluation Instruments

Textbooks

A survey of textbooks dealing with administration of physical education and athletic programs produced little specifically on evaluation. Earlier sources such as Bucher, Scott, and Voltmer and Esslinger suggest that evaluation is an essential part of an athletic director's duties. "The quality of the athletic program is determined more by the caliber of the coaches than by any other consideration."  

_________________________  


In these same textbooks the need for athletic objectives and goals is stressed. Many objectives and goals are outlined, which then should be transformed into principles by which a coach and his program are evaluated. But a specific instrument that takes these principles and outlines, and then incorporates them into an evaluation instrument is simply not there.

In more recent textbooks, like those of Steitz,\(^1\) Resick and Erickson\(^2\) and Resick, Seidel and Mason\(^3\) a similar approach is taken. Steitz utilizes basically the same approach as his predecessors in that he states objectives, goals, and policies. However, he goes one step further and also lists a number of personal qualities and professional objectives such as, "...a sincere interest in youth, ...initiative and imagination, ...a knowledge of coaching methods."\(^1\)

In the Resick, Seidel and Mason textbook basically two pages are devoted to the role of the athletic coach. Here the author comments that a coach should teach skills, be part of the community, possess a long list of personal traits (both personal and professional) and be selected carefully by administrators. This section describes fairly well the role of the coach, it gives no mention however, of how to evaluate him.


Finally in the textbook by Resick and Erickson specific examples of evaluation instruments first begin to appear. The examples given are by Gallon, Palmieri, and Pflug, which will be presented later in this chapter. In this writer's opinion, they are good attempts at researching the evaluation problem, but they lack depth in terms of content and because of this they cannot relate to all high school systems. Therefore more research is needed in this area.

The most recent attempt is reproduced in FIGURES 1 & 2, which will be presented later in this chapter. This system is by far the most comprehensive and objective attempt thus far towards evaluating coaches. The entire instrument can be found in the Penman and Adams book.

Professional Organizations

Sources such as the Ohio Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, The State Department of Education, The Ohio High School Athletic Association, The National Council of Secondary School Athletic Directors, and The Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators all have been


23Holland, Robert, A Personal Interview determined that the Department of Education did not have an evaluation. 1979


reviewed and attest to the need for more research. Their suggestions and publications vary tremendously in quality and quantity. The publication entitled, "Criteria for the Evaluation of Local Interscholastic Athletic Programs" which is produced by the Ohio High School Athletic Association has one page dealing with the evaluation of coaches. This instrument has seven statements that are to be rated on a scale of from 0-4. The other organizations that were reviewed produced similar evaluation instruments. The Ohio Department of Education did not have any such systems. The Ohio Association of Secondary School Administrators did not have an official evaluation instrument, but they did relate to this writer examples of area high school's evaluation systems that they were aware of.

The evaluation systems reviewed from these five professional organizations ranged anywhere from an absence of an evaluation system to a system that dealt with a few aspects of coaching. The systems received from the O.A.S.S.A. were the most comprehensive systems but were inadequate because they were too specific in regards to a particular school system and therefore cannot be applied to all school systems in general.

**Current Examples of Evaluation Models**

The trend in education is towards accountability and data-based evaluations. In recent years there have been large gains in these areas. Unfortunately, there seems to be a lag with respect to these areas in athletics. It is quite obvious
that there is a need for more research into objective methods of evaluating athletic staffs. Most evaluation systems for coaches are done on the subjective level. Consequently it becomes very easy for a coach's evaluation to be based entirely on the "Verdict of the Scoreboard." It would seem that the number of wins is a very objective means of evaluating coaches, but as preceding sections have pointed out there are other factors which will affect it. Not one of the following evaluation systems reviewed by this author, felt that a coach's win/loss record was a good criteria for evaluation.

The first system that will be reviewed was constructed by Dr. Joseph Palmieri. It was felt by Dr. Palmieri that coaches should be allowed to participate in their evaluation. So working together, they developed a list of eight criteria for assessing the head coach. "They are:

1. Administrative duties.
2. Coaching.
3. On-the field supervision.
4. Recruiting.
5. Competitive event.
6. Relationships with players.
7. Coach/Administration relationships.

In assessing assistant coaches the following three criteria were constructed. They are:

1. General areas.
2. Practice areas.
3. Game duties.

The coaches are expected to provide a job self-analysis and to evaluate themselves in the criteria areas with a rating of 3 (above average), 2 (average), or 1 (unsatisfactory). Each coach is free to request other coaches and/or elected team representatives to contribute to his assessment.27

At the end of the season a meeting is held with the coach in question and the athletic director. This meeting discusses the self-assessment and goals are set for improvement.

A complete copy of the assessment questions for both the head coach and the assistant coach can be found within the previously mentioned article. Other examples of similar systems are presented by Resick and Erickson.28

A more recent attempt at solving this problem was made by Dr. Samuel H. Adams.29 He suggests a comprehensive plan for evaluating coaches that is reproduced below. (See Figure 1).

27Resick, Matthew C. and Carl E. Erickson, Intercollegiate and Interscholastic Athletics for Men and Women, Addison-Wesley, Publishing Co., 1975, Chapter 13, pp. 242-260

Name

Categories and Sub-categories

Sub-category
Rating

I. The Coach in the Profession
A. Professional Preparation
B. Educational Implications
C. Ongoing Education
D. Experience
E. Self-Evaluation

II. The Coach's Knowledge of and Practice of Medical Aspects of Coaching
A. Preparation of the Athlete for Competition
B. Health and Training Techniques.

III. The Coach as a Person
A. Personal Qualities
B. Dealings With the Team
C. Conduct in Coaching

IV. The Coach as an Organizer and Administrator
A. Organization of Practice
B. Game Management
C. Purchase and Care of Equipment
D. Finances/Budget
E. Legal Aspects
F. Evaluation
G. Recruiting
H. Rules and Regulations

V. The Coach's Knowledge of the Sport
A. Skills and Techniques and Methods of Coaching
B. Strategies
C. Scouting and Preparation for Opponent
D. Evaluation of Team Personnel

FIGURE 1
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VI. The Coach and Public Relations
   A. Communication Skills ............
   B. News Media .....................
   C. Effective Interpersonal
      Relationships ....................

VII. The Coach's Knowledge of and
     Application of Kinesiological
     and Physiological Principles
     A. Movement Analysis ..............
     B. Growth and Development .......
     C. Nutrition ......................

*Penman, Kenneth A. and Adams, Samuel A., Assessment of Physical
  Education and Athletic Programs - A Manual of Reproducing Forms,
  Allyn and Bacon, Boston, August, 1979

Average Category Rating
Sun of 7 Category
Ratings Divided by 7 = ___________________________
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________________________________________________________________________

Within this profile Dr. Adams has an assessment scale that
corresponds to each category. An example of this form is
reproduced on the next page. (See Figure 2).
I. - The Coach in the Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Professional Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coach:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. is a certified teacher.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. has an undergraduate degree major in physical education or a minor in coaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. has taken a course(s) in Theory of Coaching in the sport.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. has taken a course(s) in Fundamentals (Techniques) of Coaching in the sport.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. has taken a course(s) in Safety and First Aid.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. has taken a course(s) in Care and Prevention of Athletic Injuries.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. has taken a course(s) in officiating in the sport he/she is coaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Educational Implications
The Coach:
1. understands the role of athletics in education. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
2. knows the objectives of the athletic program. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
3. has a coaching philosophy that is in accordance with the objectives of the athletic program. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
4. effectively functions as a faculty person. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

C. Ongoing Education
The Coach:
1. has attended a clinic(s), workshop, seminar(s) or taken courses relating to athletic coaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
2. is an active member of professional associations relating to athletic coaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
3. subscribes to professional journals relating to athletic coaching. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

FIGURE 2
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D. Experience
The Coach:
1. participated as a player in the sport
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. has had experience in coaching the sport as an undergraduate (practicum in coaching, laboratory, student coaching).
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. has been an assistant coach in the sport.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. has been a head coach in the sport.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

E. Self-Evaluation
1. does an annual self-evaluation on his/her coaching ability and expertise.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. is evaluated by others (athletic director, principal, staff, players, (etc.) annually.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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More comprehensive systems like these are needed. One area that existing systems do not include is the area of student-evaluation. If faculty members, in some schools are being evaluated by students, and if athletes are supposed to be receiving the same educational values from athletics that students receive from the classroom, then why not allow student-athletes to evaluate coaches? The answer is simple, because traditionally coaches were supposed to run their teams with an iron fist and by allowing such an evaluation, it would be considered a sign of weakness. The traditional role of the coach as an authoritarian would be in direct conflict with student-athlete assessment. Today however, times are changing
and for the most part coaching philosophy has changed. Student-athlete assessment would be of value to most coaches. Many coaches seem to incorporate this form of evaluation in an informal way.

In an article by Dr. Robert Greene, he describes a student-athlete survey questionnaire, which he recommends. It is intended only as a means of aiding the coach in analysing his coaching, not as a tool for contract renewal. After a review of this instrument by this writer, one became aware of the lack of agreement between items six through ten and the scale that is to be followed. This evaluation instrument points out the need for more extensive research in the area of evaluation.

"The following categories are used:

0 - Don't know or doesn't apply.
1 - Strongly disagree.
2 - Disagree.
3 - Agree
4 - Strongly Agree.

The following checklist is then used:

1. The team is well organized.
2. The coach is effective in creating the strongest possible team, considering his player material.
3. The morale and the spirit of the team is high.
4. The coach works hard in developing the team.
5. The coach is enthusiastic for the sport and the team.
6. How would you rate the coach's oral presentations and ability to articulate?
7. How would you rate the coach's knowledge of the sport?
8. How would you rate the coach in terms of mutual respect between player and coach, lines of communication, and freedom to offer critical opinions and questions?
9. Relative to other teams you have played on or know about, how would you rate the work load in terms of time and energy, on this team?
10. Overall, how would you rate the coach of this team?"30

At the bottom of this form the athletes have room to make any additional comments that they would like.

The evaluation systems that have been reviewed in this section are examples of the attempts that have been made to evaluate coaches. The lack of quality instruments is evident in this writer's opinion.

Summary

The behavior of the coach basically falls into five general areas. They are the Traditional Coach, the Nice-Guy Coach, the Intense or Driven Coach, the Easy-Going Coach or the Business-Like Coach. These five approaches to coaching are ways of dealing with the smaller more practical aspects of coaching such as budgeting, teaching, evaluating, planning and becoming involved with the community as a whole.

One major aspect of coaching is the leadership role that the coach provides. Much work has been done to describe leadership roles by use of the Situational Leadership Theory. The Situational Leadership Theory deals with the total situation that the leader finds himself in. This theory was developed by Gates, Blanchard and Hersey and seems to describe, in this writer's opinion, the coaching leadership role.

30 Greene, Dr. Robert, "Student Evaluation of Coaches: A Step Toward Accountability," Athletic Administration, Spring 1975, p. 21
A review of textbooks in the area of athletic administration has revealed little specifically on evaluation of coaches. Professional organizations have done some research into the evaluation process of coaches, but basically it has been limited in scope. The best source of literature in this area has come from the periodicals. Several evaluation models were reviewed. Most of them were not acceptable due to the fact that they were not comprehensive enough. The role of the coach as reviewed in this chapter showed a wide variety of skills that are needed in coaching. The evaluation plans that were reviewed did not reflect entirely these skills.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter will present an overview of the methods and procedures used throughout this study which is designed to identify the present roles and responsibilities of basketball coaches in Ohio's high schools, to ascertain the evaluation systems which are most frequently employed by these school systems, and to propose an improved evaluation system. The purpose of this chapter is to provide the reader with a description of the means by which this study was conducted.

Selection of the Sample and Procedures

The population of this study consisted of secondary institutions within the state of Ohio. Ohio secondary schools were used for two reasons. First, the boundaries presented by the state lines provided an economically feasible division for this study. Secondly, the state of Ohio has a representative distribution of the various levels of secondary schools.

The sample chosen in this study was a stratified, systematic double sample of the entire population. A stratified sample was chosen because it was felt that a more representative sample was needed than could be obtained by using a random sample.

29
Van Dalen, says that, "an investigator may use a stratified random sampling to get a more representative sample. Because proportional sampling improves representativeness, a researcher may use a smaller sample."

This stratified sample was drawn from a list of all the high schools in the state of Ohio. The schools were placed on a list in alphabetical order according to the classification of size, (Class A, Class AA, Class AAA) and within the Ohio High School Athletic Association's designated districts. These figures were obtained from the Ohio High School Athletic Association.

At this point a systematic sampling technique was decided upon. A fixed interval of eight was used. This was obtained by establishing the sample at one hundred schools. The number was then divided into the 803 high schools from all the districts within the state of Ohio, thus setting the interval at eight.

By selecting at random, from a list of 1-8 starting numbers, an initial school was selected. The number that was selected was the number one. After this starting number was obtained every eighth school was drawn until there were 100 schools in the sample.

Because of the stratified technique used there were a total of 33 Class A schools, 34 Class AA schools and 33 Class AAA schools from the districts in the state.

The athletic director representing these 100 schools was sent a packet consisting of a cover letter, two questionnaires, two stamped self-addressed envelopes and a special enclosure urging the subject to respond to the questionnaire. The athletic directors were directed to answer one questionnaire himself and give the other questionnaire to the coach designated. The author designated fifty of the questionnaires to be sent to the boys coaches and fifty of the questionnaires to be sent to the girls coaches. After a three week waiting period, the double sampling technique was employed. This technique was used because the subjects in the first sample who did not respond might have created a bias due to the data that was missed. To eliminate this bias and to obtain a more representative sample a second sample was drawn from the list of schools that were not contacted in the first sample.

Twenty more schools were drawn from all the districts in the state of Ohio. The interval for this sample was set at 40. A starting number was selected using the same procedure as the first time. From that numbered school every 40th school was drawn until 20 schools were selected. Seven Class A schools, six Class AA schools, and seven Class AAA schools were chosen. The same packet of materials were sent to these schools, using the same distribution technique. A total of 120 schools were selected in all.
Development of the Survey Instrument

A review of textbooks by Clarke and Clarke\(^\text{32}\) and Van Dalen\(^\text{33}\) was taken to study the basic points in developing a questionnaire. From this review, an outline of the steps to be followed was constructed. Basically, a closed form was decided upon, with a few exceptions. There were four open questions.

A review of textbooks in research, consultation with The Ohio State University Research and Evaluation Consultation Service and articles by Likert\(^\text{34}\) and Meinhardt\(^\text{35}\) were undertaken. The knowledge obtained from these sources was coupled with this author's personal knowledge, experience and conversations with local coaches and administrators to develop a rough draft of the instrument that was later used.

This rough draft was then sent to two people, Dr. Carl Erickson from Kent State University and Dr. Terry Parsons from Bowling Green State University. These people have had experience, at their respective universities and nationally, working in the


\(^{34}\) Likert, R., "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes", Archives of Psychology, 1932, No. 140

areas of coaching evaluation and certification of coaches. They were asked to evaluate the questionnaire for quality of content and to suggest improvements in the questionnaire. These suggestions were then incorporated into the questionnaire.

At this point a pilot study was conducted to evaluate the clarity and the worth of the items within the questionnaire. A panel of experts (Appendix F) was selected from around the state. These experts included members of the Ohio High School Athletic Association, the Ohio High School Athletic Directors Association, the Ohio Basketball Coaches Association and the State Department of Education.

A correction sheet was constructed (Appendix A and B) and mailed to the panel along with a copy of the tentative questionnaire and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the pilot study. A return of sixty percent was obtained from the panel. If a majority of experts responded to an item in a similar fashion, then their suggestions were incorporated into the questionnaire. A final review of the questionnaire was made with the help of the Educational Research and Evaluation Consultation Service at the Ohio State University.

The final format of the questionnaire that was used is as follows:

1. Two hundred and thirteen items within the questionnaire required an answer from the subject using a Likert type of attitude scale. As an example:

   Scale  Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important
A successful basketball coach should possess the following skills:

1. A certification in coaching.

2. Nineteen items within the questionnaire required a Yes or No answer from the subjects. As an example:

Should a state-wide organization (O.H.S.A.A., O.E.A., etc.) adopt an evaluation system for coaching contract renewals?

Yes ________ No ______

3. Four items required an open statement from the subjects. As an example:

What would you like to see the nature of the evaluation process be, in the near future? Comment to whatever extent that you think necessary.

4. Four items required a type of checklist to be used by the subjects for their answers. As an example:

For your school, who has the major responsibility for the evaluation of assistant coaches?

_____ Principal _____ Athletic Director

_____ Head Coach

5. Seven items required a multiple choice type of answer from the subjects. As an example: check appendix D, the questionnaire numbers 112-118.

Treatment of the Data

All tabulations were completed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. This is a standard program which is used for the analysis of data predominately found within the social sciences. Fortran coding forms were used for the tabulation of the data from the questionnaires. All data were then recorded on the coding forms and key punched onto program cards. The program
cards were then submitted to a computer at The Ohio State University Computer Center for statistical analysis.

The SPSS program is able to compute basic descriptive statistics, simple frequency distributions, cross tabulations, simple correlations, multiple regressions, factor analysis, and scaling. Simple frequency distributions, cross tabulations, basic descriptive statistics and simple correlations were used in this study.

Individual sections of the questionnaire were analyzed differently according to the type of information that was desired. The questionnaire was divided into three parts and six sections. Some of the sections were then subdivided into logical groups of subject matter.

The first part was designed to deal with characteristics of the ideal role of the basketball coaches in the state of Ohio. This part had four sections which dealt with: the basketball coach's responsibilities; the basketball coach's skills; the basketball coach's traits and the qualities of being a successful basketball coach. The first two sections were then subdivided into groups of subject matter. These groups were: skills not directly related to the sport; skills directly related to the sport; maintaining interpersonal relationships and administration.

Part two of the questionnaire dealt with the current systems of evaluation that are being used within Ohio's high schools.
Part three of the questionnaire dealt with the future goals and suggested improvements for evaluation of basketball staffs. This part has two sections. The first section dealt with specific ways of improving the evaluation process. The second section was an open-ended question about the future of evaluation of coaches in Ohio.

Using these sections of subject matter, the data was then tested for its reliability. The sections became an easily manageable method for computing the statistics. The data was processed through the Ohio State University computer and a reliability coefficient was established.

The internal reliability of the questionnaire items were then considered and the items that were found to possess an extremely low reliability coefficient were eliminated from the final analysis. The items that were finally eliminated were four. They are items twenty-four, forty-nine, fifty-two, and fifty-three. All of these items were found in part one of the questionnaire.

The final items were statistically analyzed according to the following approaches:

1. The athletic directors' responses to part one of the questionnaire, items one through ninety-three, were analyzed against the total number of basketball coaches responses for the same items. This included both the female coaches and the male coaches. They were analyzed using a t-test to test the differences between groups. The subjects were also divided according to their schools size. Class A coaches were compared
to Class A athletic directors, and so on.

2. The athletic directors responses to their view of the community opinion in part one were analyzed against the responses of all basketball coaches, for the same items. A t-test was used to analyze the differences between the two groups. This test covered items 1-93 of part one.

3. The male athletic director responses were analyzed against all female subjects. A t-test was used here to test for differences.

4. All athletic director responses on items 1-93 of part one of the questionnaire, were tabulated for both the frequency of the response and the percentage of that response.

5. A cross tabulation was performed on items 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 119, 120 and 121. These items were cross tabulated according to the three classifications of schools and according to the group that they belonged to. This included either the athletic directors groups or the basketball coaches groups. All coaches were put into the same groups regardless of whether they were girls coaches or boys coaches.

6. A cross tabulation was performed on items 96, 98, 101, 102, and 104. These items were cross tabulated according to the three classifications of schools.

7. A simple frequency distribution was performed on items 111-118. These were tabulated for athletic directors responses and then for all the subjects responses.
8. The remaining items were tabulated by the author using a simply frequency distribution. This was done because of the wide variety of responses to these items.

Summary

The population for this study consisted of all high schools in the state of Ohio. One hundred schools were selected in the first sample. Twenty schools were selected in the second sample. Each sample had approximately an equal number of schools representing each district of the state, at each school classification. In the study there were approximately 40 schools in the Class A classification, 40 schools in the Class AA classification and 40 schools in the Class AAA classification.

The questionnaire was developed with the aid of articles, textbooks, research consultants and professional experts in the field of athletic administration. A pilot study was conducted using a panel of 15 experts from various organizations around the state. The suggestions from this panel were incorporated into the final questionnaire.

The data was processed through the Ohio State University Computer Center using the SPSS computer program. Individual sections of related subject matter were tested for its internal reliability and a reliability coefficient was established. Items of the questionnaire that were not reliable were eliminated from the final data.
The data was then tabulated into simple frequency distributions, basic descriptive statistics and cross tabulations. The results of these tabulations are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

This chapter will present and discuss the data that was received and collected during this study on evaluation of basketball coaching staffs. The data was obtained entirely from the questionnaire that was used.

Basically four statistical techniques were used to analyze the data. First of all, a reliability coefficient was determined on items 1-93 of the questionnaire. The remaining items were then analyzed either by using a frequency and percentage, a cross tabulation, or a t-test.

**General Information: Respondents**

A total of 240 questionnaires were sent out to 120 high schools in the state of Ohio. A response of 80 high schools was obtained from this sample. From the possible sample of 240 questionnaires the return of 80 resulted in a 34 percent return.

By using the stratified sampling technique, a representative sample was obtained. In the Class A level of high school, a return of 23 questionnaires were obtained, for a percentage of 29 percent of the total sample. 11 questionnaires came from the athletic directors, 6 from the girls coaches and 6 from the boys coaches. This resulted in a 25 percent response of the athletic directors, a 43 percent response from the
girls coaches and a 30 percent response from the boys coaches.

At the Class AA level, 26 questionnaires were returned for a 33 percent return. 33 percent of the athletic directors were in this group. (15 questionnaires) 29 percent of the girls coaches were from this group. (4 questionnaires) 37 percent of the boys coaches were in this group. (7 questionnaires)

At the Class AAA level, 31 questionnaires were returned. This is a return of 40 percent. 45 percent of the athletic directors were found in this group. (20 questionnaires) 29 percent of the girls coaches were found in this group. (4 questionnaires) 37 percent of the boys coaches were found in this group. (7 questionnaires)

A total of 58 percent of the respondents were athletic directors, (46 questionnaires) 18 percent of the respondents were girls coaches, (14 questionnaires) and 25 percent of the respondents were boys coaches (20 questionnaires).
TABLE 1
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF THE SAMPL ED POPULATION
BY SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls Coaches</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6 (3)*</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Coaches</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>7 (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>7 (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11 (0)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>15 (2)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>20 (3)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>23 (3)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>26 (4)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>31 (6)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Female Respondents

Reliability Analysis By Position Groups

Before the statistical analysis was run on the data collected, a reliability analysis was run on the data to eliminate those responses within the questionnaire that proved to have a low coefficient.

A reliability test is run to determine if a particular item differs markedly among respondents. If it is a good item, then it should correlate with the scores of other respondents. After reviewing the literature it was felt by this author that
a reliability coefficient of .50 or higher would be an acceptable coefficient for this analysis.

The items one through ninety-three of this questionnaire were subjected to analysis and either accepted or rejected according to their reliability coefficient. All items were analyzed within the subject groups created by the divisions of the questionnaire. These items were analyzed for the athletic directors responses and then for the coaches responses. Also the "Your opinion" responses were analyzed separately from the "Community opinion" responses.

Because of this analysis it was found that items twenty-four, fifty-two, fifty-five and fifty-six would not be used in the final analysis. By dropping item twenty-four from the analysis it raised the reliability coefficient on the "Your opinion" responses of athletic directors from an alpha of .75027 to one of .78891. On the "Community opinion" responses of the athletic directors it raised the alpha from a .69555 to a .74989. Table 2 will summarize the other items that were dropped.

**TABLE 2**

**ITEMS DROPPED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alpha With Item</th>
<th>Alpha Without Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.75027</td>
<td>.78891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52, 55, 56</td>
<td>.31080</td>
<td>.43626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table shows the reliability coefficients that were established in each of the groups. Groups of items were used to facilitate the management of the data. There were only five groups that fell below the .50 level.

**TABLE 3**

**RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR "YOUR OPINION" ANSWERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Items</th>
<th>Athletic Directors</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>.68111</td>
<td>.67887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-22</td>
<td>.71928</td>
<td>.81412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>.78891</td>
<td>.81586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>.36122</td>
<td>.72374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48,58</td>
<td>.78934</td>
<td>.80790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-57,59</td>
<td>.43626</td>
<td>.49603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>.95184</td>
<td>.87780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-93</td>
<td>.79149</td>
<td>.70704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS**  
**FOR "COMMUNITY OPINION" ANSWERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Items</th>
<th>Athletic Directors</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>.73507</td>
<td>.70332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-22</td>
<td>.85493</td>
<td>.79700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>.74989</td>
<td>.70489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>.75766</td>
<td>.80314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48,58</td>
<td>.90940</td>
<td>.90370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-57,59</td>
<td>.63853</td>
<td>.54603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>.96228</td>
<td>.95354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-93</td>
<td>.85013</td>
<td>.83251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To help understand the following tables, the questionnaire that was used in the study is reproduced on the next few pages.
Instructions For Completing
The Basketball Staff Evaluation Inventory

This instrument consists of three sections concerning the evaluation of high school basketball staffs. Part I will deal with the role of the basketball coach in the high school. Part II deals with the current evaluation systems that are being used. Evaluation is defined as any type of assessment that takes place regardless of whether it is used for contract renewal or for professional growth. Part III deals with the implementation of any future evaluation systems.

Please rate each statement as to its importance as indicated on the scale below. Mark your answer in the appropriate space.

**Scale:** Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

If you feel strongly that your experience or background does not give you an adequate basis for judgement, then leave the space blank.

Return to:
Donn Bennice
Elyria High School
Middle & 6th St.

Please circle
School Classification
A AA AAA
Sex: M F

PLEASE FILL OUT COMPLETELY

Part I
The Role of the Basketball Coach

1. A basketball coach's responsibilities consists of:
   A. Skills Not Directly Related To The Sport

   **Scale** Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

   Your opinion

   Your View of the
   Community Opinion

   1. The control of the total basketball program in terms of players, asst. coaches, and fans.

   2. The ability to effect positive crowd behavior during contests.

   3. Insuring proper athletic training, conditioning and care for players. (Taping, First Aid)

FIGURE 3
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Your opinion

4. Insuring the proper nutrition of athletes.

5. Having advanced academic training.

6. Having and carrying out normal teaching responsibilities.

7. Attendance at basketball clinics.

8. Membership in professional organizations.


10. Recruitment of quality assistant coaches to the program.

B. Skills directly related to the sport

11. The development of the basketball program K-6.

12. The development of the basketball program 7-9.

13. The development of the basketball program 10-12.

14. Insuring the professional growth of the basketball staff. (clinics, camps, etc.)

15. The competent organization of daily practice plans.


17. Competencies in studying game films.

18. The ability to organize a summer program.

19. The ability to organize an off-season conditioning program.

20. The recruitment of athletes to basketball.

21. Establishing good player-coach relationships.

22. Having a .500 season or better.

FIGURE 3 (Continued)
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### C. Maintaining Interpersonal Relationships

**Scale**
- Unimportant
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your opinion</th>
<th>Your View of the Community Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Maintaining favorable public relations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Attending all sports banquet functions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Quality academic counseling of players.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The handling of players' personal problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Establishing good relationships with opponents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Establishing and maintaining public relations with the news media.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Supporting other non-sport activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your opinion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Developing team finances within your schools stated limits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The management of equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Insuring competitive scheduling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The proper planning and cooperation on trips. (meals, lodging, equipment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Performing self-evaluation for contract renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. A successful basketball coach should possess the following skills:

#### A. Skills directly related to the sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your opinion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Offensive knowledge of the game.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Defensive knowledge of the game.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Past high school playing experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Past college playing experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Critical Evaluation - the ability to analyze the game situations and make adjustments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scale Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

Your opinion

Your View of the Community Opinion

40. Adjusting their seasonal and individual game plans and philosophies to fit his or her players' skill levels.

41. Previous coaching experience.

42. Ability to recruit within legal and moral guidelines.

43. Ability to successfully evaluate player...
   A. Personalities
   B. Intelligence and perceptual abilities
   C. Physical abilities
   D. Playing abilities

44. Teaching ability on the floor.

45. The ability to clearly and successfully present fundamentals.

46. Maintaining the discipline of athletes.

47. Teaching of self-discipline to athletes.

48. Treatment of athletic injuries.

B. Skills not directly related to the sport

49. Teaching ability in the classroom.

50. Bachelors degree for non-certified teachers holding an Educational Aid Certificate.

51. Masters degree.

52. Doctoral degree.

53. Leadership ability in terms of the total basketball program.

54. A certification in coaching.

55. Public speaking ability.
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### C. Interpersonal Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Your opinion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>The ability to motivate players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>The ability to meaningfully communicate with staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>The ability to evaluate the entire basketball program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>The ability to handle general administrative duties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. A successful basketball coach should possess the following personal traits:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Enthusiasm for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Enthusiasm for the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Professionalism in all areas of coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>The ability to view winning and losing in its proper perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Tact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Warmth of personality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Self-control under game situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Self-control outside of game conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>A positive image in terms of dress, grooming, floor conduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Fairness of decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Your opinion

74. Dedication to the profession and the school.

75. Respect for opponents.

76. Respect for assistants.

77. Respect for players.

78. Respect for the public.

79. Responsibility to his total school assignment by setting the example.

80. Honoring the spirit of the rule as well as the letter.

4. To be a successful coach ...

81. One needs to be a physical education teacher.

82. One should be an authoritarian type of coach.

83. One should have control of major decisions relating to the basketball program.

84. One should consult with assistant coaches in making all practice and game decisions.

85. One should consult with players on making decisions not directly related to their playing.

86. One should consult with players in making player decisions.

87. One should delegate authority to others in specific areas.

88. One should be able to adjust to situations and successfully take advantage of them.

89. One should base decisions on fitting a style of play to a given situation.

90. One must have the ability to influence athletes towards greater use of their talents in a competitive situation.
Your opinion

91. One has to start with players of great physical talent to have a successful team.

92. One needs to believe that the value gained from a team win justifies circumventing certain individual players' needs at the moment.

93. One has to set his job as his number one priority.

Part II
Current Systems of Evaluating High School Basketball Coaches

94. Are the basketball coaches (grades 7-12) formally and objectively evaluated in your system thru the use of checklists or other written documents?

Yes ___ No ___

95. Are your basketball coaches evaluated in a systematic manner which does not involve the use of checklists?

Yes ___ No ___

If the answers to both items 94 & 95 are no, then proceed to Section III. of this inventory. Do not answer items 96 through 110.

96. For your school, which administrative individual has primary responsibilities for evaluating coaches? (Check only one)

___ Superintendent ___ Principal ___ Athletic Director

97. How important are the following criteria, upon which coaches may be specifically evaluated?

Scale Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

___ Income generated specifically by the head coach

___ On-the-floor organization of practice

___ Timely game decisions
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Scale Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

Overall knowledge of current coaching methods
Professionalism on the floor
Professionalism off the floor
Player-coach relations
Staff and personal growth
Program development
Elementary K-6
Junior High or Middle school 7-9
High School 10-12
Acceptance and adherence to school philosophy and policy
Public relations
Classroom teaching effectiveness
Win-loss record
Professional training
Certification of coaching
Objectivity of the coach in relation to the political climate of the community.

98. For your school, who has the major responsibility for the evaluation of assistant coaches? (Check only one)

___ Principal ___ Athletic Director ___ Head Coach

99. Are student-athletes used in the evaluation process?

Yes ___ No ___

100. Are the coaches ever asked to evaluate themselves?

Yes ___ No ___

If yes, is this evaluation seriously used to determine whether their contract will be renewed or not?

Yes ___ No ___
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101. Is the total evaluation process used for ... 
   a. Contract renewal   Yes   No ____
   b. Professional growth   Yes   No ____

102. If yes on items 101 a. & b, indicate what weight should be given to the evaluation in establishing ... 
   a. Contract renewal   ____%
   b. Professional growth   ____%
   Total 100%

103. What is the most important factor to be considered in evaluation for contract renewal?

104. What is the degree of involvement in the evaluation process by the following?
   Scale Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important
   ___ Booster Clubs
   ___ Parents of players
   ___ Board of Education

105. Should there be any community involvement in the evaluation process?
   Yes   No ____

106. When does the evaluation process begin? (Check only one)
   ___ June-August
   ___ September-October
   ___ November-March
   ___ April-June

107. When does the evaluation process end? (Check only one)
   ___ June-August
   ___ September-October
   ___ November-March
   ___ April-June
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108. Is there an attempt to aid coaches in self-improvement through the evaluation process?

Yes____ No____

109. Should athletic directors be held accountable to the pressures of athletics and winning that coaches are?

Yes____ No____

If yes, to what extent?

110. Do you think this accountability would enable athletic directors to evaluate coaches more objectively with less attention to various public concerns?

Yes____ No____

Part III
Future Goals and Improvement in Evaluating High School Basketball Coaches

111. Specifically, what suggestions for change would you like to offer for improving the present system? For each change that you would offer, circle the numbers of all implementation procedures you would use from the list below. If you would not like to offer a change then circle zero. You may use any or all of the procedures in the right-hand column with any change listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Implementation Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1 2 3 4 112. Establish a system where all coaches are placed on a multi-year contract to allow time to provide for professional growth. 5 6 ? 0)</td>
<td>1. Offer legislation state-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1234 113. Require the head coaches to evaluate all assistant coaches. 5 6 ? 0)</td>
<td>2. Offer legislation locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Require specific additional course work in athletic administration for athletic directors and principals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(1 2 3 4 114). Require coaches to undergo the same evaluation procedures that teachers do.

(1 2 3 4 115). Require all supplemental contracts to follow the same master contract and afford it the same due process that regular contracts.

(1 2 3 4 116). Require an inservice program for all coaches as part of the evaluation process.

(1 2 3 4 117). Require all head coaches to be certified in coaching.

(1 2 3 4 118). Require all assistant coaches to be certified in coaching.

119. Which of these would you use to carry out an evaluation of a basketball staff?

a. Conference
b. Observation
c. Self appraisal
d. Student-athlete appraisal
e. A checklist or rating scale
f. Community opinion survey

---

4. Select a state-wide panel consisting of O.H.S.A.A. school representatives to study the problem.

5. Select a state-wide panel consisting of O.H.S.A.A. officials to study the problem.

6. Select a state-wide panel of professional experts to study the problem.

7. Perform additional research to suggest ways of implementation.

120. Should a state-wide organization (O.H.S.A.A., O.E.A., etc.) adopt an evaluation system for coaching contract renewals? If no, skip item 121.

Yes ___ No ___
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121. Should state-wide organizations recommend that all
school districts within the state of Ohio establish
a means of utilizing this system within their districts?

Yes ____ No ____

122. What would you like to see the nature of the evaluation
process be, in the near future?
Comment to whatever extent that you think necessary.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
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Results of T-Test and Mean Scores

A t-test was performed on all data. This test was designed
to test for the differences that may be found among the various
groups of the study. The items were grouped according to subject
content, similar to those used for the reliability coefficients.
These items were then divided into the athletic directors'
responses and the coaches' responses. The coaches' responses
included those of all the females in the study. The responses
were further broken down into the three levels or classifications
of high schools.

The resulting t-tests were computed on the athletic
directors and coaches at the Class A level, then at the Class
AA level and finally at the Class AAA level.
It was anticipated that there would be little difference between athletic directors answers and the coaches. By computing a t-test on the athletic directors and the coaches some validity could be given to the athletic directors answers that were to be used in the final evaluation instrument. This in fact, is what was done. The following table shows the areas where significant differences were found between the athletic directors and the coaches. These differences are reflected in the mean scores of that group.

**TABLE 5**

**ITEMS THAT SHOWED SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON t-SCORES BETWEEN ATHLETIC DIRECTORS AND COACHES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Score Coaches</th>
<th>Mean Score Ath. Dir.</th>
<th>Category of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>35-48,58</td>
<td>4.8219</td>
<td>4.1441</td>
<td>Community Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>11-22</td>
<td>5.2500</td>
<td>4.8182</td>
<td>Your Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>5.5136</td>
<td>4.9333</td>
<td>Your Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>5.6760</td>
<td>5.2700</td>
<td>Your Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>3.4222</td>
<td>3.9250</td>
<td>Community Opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the Class A group, the coaches and the athletic directors were found to have little variance in their responses. Therefore it was concluded that basically the two groups answered the items the same. The only group of items that showed any major differences in their mean scores was the group of items 35-48,58
of the "community opinion" responses. This group of items dealt with the skills that are directly related to the sport, such as offensive knowledge of the game, past playing experience, previous coaching experience, etc. The mean score of this group was 4.1841 for the athletic directors and a score of 4.8219 for the coaches. This writer could not account for the differences in the mean.

**TABLE 6**

**MEAN SCORES OF ITEMS BY GROUPS**

**CLASS A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Items</th>
<th>Athletic Directors</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y.O.</td>
<td>C.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>4.6500</td>
<td>3.4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-22</td>
<td>4.8633</td>
<td>4.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>5.1167</td>
<td>3.6107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4.9600</td>
<td>3.4933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48,58</td>
<td>4.9791</td>
<td>4.1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-55</td>
<td>3.1000</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56,57,59</td>
<td>5.5667</td>
<td>0.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>5.7143</td>
<td>4.8238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-93</td>
<td>3.9538</td>
<td>3.7429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Groups that showed significant differences on t-test

Within the Class AA group, the coaches and the athletic directors were found to have more areas of differences than in the Class A classification. In this t-test the groups of items that were found to have major differences were items 11-22 in
the "your opinion" responses, items 30-34 in the "your opinion" responses, and items 60-80 in the "your opinion" responses. Items 11-22 dealt with coaching responsibilities that are directly related to the sport such as having a winning season, the recruitment of athletes, the development of the program grades 7-9, etc. Items 30-34 dealt with the administrative responsibilities of coaching such as, team finances, equipment management, scheduling, etc. Items 60-80 dealt with the personal traits of a coach such as enthusiasm, tact, self-control, etc. The differences in the mean scores are: items 11-22 are 4.8182 for the athletic directors and 5.2500 for the coaches, items 30-34 are 4.9333 for the athletic directors and 5.5136 for the coaches and items 60-80 are 5.2700 for the athletic directors and 5.6760 for the coaches. The mean scores for items 30-34 fall within the .05 level of significance.
### TABLE 7
**MEAN SCORES OF ITEMS BY GROUPS**  
**CLASS AA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Items</th>
<th>Athletic Directors</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y.O.</td>
<td>C.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>4.6867</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-22</td>
<td>4.8182</td>
<td>3.9167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>4.9556</td>
<td>3.4778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>5.1333</td>
<td>3.3233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48,58</td>
<td>5.1741</td>
<td>4.4900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-55</td>
<td>3.9167</td>
<td>2.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56,57,59</td>
<td>5.2667</td>
<td>0.9333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>5.2700</td>
<td>4.1302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-93</td>
<td>4.0391</td>
<td>3.3419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Groups that showed significant differences on t-test

Within the Class AAA group, the coaches and the athletic directors were found to have major differences on only one group of items. In this t-test, the group of items that were found to have major differences between athletic directors and the coaches were items 30-34 in the "community opinion" responses. Items 30-34 dealt with the administrative responsibilities of coaching such as team finances, equipment management, scheduling, etc. The differences in the mean scores of the two groups on items 30-34 was a 3.9250 for the athletic directors and a 3.4222 for the coaches.
Items 30-34 in both the Class AA and AAA showed a significant difference. These differences could be accounted for by the fact that the items represented administrative duties that fall into "gray" areas of responsibility for athletic directors and coaches. It is understandable that differences here would develop.

TABLE 8
MEAN SCORES OF ITEMS BY GROUPS
CLASS AAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Items</th>
<th>Athletic Directors</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y.O.</td>
<td>C.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>4.7000</td>
<td>3.7889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-22</td>
<td>4.9803</td>
<td>4.2675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-29</td>
<td>5.0417</td>
<td>4.0392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4.9658 *3.9250</td>
<td>4.8818 *3.4222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-48,58</td>
<td>5.2631</td>
<td>4.6524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-55</td>
<td>3.5625</td>
<td>2.9111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56,57,59</td>
<td>5.4737</td>
<td>0.9941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>5.6316</td>
<td>4.9231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-93</td>
<td>3.7429</td>
<td>3.7861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Groups that showed significant differences on t-test

The Class AA level showed differences between coaches and athletic directors, in the area of coaching responsibilities like having a winning season, the recruitment of athletes, the development of the program grades 7-9, etc. This writer could not account for these differences. However, the differences
at the Class AA level could have occurred due to the fact that this group represents the personal traits of the coaches. These traits are somewhat ambiguous and left open to an individual's interpretation, thus causing the differences.

Items 56, 57, and 59 show a huge difference between the "your opinion" and the "community opinion" responses, in all three classifications. These items dealt with the areas of communication between coaches, motivation of players and the leadership provided for general administrative duties. This writer can not account for these differences in mean scores. Overall, the "community opinion" scores will be lower due to the fact that respondents were asked to relate someone else's opinion.

**Frequency Distribution on Items 1-93**

This section is designed to show how the athletic directors responded to items 1-93 on the questionnaire. There are little differences in most areas as shown by the preceding section, between athletic directors and the coaches responses. The athletic directors' responses will be used as the norm however, because it was felt by this author that the athletic directors' responses come from a more expert group and thus are a more reliable indicator of the current feeling in the high schools. It was also felt by this author, that within the areas that coaches and athletic directors disagreed, the athletic directors responses were probably more knowledge.
Items 1-93 dealt with the role of the basketball coach in Ohio's high schools. These items were either accepted or rejected by the response of the athletic directors in the survey. By determining the responses that have been accepted by the athletic directors, the role of the basketball coach can then be summarized into an evaluation instrument.

The frequencies are tabulated according to the classification that the athletic director responded from. It was anticipated by the author that there would be some major philosophical differences in the role of the basketball coach among the three classifications of high schools. These differences in the author's opinion, would be due to financial limitations and administrative structures that are prevalent at the various classifications. It would seem logical that these differences are a must for athletic departments to function at various levels.

Each item of the questionnaire was to be evaluated on a scale of one through six with one being unimportant and six being important. A scale of six was selected because this number does not provide a mid-point for the subjects to rest on. The author wanted the subjects to make a clear decision on whether he was in favor of an item or not. It was observed that in most cases the subjects responded at the extremes of the scale.
In addition to the frequency distribution, a percentage of scores that fell above the mid-point on the scale was tabulated. This percentage would tell whether an item was generally accepted by that classification of athletic directors in question or not. A more elaborate statistical analysis is not needed because generally the question here is whether the athletic directors are in favor of an item or not. The question was not, by how much.

With a percentage of fifty as the limit for accepting or rejecting an item a total of seven items were rejected by Class A athletic directors. The items that were rejected were items 38, 50, 51, 54, 81, 86, and 91. There were seven other items that were on the borderline to reject them. These items either fell right at the fifty percent mark or had an even distribution throughout the six-point scale. The decision to reject or accept these items was then made by where the mode of scores on the item fell. The items that were in question were items 4, 22, 37, 41, 82, 84, and 93. The items that were rejected were items 4 and 22.

TABLE 9 will show the frequency distributions for Class A athletic directors.
### TABLE 9

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON ITEMS 1-93 RELATING TO ATHLETIC DIRECTORS OF CLASS A SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>% above mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rejected items
TABLE 9 (continued)

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON ITEMS 1-93 RELATING TO
ATHLETIC DIRECTORS OF CLASS A SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43A</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 3 4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43B</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 6 2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43C</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 5 3</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43D</td>
<td>0 0 2 0 2 5</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 3 6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 4 6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 0 2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4 0 3 1 1 0</td>
<td>22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4 0 4 1 0 0</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2 2 3 1 1 0</td>
<td>22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1 1 0 1 6 1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 5 3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>0 1 0 2 2 5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 4 5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>7 1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2 1 1 4 1 1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1 0 1 1 2 5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1 2 2 3 2 0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3 0 0 2 3 2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2 3 3 2 0 0</td>
<td>20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>0 0 1 3 2 4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The frequency distribution was then tabulated for the athletic directors at the Class AA classification. A total of six items did not score fifty percent or higher than the median. The items that were rejected by the Class AA athletic directors were items 38, 51, 81, 82, 86 and 91. There were no items that fell at the fifty percent mark that were rejected.

TABLE 10 shows the frequency distribution for the Class AA athletic directors.
### TABLE 10
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON ITEMS 1-93 RELATING TO ATHLETIC DIRECTORS OF CLASS AA SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>% above mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rejected items
TABLE 10 (continued)

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON ITEMS 1-93 RELATING TO
ATHLETIC DIRECTORS OF CLASS AA SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency Distribution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2 1 3 2 1 6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43A</td>
<td>0 0 0 4 5 6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43B</td>
<td>0 0 0 5 5 5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43C</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 4 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43D</td>
<td>0 0 0 3 2 10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 5 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 1 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0 0 2 2 6 5</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0 0 2 2 1 7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2 5 1 6 1 0</td>
<td>46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2 3 1 5 0 4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0 0 1 8 6 0</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 5 8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 5 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 6 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0 0 1 3 7 4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 5 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0 0 0 3 2 10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>0 0 2 4 3 6</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 3 11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 6 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 6 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 5 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 3 11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 3 11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 3 11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 4 9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0 0 0 4 3 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 3 11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 2 12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 5 8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 7 7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 5 8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>8 7 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rejected items
The frequency distribution was tabulated for the Class AAA athletic directors. A total of six items did not score fifty percent or higher than the median. The items for this classification that were rejected were items 51, 54, 81, 82, 86 and 91. There were no items in this classification that fell at the fifty percent mark that were rejected.

In summarizing the items that were rejected at the various levels; at the Class A classification items 4, 22, 38, 50, 51, 54, 81, 82, and 91, at the Class AA classification items 38, 51, 81, 82, 86 and 91, at the Class AAA classification items 51, 54, 81, 82, 86 and 91. Items 51, 81, 86 and 91 were rejected by all three classifications.

TABLE 11 shows the frequency distribution for the Class AAA athletic directors.
TABLE 11

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON ITEMS 1-93 RELATING TO ATHLETIC DIRECTORS OF CLASS AAA SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>% above mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rejected items
### TABLE 11 (continued)

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON ITEMS 1-93 RELATING TO ATHLETIC DIRECTORS OF CLASS AAA SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>8 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43A</td>
<td>0 0 2 3</td>
<td>6 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43B</td>
<td>0 0 2 4</td>
<td>6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43C</td>
<td>0 1 1 5</td>
<td>5 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43D</td>
<td>0 0 1 4</td>
<td>4 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0 0 0 5</td>
<td>5 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0 0 0 6</td>
<td>6 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0 0 1 1</td>
<td>1 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0 0 1 5</td>
<td>5 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5 2 7</td>
<td>7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>5 4 7</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>4 3 6</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0 0 3</td>
<td>3 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0 0 0 6</td>
<td>6 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0 0 0 3</td>
<td>3 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0 0 0 3</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>0 0 1 4</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0 0 1 1</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>0 0 0 2</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>17 1 0 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>7 2 5</td>
<td>5 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *Rejected items*
TABLE 11 (continued)

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON ITEMS 1-93 RELATING TO
ATHLETIC DIRECTORS OF CLASS AAA SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rejected items

Current Evaluation Systems

This section of the study deals with what evaluation systems are now in use in Ohio's high schools. The survey showed that basketball coaches are not evaluated formally within their schools. For Class A schools 86%, for Class AA schools 69% and for Class AAA schools 74% did not evaluate their coaches formally. A majority of schools did not evaluate their coaches through the use of any systematic manner (Class A 57% did not, Class AA 58% did not and Class AAA 65% did not).

The schools that did evaluate their coaches were then asked to reveal which administrative head was primarily responsible for this evaluation. At all three classifications the athletic directors seem to have the major responsibility for the evaluation. Class AAA schools responded with 71% selecting
their athletic director. In Class AA, 54% chose their athletic directors. In Class A however, the responsibility seemed to be shared by the athletic directors and the principals equally.

Item 97 of the questionnaire asked the respondents for criteria upon which to evaluate coaches. Eighteen possible criteria were proposed to the respondents. They were to rate these criteria using the same scale of one to six that was used on items 1-93 of Part I of the questionnaire. These items were to be accepted or rejected for the study by the same criteria as in Part I, whether they scored above the median or not. Using this criteria only items 97-1, 97-9 and 97-17 were rejected by all three classes. Item 97-18 was rejected by the Class AA respondents.

Item 97 consisted of the following items as they appeared in the questionnaire:

1. Income generated specifically by the head coach
2. On-the-floor organization of practice
3. Timely game decisions
4. Overall knowledge of current coaching methods
5. Professionalism on the floor
6. Professionalism off the floor
7. Player-coach relations
8. Staff and personal growth
9. Program Development: K-6
10. Program Development: Junior High or Middle School 7-9
11. Program Development: High School 10-12
12. Acceptance and adherence to school philosophy and policy
13. Public relations
14. Classroom teaching effectiveness
15. Win-loss record
16. Professional training
17. Certification of coaching
18. Objectivity of the coach in relation to the political climate of the community.
TABLE 12 shows the frequency distribution of all the criteria, for the Class A schools. TABLE 13 shows the frequency distribution for the Class AA schools. And TABLE 14 shows the frequency distribution for the Class AAA schools.

**TABLE 12**

**CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION**

**CLASS A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>% above mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rejected item
### TABLE 13

**CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION**

**CLASS AA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>% above mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rejected items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>% above mid-point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rejected item
The questions of assistant evaluation, self-evaluation and student-evaluation were then discussed. The evaluation of assistant coaches was without a doubt, handled primarily by the head coaches. In all three classifications the head coaches had the major responsibility. Of the respondents that answered this question, 57% of the Class A, 67% of the Class AA and 71% of the Class AAA responded in this fashion.

On the question of self-evaluation there seemed to be a difference of opinion as to whether this was done in the high school setting. About 50% of the Class AA and AAA respondents said that they do ask the coaches to evaluate themselves, but only 25% of the Class A respondents stated that they used this technique. When asked whether this evaluation was seriously used, most said that they did not. Only 31% of the total took self-evaluation seriously.

It was felt that student-evaluation was not to be used. The data provided a clear response to this question. 100% of the Class A schools and 94% of the Class AA and AAA schools indicated that they did not use student-evaluation in their evaluation process. In this writer's opinion, the reason for this response is that by allowing student evaluation, the coach's image would not fit into the traditional authoritarian role that he has had for so long.

The next area to be considered was whether the coach's evaluation was used for contract renewal, professional growth or both and if so how much. On those that responded to this
question, most stated that they did use the evaluation for both contract renewal and for professional growth. TABLE 15 shows how the three classifications responded.

TABLE 15
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND CONTRACT RENEWAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percent Using Professional Growth</th>
<th>Percent Using Contract Renewal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class AA</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class AAA</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the respondents answered yes on both of the preceding questions, they were then asked what weight was given to professional growth and to contract renewal? In all three classifications it was about equally divided in its use. The Class A and AA both felt that 54% should go to contract renewal and 46% of the evaluation should be considered as professional growth. At the AAA level, these percentages were reversed. 46% should be used for the contract renewal and 54% for professional growth.

Question number 103 asked, what is the most important factor in evaluation for contract renewal? The following eleven general types of answers appeared.

1. It is winning.

2. The degree of potential reached by the program.
3. The quality and the growth of the program.
4. The acceptance of the program by the community.
5. The coach's abilities and skills.
6. The coach's teaching ability.
7. The overall professional conduct of the coach.
8. The overall competency of the coach.
9. The discipline of the team.
10. The coach's interpersonal relationships.
11. Is the coach meeting the job criteria?

In most school systems there are many forces that try
to influence the evaluation process. The respondents were
asked if booster clubs, parents of players and/or boards of
educations should become involved in the process. At all three
classifications the idea of allowing booster clubs to become
involved was rejected. Only 25% at the Class A level, accepted
the idea, 33% at the Class AA level accepted the idea and 15%
at the Class AAA level thought that booster clubs should become
involved in the evaluation process. All three classifications
also rejected the idea of allowing parents to become involved.
At the Class A level 50%, at the Class AA level 40% and at the
Class AAA level 23%. Boards of Education on the other hand
were accepted as a force that should become involved in the
evaluation process. At the Class A level 72% agreed, at the
Class AA level 87% agreed and at the Class AAA level 54%
agreed. On a related question of whether there should be commun-
ity involvement at all in the evaluation process, all three
classifications rejected this idea also.

It was found that for most schools, at all three classifications that the evaluation process begins in a period from November through March. In all cases the evaluation process ended sometime between November and June. The majority of schools ended their evaluation in the period from April through June.

All three classifications indicated that there was an attempt to aid coaches in self-improvement through use of an evaluation process. At the Class A level 75% said that they did try to aid their coaches. While at the Class AA level it was 80% and at the Class AAA level it was 78%.

The final two questions in this section contained a somewhat different subject matter than the others. They both dealt with the concept of whether athletic directors should be evaluated and held accountable in the same manner as basketball coaches. As was to be expected the answer was a definite no. 74% of the athletic directors and 55% of the coaches felt that they should not be evaluated the same. Although the Class A and AAA respondents (72%, 67%) both agreed that if athletic directors were held accountable that perhaps this would cause them to evaluate with less attention to various public concerns.

Methods of Improvement

This section deals with the changes that the respondents would like to see in this process. Items 112 through 118 suggests some possible changes in the current evaluation
systems and ways of implementing these changes.

Items 112 suggests that a system be established where all coaches are placed on a multi-year contract to allow time to provide for professional growth. 53% of those that responded rejected this proposal, 47% accepted it. 13% suggested that more research needs to be done in this area.

Item 113 suggested that head coaches be required to evaluate all assistant coaches. 36% that responded rejected this, while 64% accepted. 24% thought there ought to be more research done on this idea and 9% thought that local legislation by school boards ought to be enacted.

Item 114 suggested that all coaches undergo the same evaluation procedures that teachers do. 51% rejected this idea, while 49% accepted it. 10% would like to see more research in this area.

Item 115 suggested that all supplemental contracts follow the same master contract and afford it the same due process that regular contracts have. 51% rejected this proposal and 49% accepted. 14% of the subjects would like to see state-wide legislation to that effect. It is hard for this writer to understand why this proposal was rejected. Unless the athletic directors felt that due process would tie the two contracts together and fire coaches in both areas.

Item 116 suggested that an inservice program for all coaches be set up as a part of the evaluation process. 49%
rejected this idea and 51% accepted it. 11% would like to see local legislation in this area.

Item 117 suggested that all head coaches be certified in coaching. 68% rejected that proposal, while only 32% accepted it. 10% thought that state-wide legislation should be enacted. Perhaps if the certification were restricted to newly graduated coaches the response would have been different?

Item 118 suggested that all assistant coaches be certified in coaching. 67% rejected that proposal, while only 33% accepted it. 11% would like to see state-wide legislation enacted.

The question of what types of evaluation techniques would the respondents like to see is summarized in TABLE 16, 17, and 18.

**TABLE 16**

CLASS A EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self appraisal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete appraisal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A checklist or rating scale</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 17

CLASS AA EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self appraisal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete appraisal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A checklist or rating scale</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community opinion survey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 18

CLASS AAA EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self appraisal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete appraisal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A checklist or rating scale</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community opinion survey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 120 asked whether a state-wide organization should adopt an evaluation system. All three classifications of schools responded with an 80% plus rejection of this proposal. For those respondents that answered yes to item 120, item 121 asked should a state-wide organization recommend that schools districts utilize this system. The Class AA and AAA schools said yes and the Class A schools said no.

Item 122 was an open-ended question allowing the respondent to comment on the evaluation process and make suggestions. Their comments are summarized as follows. The number in parenthesis after the statement is the number of schools that made that comment.

1. Establish a checklist. (4)
2. Leave it as is. (3)
3. No comment. (3)
4. Develop local objectives from their job descriptions and each coach should work towards these. They are then evaluated on the attainment of these goals. (9)
5. Evaluation should be fair and consistent. (4)
6. In the case of multi-year contracts, goals for growth should be established. (1)
7. A community survey should be taken to determine the importance that is placed on winning and losing. (2)
8. Evaluation should be handled locally. (4)
9. A higher pay scale so quality coaches can be hired (1)
10. Establish some type of uniformity for all athletic evaluation. (2)
11. The head coaches should evaluate assistant coaches. (1)
12. Develop and require course work for athletic directors and principals to aid in their knowledge of evaluation. (2)
13. Establish an athletic board to evaluate coaches. (1)
14. Use self-evaluation of coaches. (1)
15. Establish the same due process for coaches that teachers have. (2)
16. Provide an in-service program for coaches as part of their evaluation. (1)
17. Do not evaluate on winning and losing. (3)
18. Establish tenure for coaches. (2)
19. Eliminate pressure groups from the process. (1)
20. Eliminate athletic goals and policies changing as new principals and superintendents take over. A coach should be evaluated on the goals under which he is hired. (1)
21. Have the same guidelines for both men and women coaches. (1)
22. General guidelines should be established by the state, with the individual schools using these to become specific. (2)
23. Should be based only on winning. (1)
24. Eliminate the hiring of non-qualified coaches. An evaluation process can help to sort this out. (1)
25. There should be no state involvement. (1)
26. Evaluation should be based on the growth of the program. (1)

Summary

In summary, a total of 240 questionnaires were sent out to 120 different high schools in Ohio. A response of 80 questionnaires was obtained from this sample. Approximately a 40% return was obtained from the athletic directors in the sample.

A reliability analysis was done by groups on items 1-93. The items that received a .50 or lower reliability coefficient were eliminated from the final analysis of the data. The items that were dropped from analysis were items 24, 52, 55 and 56.

A t-test was then calculated, by groups on items 1-93. These were run between the coaches' responses and the athletic directors' responses. The groups of items that were found to have differences were: in the Class A group, items 35-48; in the Class AA groups, items 11-22, 30-34 and 60-80; and in the Class AAA groups, items 30-34. Items 1-93 on the questionnaire were then summarized as to the mean scores of each item. Tables 6, 7, and 8 summarize these scores.

The frequency distributions were then tabulated on items 1-93. Any item that had 50% of its scores falling below the mid-point of the scale (unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 important) was rejected as a valuable item for the final evaluation model. These tabulations were done for all three classifications of
high schools to see if there were any differences between classifications.

Part II of the questionnaire dealt with the current evaluation systems in the high schools. The results showed that the basketball coaches are not formally evaluated for their coaching duties. In most cases the athletic directors had the major responsibility for evaluation of coaches.

Eighteen criteria for evaluation were presented to the athletic directors for approval. Only items 1, 9, 17 and 18 were rejected as valid criteria for evaluation.

The data showed that the respondents felt that assistant coaches were to be evaluated by their head coaches. It also showed that self-evaluation was used by about 50% of the schools at the Class AA and AAA level. All three classifications agreed that student-evaluation should not take place. In all cases the evaluation was used for contract renewal and for professional growth. Table 15 summarizes the weight in terms of percentages that each was given.

All three classifications rejected the idea of allowing booster clubs and parents to become involved in the evaluation process. Boards of education on the other hand were accepted as a force that should be involved in the evaluation process.

All three classifications began their evaluation process from November through March. The majority ended it from April through June. Self-improvement was a goal of all three classifications. And finally, it was felt that athletic directors
should not be held accountable for the same things as coaches.

In Part III, the improvements that could be made that were rejected, are multi-year contracts, due process, master contracts, certification of coaches and state-wide evaluation systems. Inservice programs and the idea that head coaches should evaluate their assistant coaches were accepted as methods for improvement.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTED EVALUATION MODEL

This chapter will deal with the findings of this study as indicated by the data received. From this data the author will make some recommendations and present some general guidelines for the development of local evaluation models.

Conclusions

The first step in developing a logical look at evaluation is to understand what it is you are trying to evaluate. Therefore, understanding the role of the basketball coach in Ohio's high schools is essential. This is where our discussion of the problem will begin.

The following conclusions were drawn in this study:

1. The role of the basketball coach has many similarities across the three classifications of schools as witnessed by the fact that most items in Part I were accepted by all three classifications.

In the areas of coaches' skills and traits, the schools were very similar in the items that were 100% accepted as important. All three classifications accepted the same items at 100% except the items that dealt with a coach's ability to evaluate player personality, physical ability and perceptual abilities.
In the area of coaching responsibilities, the smaller schools showed 100% acceptance of those items that dealt with equipment, extra programs, athletic training, etc. The larger schools tend to show 100% acceptance on items that dealt with the individual, such as character development, individual teaching and evaluation.

The elements of the questionnaire that were considered most important by the respondents and this writer were those that received 100% of its scores above the mid-point. These therefore reflect the most important elements of the role of the basketball coach in Ohio. However, all of the items below were accepted by all three classifications. The following items are those items of the questionnaire that scored 100% above the mid-point. They are also reflected in the final evaluation model.

In the area of basketball coaching responsibilities these items scored 100% above the mid-point.

1. Item 1 - The control of the total program. (A,AA)
2. Item 3 - Insuring proper athletic training for players. (A)
3. Item 9 - The character development of athletes. (AA,AAA)
4. Item 12 - The development of the basketball program grades 7-9. (A)
5. Item 13 - The development of the basketball program grades 10-12. (A,AA,AAA)
6. Item 15 - The competent organization of daily practices. (A,AA,AAA)
7. Item 16 - On-the-floor coaching. (AA,AAA)
8. Item 21- Establishing good player relationships. (A, AA, AAA)


10. Item 25- Quality academic counseling of players. (A, AA)

11. Item 27- Establishing good relationships with opponents. (A, AA, AAA)

12. Item 28- Establishing good public relations with the media. (A, AA, AAA)

13. Item 29- Supporting other non-sport activities. (AA)

14. Item 30- Developing team finances. (A)

15. Item 31- The management of equipment. (A, AA)

16. Item 32- Insuring competitive scheduling. (AA)

*Indicated in parentheses are the classifications in which the 100% was achieved.

In the successful coach should possess the following skills section these items scored 100% above the mid-point.

1. Item 35- Offensive knowledge of the game. (A, AA, AAA)

2. Item 36- Defensive knowledge of the game. (A, AA, AAA)

3. Item 39- Critical Evaluation - the ability to analyze the game situation and make adjustments. (A, AA, AAA)

4. Item 40- Adjusting their seasonal and individual game plans to fit his or her players skill levels. (A, AA, AAA)

5. Item 43A-The ability to evaluate players personalities. (A, AA)

6. Item 43B-The ability to evaluate players perceptual abilities. (A, AA)
7. Item 43C-The ability to evaluate players physical abilities. (AA)
8. Item 43D-The ability to evaluate players playing abilities. (AA)
9. Item 44 -Teaching ability on the floor. (A,AA,AAA)
10. Item 45 -The ability to clearly present fundamentals.
11. Item 46 -Maintaining the discipline of athletes. (A,AA)
12. Item 47 -Teaching of self-discipline to players.
13. Item 56 -The ability to motivate players. (A,AAA)
14. Item 57 -The ability to communicate with staff.
15. Item 58 -The ability to evaluate the entire program.
16. Item 59 -The ability to handle administrative duties. (A,AAA)

In the successful coach should possess the following traits section these items scored 100% above the mid-point.

1. Items 60-65 -Enthusiasm, professionalism, integrity, tact and the ability to view winning and losing in its proper perspective. (A,AA,AAA)
2. Items 67-74 -Leadership, self-control, decisiveness, initiative, fairness of decisions and dedication to the profession. (A,AA,AAA)
3. Items 75-77 -Respect for opponents, assistants, and players. (A,AA)
4. Item 78 - Respect for the public. (A,AAA)
5. Items 79-80 -Responsibility to the total school assignment and honoring the letter and spirit of the rules. (A,AA,AAA)
In the to be a successful coach section these items scored 100% above the mid-point.

1. Item 88 - One should be able to adjust to situations and successfully take advantage of them. (A, AAA)

2. Item 89 - One should base decisions on fitting a style of play to a given situation. (A, AA, AAA)

3. Item 90 - One must have the ability to influence athletes to greater use of their talents. (A, AA, AAA)

*Indicated in parentheses are the classifications in which the 100% was achieved.

The items presented in Part I of the questionnaire were accepted by the sample used, as valid components of a basketball coach's role in Ohio's high schools. Exceptions are those items that were rejected by the various classifications. The items that were rejected by the Class A schools were: the insuring of proper nutrition, having a winning season, college playing experience, a bachelors degree for non-certified teachers who are employed as coaches, a masters degree, a certification in coaching, an authoritarian style of coaching, consulting with players on all decisions and the idea that a coach has to have great talent to win.

The items that were rejected by the Class AA schools were: past college playing experience, a masters degree, a coach must be a physical education teacher, an authoritarian style of coaching, consulting with players on
all decisions, and the idea that a coach has to have
great talent to win.

The items that were rejected by the Class AAA schools
were: a masters degree, a certification in coaching, a
coach should be a physical education teacher, an author-
itarian style of coaching, consulting with players on
all decisions, and the idea that a coach has to have
great talent to win.

2. Currently basketball coaches at 75% of the schools in
Ohio are not being evaluated objectively or formally by
their superiors.

3. In cases where an objective evaluation does take
place the athletic directors generally are the responsible
party. An exception is at the Class A level where the
athletic directors and the principals seem to share
these duties.

4. At the Class A, AA and AAA levels the following criteria
should be included in the evaluation.

   a. On-the-floor coaching
   b. Timely game decisions
   c. Overall knowledge of current coaching methods
   d. Professionalism on the floor
   e. Professionalism off the floor
   f. Player-coach relationships
   g. Staff and personal growth
   h. Junior high responsibilities
i. High school responsibilities
j. Acceptance and adherence to school philosophy and policy
k. Good public relations
l. Classroom teaching effectiveness
m. Win-loss record
n. Professional training

o. Objectivity of the coach in relation to the political climate of the community. (Accepted only at the Class AA level). The differences found on this criteria could be due to the differences of pressure that is placed on coaches at the various levels. Political climates do vary from school to school.

6. All three classifications of schools agreed that assistant coaches should be evaluated primarily by their sports head coach. It would seem, to this writer that if head coaches are fired because of performance created by his entire staff, then he should have primary evaluation responsibility over these coaches. If head coaches do not have this input now, they should in the future.

7. It was concluded that Class AA and AAA schools use to some extent the self-evaluation technique within their evaluation systems. This author strongly feels that all classifications should use some form of a self-evaluation.
8. All three classifications agreed strongly that student-evaluation should not be used to evaluate basketball coaches. This conclusion would seem to this writer, is a strong indication of the acceptance of the authoritarian role that coaches have had in past years. The thought continues to prevail that the coach can do no wrong.

9. All three classifications indicated that they did use their evaluation process for both professional growth and for contract renewal. However, there seemed to be more emphasis placed on the evaluation for contract renewal than for professional growth.

10. The influence of booster clubs and parents should not be allowed into the evaluation of a coach according to all three classes. However, they did feel that Boards of Education should have a voice. This is a predictable conclusion due to the fact that legally Boards of Education must give their approval on all contracts.

11. General speaking, all three classifications agreed that community involvement in evaluation should be held to a minimum. This could be explained by the attitude that administrations appear to have, that they are the experts in the field. Therefore they will make the decisions based only on their observations.

12. Most schools start their evaluation process between November and March. It is ended during the period from November through June.
13. All three classifications of schools try to aid their coaches in self-improvement through the evaluation process.

14. It was strongly felt that athletic directors should not be held accountable to the same win-loss pressures as their coaches. However if they were, the Class A and AAA respondents agreed that it would force athletic directors to be influenced less by various public concerns. The athletic directors would then hire and fire based on quality not emotions.

15. The idea of requiring all head and assistant coaches to be certified in coaching was very strongly rejected by the respondents.

16. The following techniques to be used in the evaluation process were suggested by all three classifications.
   a. Conference
   b. Observations
   c. Self appraisal
   d. A checklist or rating system

17. All three classifications agreed strongly that they did not want any state control in the evaluation process. This included either a direct mandate or a recommendation.

18. A large percentage of the respondents would like to see the basketball coach in the future evaluated on clear and locally developed objectives. These objectives should be set at the start of the contract and worked toward obtaining them.

19. The coaches and athletic directors disagreed on the role of the basketball coach in the areas of the importance
of past playing experience, offensive knowledge of the
game, previous coaching experience, having a winning
season, team finances, self-control, and scheduling.
The questionnaire did not allow for enough detail to
determine in what ways they disagreed.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are indicated as a result of this study. It is obvious to this author that at present in the state of Ohio there is little if any systematic or objective evaluation of basketball coaches taking place. The following recommendations are not intended as a final word to secondary educators and administrators, but rather they are intended to help focus upon the current state of high school coaching evaluation in Ohio. From these suggestions and guidelines local school districts may be better able to develop new ideas for evaluating their coaching staffs. This author's recommendations which arose from the data of this study are as follows:

1. From the local viewpoint develop a philosophical role of athletics and coaching that fits your school system. This role should be based on sound educational philosophy that is adjusted to meet the needs of the community. It should not be based solely on local conditions.

2. From the local viewpoint develop and use an objective comprehensive evaluation system for coaches within the school system. It should be based on a comprehensive plan that utilizes more than win-loss records.

3. Develop goals and objectives for coaches that are specific to the community in which a coach is hired. These objectives should then be used as a basis for evaluating the coach's performance and thus making future decisions. The coaches and administrators should
contribute jointly to the development of these stated objectives by securing research such as this study, and applying it to their community and school situation.

4. A state supported organization should develop courses to aid the evaluator in athletic evaluations. Obviously it can be seen from this study, that athletic evaluation is in many cases different from the evaluation of regular teaching contracts. The goals, objectives, techniques, and due process of the two are totally different, although it does not need to be.

5. More research needs to be conducted into specific evaluation instruments that can be used by non-athletic administrators when evaluating athletic staffs. This study provides the evaluator with knowledge from which to base decisions. However, more research still needs to be done on more specific areas. Possible areas for more research are the evaluation of assistant coaches, a comparison of actual community views and the schools views, and a correlation between win-loss records and a coach that displays the characteristics that this study suggests.

6. It is recommended that additional research be conducted to investigate what factors caused the athletic directors not to be in favor of either the due process item of this study or the certification of coaches item.

7. A self-evaluation technique needs to be developed and used when evaluating coaching staffs. It should become
a meaningful part of the process that provides useful information to both the coach and the evaluator.

8. In this writer's opinion, supplemental contracts should show progress towards being subject to the same evaluation process as regular teaching contracts. This would help to eliminate the current practice of evaluating coaches without the use of a comprehensive plan.

9. It is also recommended that state agencies provide more leadership in aiding local school districts in the development and use of evaluation techniques for coaches. This recommendation seems contrary to the data received in this study. However, many respondents answered negatively to this question, but then stated otherwise in their comments.

10. The evaluation process should be utilized as a means of evaluating not only for contract renewal but for providing professional growth and in-service training for coaches.

With these recommendations in mind, FIGURE 4 will offer an example for the development of a sample of an evaluation instrument at the Class AAA level. This instrument is not intended to provide the answers for any particular school system, but rather it hopes to encompass an overview of the points brought out in this study.

Because of the fact that there were some obvious differences in philosophy and methods used at the various levels of schools, this model will not work equally well in all situations.
It is hoped that bits and pieces will be drawn out and used as needed by individual school systems. Not all accepted items are used to describe the coach in a particular high school.

The numbers found in parentheses after the item represent the percentage of the responses that fell above the mid-point for that item.
Name of Coach   Sport Assignment   School

This form is to be filled out by the athletic director twice a year. Once in November, to be used for professional growth and once in April, to be used for contract renewal. Copies should be forwarded to the Principal, Superintendent and the Board of Education. (Percentages listed after the item indicate the response of the Class AAA athletic directors to that item)

Date

Professional Growth

Contract Renewal

I. Coaching Responsibilities

A. Related to the Sport
1. Displays total control over the basketball program. (95%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Insures proper medical care for team. (95%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Insures proper nutrition of players while under his/her supervision. (65%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Attends basketball clinics and urges his staff to do likewise. (85%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Is an active member in professional organizations. (70%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Contributes to the character development of athletes. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Actively recruits quality assistant coaches to the program. (90%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Develops the basketball program, K-6. (55%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Develops the basketball program, 7-9. (90%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Develops the basketball program, 10-12. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6

FIGURE 4
CLASS AAA
EVALUATION MODEL
I. Coaching Responsibilities (Continued)  

A. Related to the Sport  

11. Insures the professional growth of the basketball staff. (clinics, camps, etc) (95%)  

12. Displays competent organization of daily practice plans. (100%)  

13. On-the-floor coaching. (100%)  

14. Displays competencies in studying game films. (80%)  

15. Displays the ability to organize a summer program. (85%)  

16. Displays the ability to organize an off-season conditioning program. (85%)  

17. Has the ability to recruit athletes to basketball. (55%)  

18. Establishes good player-coach relationships. (100%)  

19. Has a .500 season or better. (70%)  

20. Handles players' personal problems. (95%)  

B. Administrative  

1. Effects positive crowd behavior during contests. (85%)  

2. Establishes good relations with opponents. (100%)  

3. Establishes and maintains good public relations with the news media. (100%)  

4. Developes team finances within your schools stated limits. (55%)  

5. The management of equipment. (95%)  

6. Insures proper scheduling. (85%)  

7. Insures proper planning and cooperation on trips. (meals, lodging, etc) (84%)
I. Coaching Responsibilities

Please Circle
Low High

B. Administrative

8. Performs self-evaluation for contract renewal. (80%)

C. Community Responsibilities

1. Maintains favorable public-relations (100%)

2. Supports non-sport activities. (90%)

D. Teaching Responsibilities

1. Has advanced academic training. (50%)

2. Carries out a normal teaching load. (90%)

3. Displays quality academic counseling of players. (95%)

II. The basketball coaches knowledge and skills.

A. Related to the Sport

1. Offensive knowledge of the game. (100%)

2. Defensive knowledge of the game. (100%)

3. Past high school playing experience. (75%)

4. Past college playing experience. (60%)

5. Displays the ability to analyze the game situations and make adjustments. (100%)

6. Displays the ability to adjust seasonal and individual game plans and philosophies to fit his or her players' skill levels. (100%)

7. Previous coaching experience. (95%)

8. Has the ability to recruit within legal and moral guidelines. (84%)
II. The basketball coaches knowledge and skills. Please Circle Low High

A. Related to the Sport

9. Has the ability to evaluate player...
   Personalities. (90%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Intelligence and perceptual abilities. (90%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Physical abilities. (90%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
   Playing abilities. (95%) 1 2 3 4 5 6

10. Displays teaching abilities on the floor. (100%)

11. Displays the ability to clearly and successfully present fundamentals. (100%)

12. Maintains the discipline of players. (95%) 1 2 3 4 5 6

13. Teaches self-discipline to athletes. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6

14. Has the ability to treat athletic injuries. (95%) 1 2 3 4 5 6

15. Has the ability to motivate players. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6

B. Administrative

1. Displays the ability to communicate with staff. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Has the ability to evaluate the entire basketball program. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Displays the ability to handle general administrative duties. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
III. Coaches' Personal Traits and Qualities.

Please Circle
Low High

1. Enthusiasm for students. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Enthusiasm for the program. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Professionalism in all areas. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Integrity. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. The ability to view winning and losing in its proper perspective. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Tact. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Warmth of personality. (95%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Leadership. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Self-control under game conditions. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Self-control outside of game conditions. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. A positive image in terms of dress, grooming, floor conduct. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Decisiveness. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. Initiative. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Fairness of decisions. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. Dedication to the profession and the school. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. Respect for opponents. (95%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. Respect for assistants. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. Respect for players. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. Respect for the public. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. Responsibility to his total school assignment by setting the example. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. Honors the spirit of the rule as well as the letter. (100%) 1 2 3 4 5 6
IV. Comments

1. What are this coach's personal strengths?

2. What are this coach's personal weaknesses?

3. What goals need to be set for future success? (These should be discussed and agreed upon by both the coach and the evaluator before the season.)
   a. Coaching:
   b. Administrative:
      1. Evaluation of the assistant coaches.
      2. Complete a self-evaluation before the season.
   c. Personal:

4. Recommendation of athletic director.

Signed:

Athletic Director

Head Coach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Card</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Actual Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Coaching Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Related to the sport</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Administrative</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Community Responsibilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Teaching Responsibilities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. The basketball coaches knowledge and skills.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Related to the sport</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Administrative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Coaches' Personal Traits and Qualities.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following instrument is the evaluation instrument for coaches, that is approved by the Ohio High School Athletic Association. It is taken from the Ohio High School Athletic Association publication entitled, "Criteria For The Evaluation of Local Interscholastic Athletic Programs." It is being presented as a comparison to the evaluation instrument that was developed through this study.

D. The Coach

Possible Score 28
Actual Score ______

Rating Scale
0 1 2 3 4

1. Coaches support the administration in the total educational program.

2. Coaches are exemplary in their behavior and sportsmanship.

3. Coaches accept the decisions of medical personnel when the question arises concerning whether or not to allow a boy who has been ill or injured to compete.

4. Coaches do not permit their coaching assignments to infringe upon their teaching responsibilities.

5. Coaches insist that squad members be good hosts, good guests, and good citizens. He teaches respect for property and emphasizes that players represent the school and community.

6. Coaches accept the decisions of the officials.

7. Coaches and trainers are acquainted with first aid procedures and have first aid supplies available.

FIGURE 5
O.H.S.A.A. EVALUATION MODEL
As far as this writer knows, the evaluation instrument that is suggested by the Ohio High School Athletic Association is the only evaluation instrument that has been approved by any official state-wide organization in Ohio. There are other organizations outside of the state of Ohio that have more comprehensive evaluation models, but this is a study on the high schools in Ohio.

Obviously there has been little done in the past with evaluation of coaches in Ohio. Based on this study, it is the suggestion of this author that high schools adopt an evaluation instrument similar to the one that has been developed in this study.
APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER FOR PILOT STUDY
March 7, 1979

Dear Athletic Enthusiast,

The attached questionnaire is part of a state-wide survey being done as part of a doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University in cooperation with the Elyria City Schools. This project is concerned specifically with the process of evaluating coaches within the high school setting.

Your name has been submitted to me, by your peers to act as a source of expertise for a pretest of the questionnaire. If you could screen the tentative form for possible areas to be included within the final questionnaire, it would be of great help.

Please look over the enclosed forms and apply the scale to each question. At any time make any comments or additions that you feel necessary. Please do not answer the questionnaire. Return it to me as soon as possible. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Donn Bennice
Elyria City Schools
APPENDIX B: INVENTORY APPRAISAL FORM
Basketball Staff Evaluation  
Inventory Appraisal Form  

Please evaluate each item on the inventory both for clarity and for the validity of the item as an evaluation criteria. A valid item is one that provides usable information for evaluating basketball coaches.

**Clarity**  
Clear & Precise 1 2 3 4 5 6 Unclear

**Validity**  
Valuable 1 2 3 4 5 6 Without value

Please comment to the extent that you feel necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Clarity</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td></td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This format was continued until all 122 items were listed.
APPENDIX C:

COVER LETTER FOR RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
April 22, 1979

Dear Athletic Enthusiast,

The attached questionnaire is part of a state-wide survey being done as part of a doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University and in cooperation with the Elyria City Schools. This project is concerned specifically with the process of evaluating coaches within the high school setting. For too long coaches have been evaluated on winning and losing. This survey will give athletic administrators a tool to evaluate more professionally their coaches.

We are particularly desirous of obtaining your responses because of your experience in athletics. We hope that you will support our project by completing the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it to us. Other aspects of this study can not be completed until we analyze the questionnaire results.

Your contribution to the professionalism of athletics is greatly appreciated. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Donn Bennice
Elyria City Schools
APPENDIX D:

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT
Instructions For Completing
The Basketball Staff Evaluation Inventory

This instrument consists of three sections concerning the evaluation of high school basketball staffs. Part I will deal with the role of the basketball coach in the high school. Part II deals with the current evaluation systems that are being used. Evaluation is defined as any type of assessment that takes place regardless of whether it is used for contract renewal or for professional growth. Part III deals with the implementation of any future evaluation systems.

Please rate each statement as to its importance as indicated on the scale below. Mark your answer in the appropriate space.

Scale: Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

If you feel strongly that your experience or background does not give you an adequate basis for judgement, then leave the space blank.

Return to:
Donn Bennice
Elyria High School
Middle & 6th St.

Please circle
School Classification
A AA AAA
Sex: M F

PLEASE FILL OUT COMPLETELY

Part I
The Role of the Basketball Coach

1. A basketball coach's responsibilities consists of:
   A. Skills Not Directly Related To The Sport

   Scale Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

   Your opinion Your View of the
   Community Opinion

   1. The control of the total basketball program
      in terms of players, asst. coaches, and fans.

   2. The ability to effect positive crowd behavior
      during contests.

   3. Insuring proper athletic training, condition-
      ing and care for players. (Taping, First Aid)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Insuring the proper nutrition of athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Having advanced academic training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Having and carrying out normal teaching responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Attendance at basketball clinics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Membership in professional organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Recruitment of quality assistant coaches to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Skills directly related to the sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. The development of the basketball program K-6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. The development of the basketball program 7-9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. The development of the basketball program 10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Insuring the professional growth of the basketball staff, (clinics, camps, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. The competent organization of daily practice plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Competencies in studying game films.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. The ability to organize a summer program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. The ability to organize an off-season conditioning program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. The recruitment of athletes to basketball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Establishing good player-coach relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Having a .500 season or better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Maintaining Interpersonal Relationships

**Scale**

Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

Your opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your View of the Community Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Maintaining favorable public relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Attending all sports banquet functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Quality academic counseling of players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The handling of players' personal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Establishing good relationships with opponents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Establishing and maintaining public relations with the news media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Supporting other non-sport activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Administration

| 30. Developing team finances within your schools stated limits. |
| 31. The management of equipment. |
| 32. Insuring competitive scheduling. |
| 33. The proper planning and cooperation on trips. (meals, lodging, equipment) |
| 34. Performing self-evaluation for contract renewal |

2. A successful basketball coach should possess the following skills:

A. Skills directly related to the sport

<p>| 35. Offensive knowledge of the game. |
| 36. Defensive knowledge of the game. |
| 37. Past high school playing experience. |
| 38. Past college playing experience. |
| 39. Critical Evaluation - the ability to analyze the game situations and make adjustments. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your opinion</th>
<th>Your View of the Community Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Adjusting their seasonal and individual game plans and philosophies to fit his or her players' skill levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Previous coaching experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Ability to recruit within legal and moral guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Ability to successfully evaluate player...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Intelligence and perceptual abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Physical abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Playing abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Teaching ability on the floor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The ability to clearly and successfully present fundamentals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Maintaining the discipline of athletes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Teaching of self-discipline to athletes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Treatment of athletic injuries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Skills not directly related to the sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Teaching ability in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Bachelors degree for non-certified teachers holding an Educational Aid Certificate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Masters degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Doctoral degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Leadership ability in terms of the total basketball program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. A certification in coaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Public speaking ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Interpersonal Relationships

Scale Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

Your opinion

--- 56. The ability to motivate players.

--- 57. The ability to meaningfully communicate with staff.

D. Administration

--- 58. The ability to evaluate the entire basketball program.

--- 59. The ability to handle general administrative duties.

3. A successful basketball coach should possess the following personal traits:

--- 60. Enthusiasm for students.

--- 61. Enthusiasm for the program

--- 62. Professionalism in all areas of coaching.

--- 63. Integrity

--- 64. The ability to view winning and losing in its proper perspective.

--- 65. Tact

--- 66. Warmth of personality.

--- 67. Leadership

--- 68. Self-control under game situations.

--- 69. Self-control outside of game conditions.

--- 70. A positive image in terms of dress, grooming, floor conduct.

--- 71. Decisiveness

--- 72. Initiative

--- 73. Fairness of decisions.
Your opinion

Scale

1 2 3 4 5 6

Important

Your View of the Community Opinion

74. Dedication to the profession and the school.

75. Respect for opponents.

76. Respect for assistants.

77. Respect for players.

78. Honoring the spirit of the rule as well as the letter.

79. Responsibility to his total school assignment by setting the example.

80. One needs to be a physical education teacher.

81. One should be an authoritarian type of coach.

82. One should have control of major decisions relating to the basketball program.

83. One should consult with assistant coaches in making all practice and game decisions.

84. One should consult with players in making decisions not directly related to their playing.

85. One should consult with players in making decisions directly related to their playing.

86. One should delegate authority to others in specific areas.

87. One should delegate authority to others in making player decisions.

88. One should be able to adjust to situations and successfully take advantage of them.

89. One must have the ability to influence athletes towards greater use of their talents in a competitive situation.

90. One should base decisions on fitting a style of play to a given situation.
Your opinion

91. One has to start with players of great physical talent to have a successful team.

92. One needs to believe that the value gained from a team win justifies circumventing certain individual players' needs at the moment.

93. One has to set his job as his number one priority.

Part II
Current Systems of Evaluating High School Basketball Coaches

94. Are the basketball coaches (grades 7-12) formally and objectively evaluated in your system thru the use of checklists or other written documents?

Yes ___ No ___

95. Are your basketball coaches evaluated in a systematic manner which does not involve the use of checklists?

Yes ___ No ___

If the answers to both items 94 & 95 are no, then proceed to Section III. of this inventory. Do not answer items 96 through 110.

96. For your school, which administrative individual has primary responsibilities for evaluating coaches? (Check only one)

___ Superintendant ___ Principal ___ Athletic Director

97. How important are the following criteria, upon which coaches may be specifically evaluated?

Scale Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

___ Income generated specifically by the head coach
___ On-the-floor organization of practice
___ Timely game decisions
Scale  Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important

___ Overall knowledge of current coaching methods

___ Professionalism on the floor

___ Professionalism off the floor

___ Player-coach relations

___ Staff and personal growth

Program development

___ Elementary K-6

___ Junior High or Middle school 7-9

___ High School 10-12

___ Acceptance and adherence to school philosophy and policy

___ Public relations

___ Classroom teaching effectiveness

___ Win-loss record

___ Professional training

___ Certification of coaching

___ Objectivity of the coach in relation to the political climate of the community.

98. For your school, who has the major responsibility for the evaluation of assistant coaches? (Check only one)

___ Principal   ___ Athletic Director   ___ Head Coach

99. Are student-athletes used in the evaluation process?

Yes ___ No ___

100. Are the coaches ever asked to evaluate themselves?

Yes ___ No ___

If yes, is this evaluation seriously used to determine whether their contract will be renewed or not?

Yes ___ No ___
101. Is the total evaluation process used for ...  
   a. Contract renewal  Yes ___ No ___  
   b. Professional growth  Yes ___ No ___  

102. If yes on items 101 a. & b, indicate what weight should be given to the evaluation in establishing ...  
   a. Contract renewal ___%  
   b. Professional growth ___%  
      Total 100%  

103. What is the most important factor to be considered in evaluation for contract renewal?  

104. What is the degree of involvement in the evaluation process by the following?  
       Scale  Unimportant 1 2 3 4 5 6 Important  
           ___ Booster Clubs  
           ___ Parents of players  
           ___ Board of Education  

105. Should there be any community involvement in the evaluation process?  
   Yes ___ No ___  

106. When does the evaluation process begin? (Check only one)  
   ___ June-August  
   ___ September-October  
   ___ November-March  
   ___ April-June  

107. When does the evaluation process end? (Check only one)  
   ___ June-August  
   ___ September-October  
   ___ November-March  
   ___ April-June
108. Is there an attempt to aid coaches in self-improvement through the evaluation process?

Yes   No

109. Should athletic directors be held accountable to the pressures of athletics and winning that coaches are?

Yes   No

If yes, to what extent?

110. Do you think this accountability would enable athletic directors to evaluate coaches more objectively with less attention to various public concerns?

Yes   No

Part III
Future Goals and Improvement in Evaluating High School Basketball Coaches

111. Specifically, what suggestions for change would you like to offer for improving the present system? For each change that you would offer, circle the numbers of all implementation procedures you would use from the list below. If you would not like to offer a change then circle zero. You may use any or all of the procedures in the right-hand column with any change listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Implementation Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 112. Establish a system where all coaches are placed on a multi-year contract to allow time to provide for professional growth.</td>
<td>1. Offer legislation state-wide 2. Offer legislation locally 3. Require specific additional course work in athletic administration for athletic directors and principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 113. Require the head coaches to evaluate all assistant coaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1 2 3 4 114. Require coaches to undergo the same evaluation procedures that teachers do.

(1 2 3 4 115. Require all supplemental contracts to follow the same master contract and afford it the same due process that regular contracts

(1 2 3 4 116. Require an inservice program for all coaches as part of the evaluation process.

(1 2 3 4 117. Require all head coaches to be certified in coaching.

(1 2 3 4 118. Require all assistant coaches to be certified in coaching.

4. Select a state-wide panel consisting of O.H.S.A.A. school representatives to study the problem.

5. Select a state-wide panel consisting of O.H.S.A.A. officials to study the problem.

6. Select a state-wide panel of professional experts to study the problem.

7. Perform additional research to suggest ways of implementation.

119. Which of these would you use to carry out an evaluation of a basketball staff?

a. Conference Yes ___ No ___
b. Observation Yes ___ No ___
c. Self appraisal Yes ___ No ___
d. Student-athlete appraisal Yes ___ No ___
e. A checklist or rating scale Yes ___ No ___
f. Community opinion survey Yes ___ No ___

120. Should a state-wide organization (O.H.S.A.A., O.E.A., etc.) adopt an evaluation system for coaching contract renewals? If no, skip item 121.

Yes ___ No ___
121. Should state-wide organizations recommend that all school districts within the state of Ohio establish a means of utilizing this system within their districts?

Yes _____ No _____

122. What would you like to see the nature of the evaluation process be, in the near future? Comment to whatever extent that you think necessary.
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APPENDIX F

EXPERTS USED IN PILOT STUDY
Panel of Experts in Pilot Study

1. Mr. George Bates, Commissioner  
The Ohio High School Athletic Association

2. Ms. Judy A. Boles, Girls Athletic Director  
Warren City Schools

3. Mr. Sherman Bowser, Past President of the Ohio High School Athletic Directors Association  
Kettering Fairmont High School

4. Mr. Edward Cinniger, Athletic Director  
Lorain City Schools

5. Ms. Lori Clark, Girls Athletic Director  
Rocky River High School

6. Mr. Lewis C. Cross, Principal  
Waite High School

7. Ms. Joan Dautek, Girls Athletic Director  
Fairborn Baker High School

8. Mr. Russel Doan, Athletic Director  
Elyria City Schools

9. Mr. Robert Holland, Asst. Director,  
Ohio Department of Education

10. Ms. Joann Maher, Girls Athletic Director  
Toledo City Schools

11. Mr. Robert Mowery, Vice President Ohio High School Athletic Directors Association

12. Mr. Rollie Platz, Northeastern District Representative,  
Ohio High School Athletic Directors Association  
Medina High School

13. Mr. Ralph Quesinberry, President  
Ohio High School Athletic Directors Association  
Chagrin Falls High School

14. Mr. John Rossi, President  
Ohio Basketball Coaches Association  
Middletown Fenwick High School

15. Mr. Richard Sherman, Athletic Director  
Fremont Ross High School