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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

As a result of the press for accountability so prominent during the past two decades, evaluation of personnel is an emerging priority for American educational institutions. This is reflected by a number of states legally mandating evaluation programs in local school systems.

The classroom teacher has been the primary focus of evaluation programs, procedures, and strategies in public schools for decades. School districts have not traditionally established formal procedures for the evaluation of middle level administrators. Even less attention has been given to the development of effective procedures for evaluating the performance of the chief executive officer, the school superintendent (Kowalski, 1976, p. 111).

Only one of the five status reports on the superintendency published by the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) from 1923 to 1971 mentions superintendent evaluations. The 1933 report includes a chapter dedicated to a "cookbook approach" on how to evaluate a superintendent. The chapter includes three sections: (a) a self-rating scale on the collective and individual aspects of leadership in the superintendency; (b) the personal qualities reported as
essential to leadership; and (c) an annotated bibliography (National Education Association, 1933, pp. 323-342).

The questions which surround the appraisal of school superintendents have, for the most part, remained unaddressed over a number of years. Although there have been several studies which report the practices and procedures for selecting and dismissing superintendents, there remains a void concerning information about the procedures of evaluation (Buchanan, 1981, p. 2). However, as the role of superintendent develops and increased pressures become evident, the issue of evaluation increases in significance (Brinkman, 1973, p. 6).

The district superintendent is employed by the governing board as its chief executive officer. The legal responsibility for evaluation of the school superintendent rests with this duly elected or appointed local educational committee (called a school board in most states) made up of residents of the community in which the school district employing the superintendent is located.

Superintendents have always been evaluated, at least informally, by school boards, parents, teachers, students, community members, and others. School districts are complex organizations subject to appraisal, criticism, and pressure from every group imaginable and the superintendent is often the focal point of such informal "evaluation." Nevertheless, information on the processes used in the evaluation of superintendents has not been collated, organized, or disseminated to any appreciable extent despite its
implication for judging a school district's total planning (Carol, 1972, p. 5).

The study The American School Superintendency, 1982 (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982) conducted under the auspices of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) includes questions pertaining to the evaluation of superintendents. The intent of this research is to study the extent to which American public school superintendents are evaluated through utilizing data from the 1982 AASA study and related information from other sources.

Background of the Problem

The worst sin towards our fellow creatures is not to hate them, but to be indifferent to them; that's the essence of inhumanity.

George Bernard Shaw

Effective leadership is fundamental to quality education at the local school district level. Tyack and Hansot (1982) document the role and function of the office of superintendent, identify the characteristics of those who have occupied the position historically, and conclude that superintendents carry a heavy burden of leadership responsibility in strengthening and perpetuating belief in public education. Clearly the responsibility for providing effective leadership rests with the chief executive officer, the school superintendent. The school board is responsible for appraising the superintendent and determining the degree of adequacy of such leadership.
The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) recently developed a joint publication on evaluating the superintendent in which the following paragraph is included:

School boards want to be assured that the superintendent serving their school system is effective in providing leadership for that system. Superintendents want to be assured that they are doing a good job . . . that they are, indeed, living up to the expectations of their school boards and their communities. A good evaluation system may provide that assurance for both the superintendent and the school board (Redfern, 1980, p. 3).

It would appear that the professional organizations representing school superintendents and boards of education across America are merely reflecting current practice, but are they?

Evaluation of educational personnel is tricky, highly political, and in an early stage of development. The practices are unclear and the principles are shoddy (Scriven, 1979, p. 7). This viewpoint is reinforced in an earlier publication of the American Association of School Administrators regarding administrative evaluation:

Administrative evaluation is fog-shrouded in most management fields. It is very dense in educational management. School administrators do not have an affinity for the fog. It is their inheritance. For them, there is more to be 'unlearned' than in other endeavors (Olds, 1977, p. 17).

A decade ago, Rosenberg (1974, p. 91) provided a scathing indictment of existing administrative evaluation systems, calling them "woefully inadequate and unfair," and based on "unacceptable evidence collected with undesirable methods from undesirable
sources." Although his comments were directed toward evaluation of building principals, Rosenberg's comments may be just as applicable to evaluations of superintendents.

Concern over executive performance appraisal is not limited to education.

Performance appraisal within the organization itself is generally acknowledged as one of the weakest points in organizational development. Indeed, organizations have been so weak in this regard that the appraisal of executive performance -- or lack of it -- has been referred to as the 'Achilles heel' of management development (Meldan, 1981, p. 7).

Evidently the art, or science, of executive performance appraisal is far from maturity; certainly, the evaluation of the chief executive officer of a school district is still in its primitive stages (Evans, 1981, p. 90). A decade ago it was reported that research on teacher effectiveness had generated more than 10,000 published studies (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974, p. 12), yet research related to the evaluation of the superintendent has been limited (Buchanan, 1981, p 6). Few empirically based descriptions of the superintendency or superintendents exist (Ogawa, 1979, p. 2).

Cuban observes in Urban Chiefs Under Fire that:

There is precious little agreement on where the superintendency has come from, where it is moving, or even what its present nature is . . . (Cuban, 1976, p. 8).

A search of the existing literature on the superintendency substantiates this observation. While numerous articles, chapters in books, and whole volumes have been written about superintendents,
few empirical descriptions focus upon performance of superintendents. Even fewer have included evaluation of superintendents as part of any information gained.

It is only in recent years that boards of education have made a start toward implementing planned systems for evaluating their chief executive officers. Because of this brief historical experience and a corresponding lack of research, a general consensus among boards of education has yet to emerge as to the most effective evaluation approach (Evans, 1981, p. 81). The complexity of evaluation and the significance of the job being done by the superintendent are what make the evaluation problem so fascinating (Bolton, 1980, p. viii).

Increasingly the impetus for evaluation of the superintendent is coming from sources other than school boards, superintendents, or any other group or individual at the local school district level. State legislative bodies constitute a significant force in the spread of plans for the evaluation of superintendents. Some states have instituted a legislative mandate requiring the evaluation of professional employees in school districts, including the superintendent. Thus, what was formerly regarded by many as a good management practice became a state requirement (Evans, 1981, p. iv). The review of the literature prepared for this study includes a status report compiled by the writer of the nation's experience with state-mandated superintendent evaluation as reported by the
executive directors of state professional associations serving superintendents.

**Problem Statement and Purposes**

The research problem is to probe current practices in the evaluation of American public school superintendents. This inquiry draws upon the perceptions of the nation's school superintendents regarding their own evaluations.

One purpose is to ascertain from superintendents themselves the "state of the art" regarding superintendent evaluations and how practices differ by size of school district. In addition, characteristics of superintendents who are formally and/or informally evaluated are explored. More specifically, the purposes of the study are three fold:

1. To compare superintendents' evaluation practices among five groups, the four groups of general local superintendents serving school districts of various sizes and the intermediate district superintendents based upon data from the 1982 AASA sponsored survey of the American public school superintendent. The data are analyzed in regard to:
   a. Frequency of evaluation
   b. Procedure - degree of formality
   c. Need to develop a formal procedure - superintendents' view
   d. Need to develop a formal procedure - board of educations' view as perceived by the superintendents
e. Reasons for evaluation
f. Criteria
g. Methods
h. Primary expectations
i. Whether a formal job description exists, and
j. If the superintendent is evaluated against the
criteria in the job description.

2. To compare three groups of general superintendents: those who report they are evaluated "formally," "informally," and "both formally and informally." This is completed by developing a profile for each of the three groups of superintendents using the following selected personal and professional characteristics:
   a. Age
   b. Sex
c. Years in the superintendency
d. Number of superintendencies held
e. Place-bound or career-bound (appointed or elected from inside or outside the district)
f. Membership in professional organizations
g. Highest degree held
h. Opinions about the usefulness of educational research
i. District size
j. District type
k. Geographic location - region
3. To compare selected characteristics of two groups of general local superintendents: those who are formally evaluated and those who are informally evaluated. This is accomplished by testing three hypotheses concerning differences in demographic data.

Hypothesis 1 - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to be younger, newer to the superintendency, and career-bound.

Carol (1972, p. 8) reports in her study that the most meaningful relationship between the degree of formality in superintendents' evaluations and demographic data involved the length of the chief school officer's tenure in his/her current position. All of the school districts with formal procedures in Carol's study had superintendents who had been on the job seven years or less.

Superintendents who are younger and newer to the superintendency have entered the position during the era of accountability so prevalent in the last decade. They are also more likely to have been a participant in evaluation programs as teachers, building administrators, or central office administrators than their older, more experienced colleagues. They are more accustomed to and, in fact, expect more formal evaluations.

Career-bound superintendents may tend to have a more formal evaluation procedure out of a sense of survival. Changing jobs brings changing expectations. Superintendents who move around need to know the new expectations when entering a school district and how they will be evaluated. Place-bound superintendents have been
in the district, sometimes longer than the school board members, and may not see the need for "bothering" with a formal evaluation program.

Hypothesis 2 - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to have attained a doctorate, value educational research more highly, and be a member of AASA and the state professional organization serving superintendents.

Professional preparation programs for school administrators, especially for the doctorate, in recent years have included increased information related to evaluation, accountability, and relationships between superintendents and boards of education. Superintendents in the 1982 AASA study give very good ratings to their preparation programs and indicate their professional preparation was relevant to the issues and problems that superintendents face on the job. "Staff and Administrative Evaluation" and "Administrator/Board Relations" are included in the top five issues/challenges facing superintendents in 1982, while these topics did not appear in the top eighteen in the 1971 AASA study (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 37).

AASA and state professional organizations serving public school superintendents are giving attention to the formal evaluations of superintendents. In 1980 AASA, in conjunction with the National School Boards Association (NSBA), published Evaluating the Superintendent and distributed it to all members. Furthermore, AASA, NSBA, and many state associations have adopted official position statements citing the importance of a formal evaluation program for superintendents of schools.
Hypothesis 3 - More superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to serve a larger urban or city school district.

Larger urban or city school districts are often in turmoil and various researchers and authors have cited superintendent/board relationships as strained in that setting. Such situations may foster a greater need for formal evaluation procedures, perhaps out of a survival instinct as mentioned earlier.

A decade ago, Carol found no meaningful relationship between a district's student enrollment and the application of formal evaluation of the superintendent. Notably absent from a list of districts using formal evaluations was any large city (Carol, 1972, p. 7). But times are changing. The theme of increased tension between boards of education and superintendents is reflected in the 1982 AASA study (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, pp. 59-62) and formal evaluation procedures are expected to be more common in larger urban or city school districts.

Operational Definitions

The following terms are operationally defined as to their use in this study:

Superintendent - The chief executive officer employed by the board of education to manage the school district.

Board of Education - The duly elected or appointed local education committee made up of residents of the community(s) in which the school district employing the superintendent is located.

Evaluation - Assessment of the superintendent's performance.
Formal Evaluation - A written assessment of the superintendent's job performance discussed in a meeting between the superintendent and the board of education.

Informal Evaluation - Assessment of the superintendent's job performance based on subjective observations with no written feedback and limited, if any, discussion.

Job Description - Written expectations for the superintendent which describe the duties and obligations of the position.

Role Expectation - An evaluative standard or anticipated behavior applied to a role incumbent by the role partners.

Role Conflict - Any situation in which the incumbent of a focal position perceives that he is confronted with incompatible expectations.

Career-Bound Superintendent - A superintendent who has been appointed or elected to the superintendency from a position outside the employing school district.

Place-Bound Superintendent - A superintendent who has been appointed or elected to the superintendency from a position inside the employing school district.

High Enrollment District - A school district with a student enrollment of over 25,000. (Group A in this study)

Moderate Enrollment District - A school district with a student enrollment from 3,000 to 24,999. (Group B in this study)

Low Enrollment District - A school district with a student enrollment from 300 to 2,999. (Group C in this study)

Very Low Enrollment District - A school district with fewer than 300 students. (Group D in this study)

Urban School District - A school district containing a central city of 200,000 or more population.

City School District - A school district containing a central city of 50,000 to 199,999 population.

General Superintendent - The chief executive officer of an individual school district excluding intermediate district superintendents.
Intermediate District Superintendent - Chief school administrator of an intermediate school district including county school districts, joint vocational schools, educational service units, and similar districts known by a wide variety of titles. (Group E in this study)

Research Process and Questions

In regard to the first purpose of the study, comparisons are drawn between and among five groups: the four groups of general local superintendents based on the size of district and the intermediate district superintendent group. The groups' responses to the ten evaluation questions listed below are summarized in terms of frequencies reported in percentages and cross-tabulations with the chi-square test of statistical significance applied where appropriate. When the chi-square technique is not appropriate to analyze data the information is reported through frequency tabulations listing responses in priority order by superintendent group.

- How often does your board evaluate your job performance? (Select only one)
  1. Annually  4. Never
  2. Semi-annually  5. Other (Specify): 
  3. At contract renewal time  6. Don't know

- What kind of procedure does your board use for evaluating your job performance? (Select only one)
  1. Formal  3. Both of these  9. I am not evaluated
  2. Informal  8. Don't know

- If you are not formally evaluated, do you see a need to develop a formal procedure? Does your board of education see a need to develop a formal procedure?
In your opinion, which of the following are reasons for your board evaluating you? (Select the two most important)

- To provide periodic and systematic accountability
- To establish evidence for dismissal
- To identify areas needing improvement
- To point out strengths
- To document general dissatisfaction with your performance
- To help you establish relevant performance goals
- To assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards
- To comply with board policy
- To determine qualifications for permanent status
- To determine salary for the following year
- Other (Specify): ______________________________________
- Don't know
- Question does not apply

For each of the following criteria please indicate the degree to which each criterion is a factor in your evaluation

- General effectiveness of your performance
- Your personal characteristics
- Educational leadership and knowledge
- Management functions
- Recruitment, employment and supervision of personnel
- Budget development and implementation
- Board/superintendent relationships
- Staff/superintendent relationships
- Student/superintendent relationships
- Community/superintendent relationships

Which of the following methods are used in your evaluation by the board? (Select the two most important)

- Discussion at executive meeting of board members only
- Discussion at a meeting of the board and the superintendent
- Rating forms used individually and/or collectively
- Written evaluation presented to the superintendent
- Criteria for the appraisal developed in advance by the board
- Criteria previously agreed to by the board and the superintendent
- The superintendent is rated on each criterion
- Board consults others before completion of its evaluation
- Observation and association of board and the superintendent at meetings, other times
- Assessment of the superintendent's written reports
Evaluation against goals and objectives for past year
Comparison with other districts
The superintendent has the opportunity to respond to board evaluation
The superintendent has the opportunity to measure the performance of the board
Other (Specify): ______________________________________________
Don't know
Question does not apply

• From your point of view, which of the following are your board's primary expectations of you as a superintendent? (Select only two)

1. Skill in human relations  5. Curriculum development
3. Internal management     7. Other (Specify): _______
4. P.R. - community relations 8. Don't know

• Do you have a formal job description?
  1. Yes  2. No

• If you have a formal job description, are you evaluated against the criteria in the description?

In regard to the second purpose, the total sample of general local district superintendents responding to the 1982 AASA survey are subdivided into three groups: Those who are evaluated formally (378 superintendents); those who are evaluated informally (468 superintendents); and those who report they are evaluated formally and informally (323 superintendents). Profiles of each of the sub-groups are developed using basic statistics of means, medians; and modes. The profiles are gleaned from the superintendents' responses to the following questions related to selected personal and professional characteristics:
• What is your sex?
  1. Male  2. Female

• What is your age?
  _____ years old

• How many public school superintendencies have you held
  including your present one? _____

• How many years have you served (in total) as a superintendent
  including 1981-82? _____

• Were you appointed or elected to your present superintendency
  from:
  1. Inside the same district  2. Outside the district

• In what professional organizations are you an active member
  in good standing? (Check all that apply)
  a. ___ AASA  d. ___ State Professional  f. ___ ASCD
  b. ___ NEA  e. ___ Association(s)  g. ___ ASBO
  c. ___ NASSP  e. ___ Other (Specify):  h. ___ NAESP

• What is the highest earned degree you hold? (Select only
  one)
  1. Less than BA  6. Master's degree plus
  2. Bachelors degree  all course work for a
  3. Master's degree in education  Ph.D.
  4. Master's degree, not educa-
    tion
  5. Master's degree plus some
    additional graduate work
  7. Specialist degree
  8. Doctor of Education/
    Philosophy
  10. Additional work beyond
    the doctorate
  87. Some other degree
    (Specify) _____

• What is your opinion about the usefulness of educational
  research?
  1. Such research is highly useful
  2. Such research is usually useful
  3. Such research is occasionally useful
  4. Such research is not useful
  8. Don't know
• How many students were enrolled in your district in September 1981?

1. 100,000 or more  4. 10,000 to 24,999  7. 1,000-2,999
2. 50,000 to 99,999  5. 5,000 to 9,999  8. 300 to 999
3. 25,000 to 49,999  6. 3,000 to 4,999  9. less than 300

• Which of the following categories best describes your school district?

1. Major urban center (school district contains a central city of 200,000 or more population)
2. City district (school district contains a central city of 50,000 to 199,999 population)
3. Suburban (school district does not contain a central city of 50,000 or more but is located within a county or contiguous counties adjudged to be socially and economically integrated with the central city)
4. Non-urban/suburban (all school districts not identified in 1, 2, or 3)

• Provide the following information for each superintendency you have held:

Present superintendency

In which geographical region is your school district located?

10. Other (Specify)

These profile data are summarized in terms of frequencies, cross-tabulations, and distributions.

In regard to the third purpose of the study, the hypotheses related to general superintendents who are formally evaluated as compared with those informally evaluated are tested using the following questions:

Hypothesis 1 - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to be younger, newer to the superintendency, and career-bound.
• What kind of procedure does your board use for evaluating your job performance? (Select only one)

1. Formal   3. Both of these   9. I am not evaluated
2. Informal 8. Don't know

• What is your age? _____ years old

How many years have you served as a superintendent including 1961-82? _____ years

• How many public school superintendencies have you held including your present one? _____

• Were you appointed or elected to your present superintendency from:

1. Inside the same district   2. Outside the district

Hypothesis 2 – Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to have attained a doctorate, value educational research more highly, and be a member of AASA and the state professional organization serving superintendents.

• What kind of procedure does your board use for evaluating your job performance? (Select only one)

1. Formal   3. Both of these   9. I am not evaluated
2. Informal 8. Don't know

• What is the highest earned degree you hold? (Select only one)

1. Less than BA   6. Master's degree plus all course work for a Ph.D.
2. Bachelors degree
3. Master's degree in education
4. Master's degree, not education
5. Master's degree plus some additional graduate work
87. Some other degree (Specify) _____

8. Specialist degree
7. Doctor of Education/Philosophy
10. Additional work beyond the doctorate

• What is your opinion about the usefulness of educational research?

1. Such research is highly useful   4. Such research is not useful
2. Such research is usually useful
3. Such research is occasionally useful
8. Don't know
• In what professional organizations are you an active member in good standing? (Check all that apply)

a. ___ AASA  d. ___ State Professional  f. ___ ASCD
b. ___ NEA  e. ___ Other (Specify):  g. ___ ASBO
c. ___ NASP  h. ___ NAESP

Hypothesis 3 - More superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to serve a larger urban or city district.

• What kind of procedure does your board use for evaluating your job performance? (Select only one)

1. Formal  3. Both of these  9. I am not evaluated
2. Informal  8. Don't know

• How many students were enrolled in your district in September 1981?

1. 100,000 or more  4. 10,000 to 24,999  7. 1,000 to 2,999
2. 50,000 to 99,999  5. 5,000 to 9,999  8. 300 to 999
3. 25,000 to 49,999  6. 3,000 to 4,999  9. Less than 300

• Which of the following categories best describes your school district?

1. Major urban center (school district contains a central city of 200,000 or more population)
2. City district (school district contains a central city of 50,000 to 199,999 population)
3. Suburban (school district does not contain a central city of 50,000 or more but is located within a county or contiguous counties adjudged to be socially and economically integrated with the central city
4. Non-urban/suburban (all school districts not identified in 1, 2, or 3)

The responses of the general superintendents who are formally evaluated are summarized in terms of frequencies and cross-tabulations applying the chi-square test of statistical significance.
Description of the Sample and Survey Instrument

The 1982 AASA study of the American school superintendency includes a stratified, selected sample of 2,533 public school superintendents from all United States school systems during 1980-81 chosen from the AASA's computerized listing. The sample is derived from a universe of all public school systems and is not restricted to the membership of the American Association of School Administrators.

The sample is stratified into five major categories:

Group A - superintendents in high enrollment school districts with 25,000 or more students

Group B - superintendents in moderate enrollment school districts with 3,000 to 24,999 students

Group C - superintendents in low enrollment school districts with 300 to 2,999 students

Group D - superintendents in very low enrollment school districts with fewer than 300 students

Group E - includes the superintendents of intermediate school districts serving county school districts, joint vocational schools, educational service units and similar districts known by a wide variety of titles.

The total number of superintendents in the population from which the sample for the 1982 AASA study was drawn is 15,214. Of all the local school superintendents in the United States, 2,533 received questionnaires. Of those, more than half (56 percent) responded. Thus, nearly ten percent of all public school superintendents in America are included in this study.
The number and percentage of American public school superintendents receiving and returning the AASA superintendency survey questionnaire in 1982 are summarized in Table 1.1.

The entire survey instrument used in the 1982 AASA study is included as Appendix A. The instrument was prepared by a research team at The Ohio State University and reviewed by staff members of the American Association of School Administrators, the Educational Research Service, a selected group of Ohio school superintendents, The Ohio State University Faculty of Educational Administration, and the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration of AASSA. A number of questions included in the AASA questionnaire provide the data base for this study of the evaluation of the American public school superintendent.

Technical assistance with the questionnaire format was provided by the Polimetrics Laboratory, a research support group in the Department of Political Science of The Ohio State University. The final draft was approved by the research team and sent to a stratified, selected sample of 2,533 public school superintendents in late 1981.

The scope of the questionnaire goes beyond typical surveys. It provides significant information useful to those now serving as superintendents, persons preparing for the superintendency, boards of education seeking to employ and evaluate superintendents, the leadership of AASA, and other educational researchers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category by Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Included in each Category</th>
<th>Receiving Questionnaires</th>
<th>Returning Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent of All Supts.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>8,040</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total Gen. Supts.</td>
<td>14,260</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group E</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,214</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Data Analysis

As previously indicated, data for this study are drawn from the study of the American public school superintendent sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators during 1982. These data have been coded for processing using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Program. SPSS is a packaged program specifically designed to compute those statistics typically used by social scientists.

Frequency counts, cross tabulations, and distributions have been completed as indicated earlier. Frequency data is reported in percentages and/or means, medians and modes where appropriate for specific research questions. A statistical format using a chi-square method is utilized to analyze appropriate research questions and the hypotheses where data are reported in the form of frequencies and involve measures of association. Levels of significance are established at .10 for hypotheses and .05 for other appropriate research questions to be analyzed using the chi-square technique.

The data are organized in order to answer research questions and test hypotheses. The hypotheses predict what the data will be found to disclose, while their proof or disproof suggest areas for further investigation (Laswell and Kaplan, 1950, p. 64). The decision to report the results of some research questions through frequency counts utilizing basic statistics of mean, median and mode serves to delimit the analysis of data while including all
important information concerning the evaluation of superintendents in the study. Final decisions as to the specific procedures used to analyze the data were made in consultation with the staff of the Polimetrics Laboratory, Department of Political Science at The Ohio State University.

**Significance of the Study**

In most school districts the superintendent of schools is the formally recognized chief executive. He/she is the most visible, most vulnerable, and potentially most influential member of the organization (Campbell, et al., 1980, p. 3). Superintending is also characterized by a basic condition of symbolic leadership, the attribution of responsibility for organizational performance (Pitner and Ogawa, 1981, p. 63). Next to the selection of a superintendent, the evaluation of the chief executive officer is an emerging priority in school districts across the country.

The need for current and new knowledge about superintendents in particular is crucial in the face of increasing tensions between boards of education and superintendents and a lack of clarity in role expectations.

The situations in the larger school districts, urban districts in particular, show evidence of intensive erosion as superintendents and school boards face unfamiliar demands, expectations, conflicts over valued resources, and critical public acclaim (Cuban, 1976, p. 168).
This study contributes to knowledge about the emerging profession of the superintendency and provides new insights about the evaluation of superintendents not only for today, but also for the future.

Finally, the growth in the number of states in which the evaluation of public school superintendents is being legislatively mandated brings new importance to this phenomena. It is imperative that the body of knowledge related to the evaluation of the chief executive officers of American public school districts continue to be developed.

Limitations of the Study

Survey research is subject to unavoidable limitations. The limitation of qualitative descriptive research is inherent in this research. As Van Dalen (1979, p. 203) notes, "verbal symbols lack precision; words do not hold the same meaning for all people for all times, and in all contexts." The AASA survey questionnaire was a self-reporting instrument and its validity is limited by the honesty, accuracy, individual recall, and clarity of the respondents. In addition, because of its descriptive nature, results do not reflect cause and effect relationships.

Since the sample only included superintendents of public schools, the results cannot be generalized to superintendents or chief executive officers of the ever increasing number of private schools in this country. Lastly, a few large, urban school districts
have board of education policies prohibiting their superintendents from completing time consuming studies such as this, thus, a partially reduced response rate results.

Research Implications
Academic scholars continue to indicate the "information base" that is specific to educational administration is extremely weak (Halpin and Hayes, 1977, p. 284). Many practitioners prefer recipes or affirmation rather than having their behaviors or their organizations submitted to examination (Campbell, 1977, p. 38). This study should contribute to the existing body of knowledge on the superintendent, particularly in the long neglected areas of evaluation.

A significant result of the 1982 study is the encouraging increase in the number of chief executive officers who responded that they find educational research to be useful or very useful. Hopefully, the practitioner will be able to glean "useful" ideas regarding evaluation that can make a difference in their school district.

In a small way, this study may contribute to the establishment of standards by which to measure superintending. The evaluation of leadership continues to be an elusive goal. There is, in short, no school of leadership, intellectual or practical. Does it matter that we lack standards for assessing past, present, and potential future leaders? Without a powerful modern philosophical tradition, without theoretical and empirical cumulation, without
guiding concepts, and without considered practical experiences, we lack the very foundations for knowledge of a phenomenon - leadership (Burns, 1978, p. 2).

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into six main chapters. Chapter I contains an introduction, background of the problem, problem statement and purposes of the study, operational definitions, and a conceptual design for addressing the problem. Chapter II is a review of the relevant literature and a status report on state legislative mandates for superintendent evaluation. Chapter III includes the methods and procedures for the collection and processing of data.

Because of the scope of this study, the presentation and analysis of data will be included in two chapters. Chapter IV includes the presentation and analysis of data for research questions related to the first purpose of the study. Chapter V covers the presentation and analysis of data for research questions and hypotheses related to the second and third purposes of the study.

The final chapter is devoted to arriving at conclusions and making recommendations based on the results of the study. The chapter also includes a suggested model for the evaluation of superintendents.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

The position of American public school superintendent is a relative neophyte in the evolution of education in this country. In fact, American education existed for 200 years before the first superintendent was appointed, and it was another 60 years before any appreciable number of cities decided to follow the lead of pioneers in the establishment of the superintendency (Griffiths, 1966, p. 1).

This relatively recent development of the position is reflected in the limited literature available on the superintendency and the paucity of research and writing directly related to the evaluation of the superintendent.

The review of literature that follows is intended to provide a representative overview of literature related to this study with a conscious effort to focus on information most pertinent to the evaluation of the chief executive officers of American public schools.

An Historical Perspective of the Superintendency

A system of public schools responsive to the citizenry and controlled by a democratically selected governing board is an
inherent part of the foundation of America. The concept of local
citizen control was established as early as 1647 when the Massa­
chusetts Bay Colony passed the Olde Deluder Satan Act. Provisions
of the act clearly outlined the responsibilities of the selectmen
charged with overseeing the operation of both the community and the
school. Even though some educational duties were assigned to
teachers and appointees, by and large, selectmen remained in control
(Cubberly, 1920, p. 23).

Knezevich (1969, p. 19) notes that in 1721 the selectmen of
Boston appointed a committee on school visitation. At first such
school committees were the agents of the selectmen, but in 1826
Massachusetts law established school committees as a separate
entity. The school committees were the forerunner of the modern
school board, the employer and evaluator of the superintendent
of schools.

Supervision of public schools in America began in the early
1800's, but it wasn't until the 1820's that public high schools
became an entity requiring some new administrative functions. The
first administrative position created was that of principal. The
combined need for supervision and administration also provided
impetus for the emergence of the superintendent (Doerksen, 1975,
p. 15). The movement away from one room school house districts, the
growth of cities, and the inability of lay school board members to
meet the growing demands led to the creation of the office of super­
intendent of schools.
Initiative in establishing the new office of superintendent was often taken by the city council. New Orleans provided its first city director in the 1820's and it is generally accepted that Buffalo employed the first titled superintendent in 1837. By 1859 thirty cities had created the office of superintendent of schools. The growth thereafter slowed so that by 1870 only three other cities had superintendents.

In 1865 the superintendents (the few in number at the local level joined with county and/or state superintendents whose positions had evolved somewhat earlier) formed an organization titled the National Association of School Superintendents, a forerunner of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). It served as a platform for superintendents, as well as a reference point from which superintendents could receive up-to-date information on major issues of the period (Buchanan, 1981, p. 10). In 1870 the organization joined with two existing groups representing teachers and formed the National Education Association (NEA), a marriage that would disintegrate in the next century.

The early superintendent's duties were delegated from the clerical and instructional power belonging to the board. Some of these duties included inspecting classes, examining applicants for teaching positions, and determining the progress of students.

The local school superintendency, unlike the county and state positions, is a configuration of common law, evolving through trial and error into its present position without specific statutory authority to support it.
The decision as to the legal status of a particular superintendent at a particular time and in a particular jurisdiction is a matter for the courts to decide. The decision as to what the superintendent's status should be is a matter for the profession and the people to decide and to be implemented by legislative enactment (Shaw, 1958, p. 108).

Gradually, boards of education were granted the legal right to appoint superintendents. However, the position of local superintendent did not gain ready acceptance. The duties and responsibilities of the superintendent had not been defined in precise manner in some states and rights of the board were also unclear. In fact, the power of school boards to expend public funds for the position of superintendent was challenged in two states.

In 1874 in Kalamazoo, Michigan the Circuit Court ruled that the school district could legally employ a superintendent and pay his salary from the public treasury (Stuart v. School District No. 1 of the Village of Kalamazoo, 1874). The Kalamazoo case established the common law principle that in the absence of enabling legislation the local school board has the implied power to employ a superintendent of schools and pay his salary out of public funds.

The first laws with respect to the termination of superintendents were in many instances non-existent and others only cursory. Regulations with reference to the dismissals of superintendents were adopted over the years, but were generally vague. The rules seemed to have been promulgated more through a process of osmosis over time, rather than as a result of deliberate planning. Today, this lack of
clarity of regulations concerning the superintendent's employment status is still prevalent in most states (Doerksen, 1975, p. 21).

The superintendency was not considered sufficiently important in the early years of the position's development to deal with tenure or longevity of term. Terms of office were brief, often ten months or a year. The superintendent was considered to be a head teacher, rather than an executive officer of the board. This marked the beginning of today's confusion in many states as to whether a superintendent is a teacher or not.

Although the entry of the superintendency into the educational sphere was firmly established in the late 1800's, the position's legal status remained shrouded. Earlier roles of errand boy soon vanished and concern over solely operational problems of the district grew to where leadership roles had to be assumed to suit the various levels and needs of society.

With the requirement for exercising leadership roles, the necessity for statutory status emerged. The need for such status was accentuated when leadership roles brought conflict with the board of education. Despite the need for proper legal status, that status did not adequately materialize and remains inadequate today (Doerksen, 1975, p. 24).

Until the beginning of the twentieth century, the school superintendent struggled to become an identified profession.

Cubberley saw the city as the chief ground for enlightened leadership and portrayed in vivid language the old-style ward boards and the large center school committees that perpetually meddled in the everyday
administrative affairs of the schools, treating the early superintendents as clerks. He applauded the changes at the turn of the century which reduced the size of the city school boards and introduced a new norm of board behavior, namely that the lay members should restrict themselves to 'legislative functions' and turn the actual running of the schools over to the experts whom they employed as superintendents (Tyack and Cummings, 1977, p. 47).

These changes came about with some professional "blood-letting." The annual meeting of the National Education Association in 1895 included a report by superintendents calling for control of the schools to be turned over to superintendents rather than be governed by the public through school boards. From these struggles emerged the division of roles between administration (superintendent) and policy (boards of education). Some superintendents lost their jobs as part of the struggle. The dominance of the school board in appointing, evaluating, and dismissing superintendents was solidified.

In the early 1900's the consolidation of rural districts and the growing complexities of operating schools led more and more boards of education to employ a local superintendent of schools. In the intervening years since then, school boards gradually have delegated their executive function to the superintendent.

and Campbell (1980, pp. 225-229) have written on the subject.

Campbell cites four major influences in the position's development:

1. **Scientific management** and the contributions to this movement by Frederick Taylor.

2. The human relations period in administration predominate in the 1930's and 1940's.


4. Open systems. This view stresses the interdependence between an organization and its environment.

The chronology of these influences and the historical development of the superintendency is not as clear cut as it appears. The historical legacies just outlined can each still be detected in superintendencies now held. However, in most school districts today the superintendent is the formally recognized chief executive (Campbell, 1980, p. 229), but is answerable to a board of education that is responsible to evaluate his/her performance.

**Superintendent Evaluation**

**Pro's and Con's**

Few management functions have challenged and intrigued executives as much as performance evaluation. The concept of evaluation has been in existence throughout the history of mankind. However, for the most part such evaluations have been performed very informally.

Among the earliest evaluations of administrative performance were those conducted by the military. Military officers were
evaluated as early as 1813. By 1920 the military had developed and adopted a standardized administrative evaluation procedure. Various branches of the United States government have been evaluating administrators since 1858 (Wallenfeldt, 1976, pp. 5-11).

As cited in Chapter I, most evaluation efforts in the history of American public education have been in regard to student and teacher evaluation, while very little has been done in regard to administrators and superintendents. Sullivan (1971, p. 64) states that evaluation has been one of the most neglected aspects of education. He believes that it is urgent that educators develop systems of evaluation that will lead to improvements in performance and will assure the public that the schools are doing the best job possible.

School administrators are increasingly being expected to account for their performance in more specific and concrete ways (Redfern, 1976, p. 4). Evaluation of the superintendent is becoming a more frequent phenomenon, but old habits are hard to break. As Gray (1976, p. 26) states "it is hard to imagine a school administrator running a multi-million dollar organization whose job evaluation depended upon phone calls that a board member received from an irate taxpayer. Unfortunately, however, it is just these kinds of isolated incidents that may affect a decision on re-employment." Ridding ourselves of existing "bad habits" such as this one may be another answer to the question "why evaluate administrators?"

Evaluation is a necessary and desirable feature of any organization. Drucker (1980, p. 67) states "there is a need to
appraise management." Management groups such as the American Management Associations indicate to their members that performance appraisal is absolutely necessary (Meidan, 1981, p. 7). Education is no less important than any other endeavor in American life. Managers in education, including superintendents of schools, should be evaluated.

In 1984 public attention in America is focused on education. The National Commission on Educational Excellence and its *A Nation at Risk* (Superintendent of Documents, 1983) report has ushered in a host of reports and publications dealing with effective schooling. The author of one of the books proposes in an earlier publication that "superintendents must be held accountable for a good many responsibilities best classified as management" (Goodlad, 1979, p. 96). Superintendent evaluation, then, is also a part of this national attention directed toward quality education in America.

After all, if the single most important task of the school board is choosing the superintendent, common sense demands that the second most important task is to direct and shape his/her performance. Evaluation helps achieve this goal.

Cuban (1977, p. 6) believes that superintendents cannot function effectively without periodic feedback about their performance and need such feedback. Others agree with this premise for evaluating the school district's chief executive officer.

A performance evaluation program . . . suggests a special means of satisfying the personal compulsions
for discovery by administrators. They must have evidence of job success and personal achievement (Olds, 1977, p. 15)

Whether an evaluation program for the superintendent is or is not in place in a school district may be tied to whether the person serving in the position is successful or not. In two companion research studies Wilson (1980, p. 22) concludes that regular and formal evaluation of the superintendent's performance by the board of education is a crucial factor in avoiding "untracking" (lack of success).

Superintendents have always experienced the uncertainty and pressure that accompany any top executive post, aggravated in this instance by being a public administrator in a position never widely understood and often suspect (Wilson, 1979, p. 4). The fundamental insecurity of the position developed from the origin and growth of the superintendency. For some time, American school superintendents have been characterized as members of an anxious profession (Spalding, 1954, p. 8). Witness this story:

The president of the board received a telephone call from someone with a heavily disguised voice, asking whether the superintendent's position was open. The president replied that it had been filled nine months ago. The person on the telephone then asked, 'Is your new superintendent fulfilling your expectations for him? Has he provided the board the leadership it needs? Has he been an effective administrator? Has he represented the district well to its internal and external publics? Has he shown initiative, accomplished results, and gotten along well with people?' The president responded in the affirmative to all the questions, but was so impressed by them that he told the caller of a superintendency open in a neighboring district and
then asked if the man was interested in that job. 'No thanks,' responded the caller. 'I already have the job as your superintendent and was just calling to find out how I'm doing.' (Dickinson, 1980, p. 34).

Morphet (1974, pp. 327-328), Reopelle (1974, p. 4), and Mintzberg (1973, p. 80) have also written about the insecurity and vulnerability of the superintendency and similar management positions. However, the 1982 AASA study of the superintendency provides a contrast to such reports of insecurity. The authors indicate it is reassuring to note the percentage (63 percent) who find considerable fulfillment in the superintendency. They report the superintendency appears to be attracting and retaining persons who accept the difficulties and challenges and enjoy the position (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 44).

Insecurity in the superintendency can affect the quality of leadership in a school district. More effective leadership and administration occur when the superintendent of schools has reasonable security in office. A superintendent cannot perform his/her duties effectively when uncertain about where he/she stands with the board of education. Dykes (1965, p. 125) indicates that security can be given and uncertainty removed by fair and honest evaluation of the superintendent's work at periodic intervals.

Past practices in evaluating superintendents have been something of an eclectic patchwork of techniques and procedures. The practice of informal, unwritten evaluations of the superintendent's performance prevailed for a long time (Redfern, 1980, pp. 7-8).
Carol (1972, p. 7) reports that three percent of the 207 districts participating in a study in New Jersey and New York indicated they used formal procedures to evaluate the chief school officer; 62 percent used informal procedures; 11 percent used a combination of formal and informal; and 29 percent did not have any procedures to evaluate their chief school officer. Although the percentages of districts conducting formal evaluations seems to be on the rise, recent studies reflect only up to 50 percent of the districts reporting some degree of formal evaluations (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 30).

Casual, unspecified evaluations of a superintendent don't work. They won't help avoid misunderstandings that develop between a board and its chief executive officer and they don't facilitate the efficient conversion of board policy into school system practice. An evaluation process that is formal, specific, and structured is needed (Dickinson, 1980, p. 34).

Superintendents should be evaluated because it is the board of education's responsibility to do so. Fensch and Wilson (1964, pp. 45-46) cite the pledge that boards of education should make to superintendents:

We accept the responsibility for representing the state and the people in this community for the management of public schools in this district. We will honor your advice in making policies, which, in our judgment, the people want for the education of their children. But we hold you responsible for executing these policies. It's your show and yours alone from there on. We will evaluate your performance and either approve or veto your recommendations,
and we will replace you if our judgment compels us to reject your plans too often.

Evaluation of superintendents is a recommended practice of local, state, and national organizations representing superintendents and boards of education. Official position statements of these organizations and their codes of ethics will be discussed later, but the sanctioning of superintendent evaluations by such professional organizations gives credibility to the activity.

In some states superintendents are evaluated because there is a state law that mandates such evaluation by boards of education. More discussion of such mandated evaluation of superintendents will be included later in this chapter.

A regular, planned evaluation program may be the soundest possible way to ensure the success of the board/superintendent team (Evans, 1981, p. 69). Miller (1982, p. 153) concludes the lack of an evaluation program for the superintendent is the most detrimental factor to good superintendent/board working relationships. A well established evaluation program may also be the soundest possible way to ensure the growth and continuation of a management team (Olds, 1977, p. 11).

Performance appraisal will always exist as it has throughout history. Administrative evaluation is a part of a school district just as it is a part of most organizations. Appraisal systems are necessary for strategic and tactical planning, motivation, communication, and equity (Davis, 1972, p. 187). When applied in a developmental sense, performance evaluation for administrators must
be considered the basic component in a continuing strategy for systematic management improvement (Olds, 1977, p. 10). This applies at every level of management in a school district, including the superintendency.

By itself a sound evaluative procedure may not bring effective administration to the field of education, but without it the quality of educational leadership so desperately needed will hardly be assured. That we need protection against an incompetent and unresponsive school administrator in these days of societal travail is hardly arguable (McCarty, 1971, pp. 38, 44).

Evaluation plays many roles. It is developmental, motivational, and an aid in coordination and planning. Ultimately, effective evaluation helps to assure a good education for students in our nation's schools (Redfern, 1980, p. 71). Administrative evaluation becomes a way of stating that there is a very vital relationship between quality of administration and quality of education (Olds, 1977, p. 17). Superintendents can make a difference in children's lives (Cuban, 1977, p. 2).

Not everyone feels an organized superintendent evaluation program is desirable or productive. In fact, some believe such evaluation can be counterproductive.

Board members sometimes give the old cliche "our board evaluates the superintendent at every meeting" when asked how they evaluate their school district's chief executive officer. Other busy school board members are probably moved to ask "Why should we
go to the extra work and trouble of setting up an appraisal system? We trust our superintendent and know he's already overworked. So why should we add one more task?" (Booth and Glaub, 1978, p. 1)

Cuban (1977, pp. 1-2) identifies three "blocks" to superintendent evaluation. One relates to selection, and sounds like this: "If we made the right choice, we'll have nothing to worry about; if we didn't, no amount of training will send a loser over the finish line." A second big block, most superintendents don't ask. They ignore the sound advice of the professional associations of school administrators to demand formal evaluations. A lack of time and expertise on the part of the board of education is the third proposed block.

Superintendents sometimes object or resist evaluation due to the perceived lack of expertise by board members (Hofner, 1965, p. 45 and Turner, 1971, p. 16). Meidan (1981, p. 56) provides one reason for such a problem when he states "even though formal appraisal programs are in existence in organizations, appraisers usually receive very little formal training to conduct such evaluations."

Many school boards fail to evaluate their superintendent because of their own insecurity about a group of lay people evaluating a professional educational administrator. McCarty (1971, pp. 38-39) suggests that there are three main reasons why boards do not formally assess the effectiveness of their chief executive officer. These include the inability to measure the superintendent's contribution to such a complex organization, the belief that an evaluation
will not be scientific or reliable, and the concern over the cataloguing and analyzing of the role behavior of the chief executive officer of the school district because of the position's uniqueness.

Boards of education do seem to be prone to pitfalls when it comes to superintendent evaluation. As cited, the greatest and most common appraisal error is avoidance; boards are uncomfortable with the process so they avoid doing it at all. They rationalize that "things are all right," "no problems," "no time to do it," "we forget," and so forth until problems surface or the relationship between the superintendent and board of education breaks down.

Common errors identified by Booth and Glaub (1978, p. 35) include:

1. Evaluation in a vacuum without understanding what is expected - where we want to go (goals) and how we get there (objectives).

2. Trying to measure performance without standards.

3. Evaluating without understanding the job to be evaluated - its functions and responsibilities.

4. Evaluators play psychologist and presume to evaluate personal relationships, mental health, interests, etc.

5. Assume that the longer and more complicated the forms, the better the system. This is usually an attempt to use volume to cover up inadequate standards.

6. Assume that evaluation should never be used for reward or discipline, but only for development.

Some of the problems related to evaluation in education in general, and evaluation of the superintendent in particular, may
have as much to do with a certain "mind set" more than anything else. For one thing, evaluation in education has many meanings. Generally it is not necessarily associated with results as in many types of personnel evaluation. (Olds (1977, p. 179) adds other aspects of this "mind set" regarding the evaluation of administrators, including the superintendent:

1. It is usually associated with negativism; a means of flunking, firing or demoting. The purpose is generally seen as punitive.

2. It is often carried out in imperialistic fashion, with conclusions based not upon facts and analysis but upon impressions, questionable data, doubtful checklists, misinformation and biases.

3. Evaluation, especially in non-personnel matters, may be so dressed with verbal camouflage from start to finish that its primary purpose of creating confusion is the main achievement.

This is the heritage of school boards and many others from generations of educators.

Another criticism of superintendent evaluation as practiced in some school districts has to do with the frequency and timeliness of the evaluations:

Many boards never evaluate the superintendent until near the end of a three- or four-year contract. Typically, the decision to renew the contract becomes a political matter at worst and a popularity contest at best, rather than an objective assessment of effectiveness (Moberly, 1978, p. 237).

The criticism that appraisal systems "come and go" every so often applies to superintendent evaluations and is a reason the value of such evaluations is questioned. One cause of such appraisal system turnover is superintendent and/or board turnover.
Such turnover makes continuity in superintendent evaluation in a school district difficult, if not impossible.

The influence of crisis evaluations and the increased complexity of the superintendency might well combine to discourage formulation of an evaluation policy (Yates, 1981, p. 30). At that point, the superintendent would likely view the evaluative process as a "garbage can for dumping an entire year's unresolved issues, unanswered questions, and untouched peeves" (Cuban, 1977, p. 6). Such approaches could cause superintendents to think twice about the value of their evaluation by the board of education.

Many of the reasons given for not doing systematic evaluations of superintendents have to do with the complicated nature of the position. According to DeVaughn (1971, p. 2), "many administrators and teachers have taken the position that teacher and administrator performance is too involved and complicated to measure and rank."

Some of the concerns have to do with the common practice of using "rating scales" in the evaluation of superintendents. The evaluation of traits requires a subjective judgmental rating by each board member and even if agreement is reached by the board on such a rating scale there is likely to be little which can be done by the superintendent to significantly alter these traits. Thus, the superintendent and board are both frustrated with the process (Miller, 1982, p. 74).
Maybe all the discussion about the difficulty of evaluating positions in education, especially the superintendency, is a "smoke-screen" to place a certain "aura" about the job.

Educational administrators have worked diligently to capitalize on the tendency of lay persons to regard the administrators' professional qualifications with deference. In fact, according to a number of observers, administrators have been instrumental in perpetuating this public tendency (Zeigler, Jennings and Peak, 1974, p. 150).

Other pitfalls in the process of superintendent evaluation involve setting low-risk, easily attainable goals and omitting goals that are not easily measured. As Cuban (1977, p. 5) states:

A top executive can learn quickly to set low, achievable goals in order to establish a solid performance record. The tougher, high-risk goals may go unattended . . . There is a growing tendency toward setting only goals that are measurable, choosing trivial areas that can be counted over such things as morale which are less susceptible to measurement.

Bolton (1980, pp. 68-70) identifies the following problems of measurement in his book Evaluating Administrative Personnel in School Systems:

1. Prejudice, bias, or poor judgment of the person(s) doing the evaluation.

2. Inconsistency of the reaction of the person(s) doing the evaluation to the behavior of the administrator evaluated.

3. Rating devices that require a conclusion about several bits of information and a response to a single scale.

4. Each person who is responsible for measuring any process or product of an administrator is influenced by his own physical and mental health.
(internal feelings) as well as by surroundings.

5. Attempts to measure too much.

6. Continuation of a prior viewpoint into other situations even though the behavior of the individual changes.

7. Consistent over- or under-evaluation. Some people have a tendency to be consistently lenient while others tend to be harsh.

The American Management Associations have speculated why, if managerial competence is so crucial for an organization's success, stability, and survival, adequate evaluation systems have not evolved before now. They indicate the truth of the matter is that development has been stalled because of two factors:

1. Failure to work closely at the reality of management roles as they differ from one organization to another - and to search for systems that take this diversity into account.

2. The tendency to apply static appraisal methods that focus on the past, rather than on the dynamic relationships between present and future (Meldan, 1981, p. 8).

In Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge, the secret to Japanese success as a special way of managing people and management styles different from most American businesses, and school systems, is cited. The Japanese outlook on evaluation reflects some of these differences:

The slowness of formal evaluation and promotion (in Japan) seems wholly unacceptable to many Americans, not only because Americans desire rapid feedback and advancement, but also because the system seems to prevent the early assignment of the most capable people to important jobs (Ouchi, 1981, p. 28).
Evidently the Japanese are not as concerned about formal evaluation of administrative leaders in their mode of managing organizations. Perhaps another Far Eastern culture can give us a final insight into the pro's and con's of superintendent evaluation. The Chinese word for crisis is a combination of the symbols for two other words: danger and opportunity. Whether a given situation is a threat or a challenge is, of course, largely a matter of individual perception (Goldberg, 1978, p. 30). So is the difference between perceptions of whether the evaluation of the superintendent of schools is possible, desirable, necessary, and productive, or not.

**Purposes of Superintendent Evaluation**

A great deal of literature has been devoted to discussion of the purposes of evaluations. In developing their plans for evaluating the superintendent, boards of education should think through the purposes they hope to achieve (Evans, 1980, p. 72). The identification of the purposes for evaluating the superintendent is extremely important because the purposes provide the direction and reason for existence of additional activities in the evaluation process.

A review of the literature regarding the evaluation of superintendents indicates that the term "purpose" is sometimes used interchangably with other terms. Those terms include: reason, aims, objectives, goals, uses, values of, and benefits.
The many purposes of administrative evaluation, including the superintendency, can be divided into two general categories: those serving primarily as a means and those serving primarily as an end. When evaluation functions as an end, it results in a specific culminating judgment regarding administrative performance. This judgment may be used as justification for merit salary increases, promotion, demotion, transfers, inservice training, self-development objectives, and similar personnel decisions; however, the evaluation process has fulfilled its function as soon the judgment is reached. The focus is on the individual and his or her performance.

When evaluation serves as a means, it functions as an on-going communication, feedback, adjustment, and assistance process. Evaluation is an integral part of the total management system and is interrelated with decision-making, resource allocation, goal development, and other administrative functions. The focus is on the improvement of the educational system.

In either case, the intended purposes of evaluation are of central importance in determining the design of an effective evaluation process and its subsumed procedures (Nygaard, 1974, p. 3).

A related perspective on the evaluation of administrators, including superintendents, uses the terminology of "summative" and "formative" evaluation. One purpose focuses on the end-product evaluation of the individual's performance (summative evaluation); the second focuses on the improvement of administrative performance
by the individual being evaluated (formative evaluation) (Willis, 1976, p. 2).

Redfern (1980, p. 23) believes the starting point in developing a good superintendent evaluation program is to determine the thrust of the program, to clarify purposes and desired outcomes. One way to get underway is for the superintendent and board to exchange views about purposes and outcomes. Presumably the superintendent has certain expectations which the evaluation process will help in meeting. The board will also have expectations. It is a good practice to develop a list of purposes.

In a global sense, the purpose behind the evaluation of the superintendent is to "insure good education through effective governance of the schools" (Booth and Glaub, 1978, p. 7). Hawkins (1972, p. 43) and Genck and Klingenberg (1978, p. 177) also see the evaluation of the superintendent relating to the effectiveness of the school district in the public's interest.

Some writers have attempted to determine the most important purpose for evaluating administrators, including superintendents. Redfern (1972, p. 4) states "the prime purpose of evaluation is to improve performance and to promote professional development. Although other purposes may be served simultaneously, the central thrust must be in the direction of improvement." Reopelle (1974, p. 4) concludes that "there appears to be general agreement that the process is designed to improve the competency of the chief administrator."
Not everyone agrees with that kind of purpose. Buchanan (1981, p. 87) reports that board members, presidents, and superintendents in his study indicated that the primary purpose for evaluating the superintendent was to identify weak areas of the superintendent's performance. That is certainly more "punitive" than the primary purposes cited above.

It appears that a determination of the most important, or primary, purpose for superintendent evaluation may be unique to the situation or individuals involved. In his study of board of education presidents and superintendents, Roelle (1978, p. 162) indicates that the two most important purposes in the evaluation of the superintendent are the "attainment of district goals and objectives and to improve board/superintendent relations."

Trying to single-out a most important or primary purpose for evaluation may ignore the full scope of the environment in which schools exist and in which superintendents work. According to Bolton (1980, p. 48), "the key question is not whether one purpose is more important than another, but whether a system (of evaluation) can be designed that will allow all purposes which are important to the individuals and the organization to be accomplished."

A recent joint publication of the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association distributed to their members lists the following purposes for the process of evaluating the superintendent:
1. Describe clearly the duties and responsibilities of the superintendent.

2. Clarify the board's expectations of his (her) performance.

3. Enable the superintendent to know how he (she) stands with the board.

4. Identify both areas of strength and weakness in the superintendent's performance.

5. Improve communications between the board and superintendent.

6. Provide ways by which needs for improvement can be met.

7. Foster a high trust level between the superintendent and board.

8. Enable the board to hold the superintendent accountable for carrying out its policies and responding to its priorities (Redfern, 1980, p. 23).

Castetter (1971, p. 233), Carol (1972, p. 51), Nygaard (1974, pp. 3-4), and Bolton (1980, p. 49) have also proposed similar lists of purposes for the evaluation of administrators, including superintendents. Few of the purposes for the evaluation of the chief executive officer of a school district relate to students. Only the Association of California School Administrators (1973, p. 1) includes "work toward common goals for the improvement of education . . . including attention to student and staff success."

McGrath (1972, p. 192) identifies five major reasons for evaluation of the superintendent. They are (in ranking order): salary, contract renewal, continued employment, improved functioning of the superintendent, and general improvement of the
district. McGrath is the only researcher, whose studies were reviewed, who indicates that determining salary is the primary reason for superintendent evaluation.

There are many purposes, reasons, etc., for evaluating educational personnel, including the chief executive officer of a school district. Some are actually in conflict with each other. A single evaluation program may not be able to do all the things reflected in the literature. Such expectations may be unrealistic and unwarranted (Redfern, 1972, p. 4).

However, in developing a plan for the evaluation of the superintendent, there should be consensus on the purposes to be sought. The purposes should be reduced to writing and incorporated as a part of the plan (Evans, 1981, p. 72). In essence, evaluation programs that have written statements of purposes that are clear, precise, and complete are more likely to produce a sound basis for open communication and cooperative relationships than programs designed around ambiguous or unwritten purposes (Bolton, 1980, p. 26).

**Board of Education and Superintendent Roles in Evaluation**

Before an understanding of the roles of boards of education and superintendents in the evaluation process can be developed, it is first necessary to discuss their individual overall role in a school district and how they are interrelated.
As cited previously, the school board preceded the superintendency in the historical development of American public schools. Child of the school board, the superintendency would mature, struggle with its parent endlessly, and never escape that fact of ancestery (Cuban, 1976, p. 11). Superintendents have been in command since the turn of the twentieth century. But it has been an uneasy command — for they hold this power at the mercy of school boards whom they have to please, and boards may play the role of educator at their pleasure (Lutz and Azzarelli, 1966, p. 30).

Textbooks and journals in school administration are almost unanimous in contending that it is the function of the board of education to legislate and of the superintendent to execute. In other words, the board establishes and the superintendent administers policy. This type of reasoning has given rise to the concept of the superintendent as the executive officer of the board of education. Although this concept oversimplifies what actually exists in practice, it symbolizes, paradoxically, what is desirable in practice (Griffiths, 1966, pp. 92-93).

Goldhammer (1964, p. 54) describes this traditional view of the board/superintendent roles in the following way:

The board acts in matters relating to over-all policy decisions, while the superintendent advises; after the board decides, the superintendent executes. After he executes policy, the board, in turn, evaluates.
From this perspective the cycle is complete from development of policy, to administration of policy, to the evaluation of results.

Although these divisions of responsibility seem clear, necessary, and logical for the smooth operation of a school district, even the professional organizations representing superintendents and school boards recognize such is not always the case and individual situations and working relationships more often establish the "rules of the game."

Basic to this relationship is an acceptance by the board and the superintendent that the board is a policy making body and the superintendent is the chief executive officer. Since lines between policy and administration are sometimes unclear, teamwork is essential (American Association of School Administrators, 1980, Introduction).

The professional organizations also take the position that if ambiguity is to be kept to a minimum in the working relationship between the board and superintendent, each should be aware of three influences that bear on this important division of responsibility:

1. The nature of policy development and administration. The emphasis must be on communication, the sharing of information between the board and superintendent.

2. The increasing influence of external factors on local school district governance and on the board/superintendent relationship. Examples include legislative mandates and unanticipated events where no formal written board policy exists.

3. The discretionary authority boards grant their chief administrators. Without sufficient authority delegated from the board, the superintendent's ability to discharge responsibility is
diminished. Where to draw the line of delegated authority is a matter for each board and superintendent to determine individually and review periodically (American Association of School Administrators, 1980, pp. 1-2).

McCarty (1971, pp. 18-20) concludes that structures and roles are interrelated in regard to power in educational governance. His view is based on the theory that the nature of the power structure affects the nature of decision making, which determines how the superintendent must play his/her role in order to survive in a particular community.

A school board's authority is delegated from the state legislature since public education is a responsibility of the states in America. The local board, therefore, is an agency of state government and is subject to regulation both by laws enacted by the legislature and by legislatively-authorized rules of a state board of education, or any other similarly constituted body that may be created in various states. In most states, the legislature delegates to local school boards an impressive array of duties and powers. This authority, duties, and powers also imposes on boards of education the responsibility for what goes on in the schools.

As stated earlier, superintendents originally came into existence when the lay boards of districts recognized the need for school supervision in excess of that which their members could provide. The local superintendency was originated by school boards as an extralegal position to help meet demands which the boards were unable to satisfy by themselves (Grieder, Pierce, and
Boards first employed superintendents without statutory authority, but relied on implied authority. Court cases cited earlier strengthened the common law status of the superintendent. Since the landmark cases, states have recognized the legitimacy of the superintendency and legislatures have specifically authorized the position of superintendent.

While state statutes often set forth the minimal responsibilities of the superintendent, they usually do not convey authority. Authority is conveyed (delegated) by the school board. Thus, the school board cannot avoid responsibility for how its powers are used or misused by saying the superintendent is responsible.

This concept of school board responsibility is important in the way that it affects the board/superintendent relationship. Where the superintendent is delegated insufficient authority, the board will have a weak superintendent. On the other hand, if the board delegates authority to the superintendent with no guidance on how to use it and never checks to see that he/she is using it responsibly - then the superintendent probably has too much authority. A good relationship for the board and superintendent to strive for is one in which both parties understand their respective rights and duties (Booth and Glaub, 1978, pp. 16-17).

Duties for superintendents and boards of education that help define roles are as numerous as the number of school districts in the country. However, it may be helpful to illustrate the
various duties using a list developed by the professional organizations serving boards and superintendents in Ohio:

The superintendent shall:

1. serve as the board of education's chief executive officer.

2. be the board of education's professional advisor in all matters and recommend appropriate school policies for its consideration.

3. implement and execute all policies adopted by the board.

4. keep the board of education fully and accurately informed about the school program.

5. interpret the needs of the school system.

6. present professional recommendations on all problems and issues considered by the board.

7. exercise a leadership role in the improvement of instruction.

8. be alert to advances and improvements in educational programs wherever they may be found.

9. lead in the development and operation of adequate school-community relations.

10. participate in the community.

11. recommend highly qualified candidates for appointments to the school staff.

12. recommend priorities for expenditure of school district funds.

13. present for its consideration an annual budget that is designed to serve the needs of the school system.

14. coordinate his/her fiscal responsibility with that of the treasurer in the financial planning and operation of the district.
15. assumes responsibility for performance evaluation of all members of the staff, except the treasurer (an employee of the board in Ohio).

16. 

17. 

18. other duties as determined by the board.

The board of education shall:

1. be solely responsible for the employment and evaluation of the superintendent.

2. be solely responsible for the employment and evaluation of the treasurer.

3. recognize the superintendent's responsibility for all administrative functions.

4. support the superintendent in all decisions that conform to professional education and existing board policy.

5. recognize the treasurer's responsibility for all fiscal functions except those specifically delegated to the superintendent by law.

6. support the treasurer in all decisions that conform to sound fiscal practices and board policy.

7. refer applications, complaints, communications and other matters directly to the superintendent unless such is brought before the board in a meeting or is an appeal from a decision of the superintendent.

8. require evaluation procedure of staff by the superintendent.

9. recognize the importance of having superintendent present at meetings of the board including executive sessions.

10. expect the superintendent to make recommendations on all issues that concern the school system on which the board may take action.
11. develop a procedure for ongoing communications between the board and superintendent.

12. establish policy as needed consistent with good management practices.

13. assist the superintendent in a manner which will provide for a well managed, fiscally responsible system by providing sufficient help, guidance and direction.

14. appoint a legislative liaison to OSBA (Ohio School Boards Association) and keep alert to federal and state legislation directly affecting education.

15.

16. other duties as determined by the board (Ohio School Boards Association and Buckeye Association of School Administrators, 1981, pp. 4, 6).

The roles and relationships between superintendents and boards of education are determined by many different factors, but some authors feel the linkage is pretty basic, along with some pitfalls. Beyond a few statutory provisions in most states, the relationship between the school board and the superintendent is controlled more by common sense than by law. The board and superintendent are free to develop the kind of working relationship that best suits their respective needs and the needs of the school district.

There are pitfalls, however. The board/superintendent relationship can be left to chance. The board and/or superintendent can easily make some unwarranted assumptions about their respective responsibilities. The board can assume that the superintendent knows precisely what is expected of him, when in fact, he is being guided by ideas that are entirely foreign to members of the board. Moreover, the membership of a school board can change dramatically in just a few years, which often changes the board's expectations (Booth and Glaub, 1978, p. 14).
Concern about board turnover is a common one of superintendents when considering their relationship with their board and ultimately the board's assessment of their performance.

In almost every case the superintendent must assume and continue the responsibility for the relationship with the board of education. Most board of education members serve only on a part-time basis. No matter how high the interest of the board of education members, it is difficult to be fully knowledgeable about as complex an operation as the modern day school district. The superintendent must initiate and maintain an effective, positive relationship (Mayer and Wilson, 1972, p. 21).

Continuity in superintendent/board relationships can also be jeopardized by the other half of the partnership. The heightened vulnerability of the superintendent's position has been described in the somewhat euphemistic phrase "superintendent's shuffle" which refers to the rapid turnover among superintendents. If board members and superintendents are "coming and going" in a school district, establishing the desired working team would be difficult, let alone putting an effective superintendent evaluation program into place.

Some believe the turnover is often a function of conflict between superintendents and boards (Watson, 1977, p. 80). Boards and superintendents face the same dilemmas and frequently are caught between cross pressures (Knezevich, 1969, p. 246). But rather than bring boards and superintendents together, the many pressures they face sometimes create and escalate conflict between them.
Johnson (1980, p. 1) attributes board/superintendent conflicts to different backgrounds and perceptions:

Boards and superintendents have troubled relationships because they are from different tribes. Board members are amateurs in education, superintendents are professionals; board members are volunteers, superintendents are paid; board members are part-time, superintendents are full-time; board members are usually elected, superintendents are usually appointed; board members hold their power collectively, superintendents hold theirs individually. Most important, while the board is, in a sense, the boss and the superintendent the employee, the superintendent is hired to be a leader. Both the board and superintendent are in charge.

No wonder so many boards and superintendents cannot work together. Once their differences are outlined in this fashion, it becomes a wonder they can sit down in the same room together (Johnson, 1980, p. 1).

The type of people who make up a board of education are seen by some as important to the relationship between the board and superintendent and whether the superintendent is successful.

Fortunate, indeed, is the superintendent who has many business executives on the board. From their industrial experience, they appreciate the need for an administrator to administer without unreasonable interference by higher authority . . . Least fortunate is the superintendent whose board members don't have enough to keep them busy - at work or at home (Wilson, 1979, p. 20).

School board/superintendent relationships have long been a topic of discussion among board members, superintendents, and researchers in educational administration. Analysis of findings from The American School Superintendency, 1982 (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, pp. 59-60), as well as other studies, indicate that serious tensions do exist between boards and superintendents in
many communities. The authors report that fifteen percent of superintendents who left their last superintendency indicated it was due to conflict with the board, the prospect of being fired, or being fired. This equates to about one in every six changes in the superintendency reported in the study involving some tension in the relationship.

Another indication of increased tensions reported by Cunningham and Hentges is the number of superintendents who cite board-related issues and challenges as causes for them to leave the superintendency, should those issues intensify. "Caliber of persons assigned to or removed from local boards of education" and "administrator-board relations" are ranked second and third among those causes. In addition, in the 1982 study, "difficulty in relations with school board members" is stated as the tenth most important factor inhibiting superintendents' effectiveness (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 60).

Obviously, disagreements between the board and superintendent cannot be avoided. Indeed, the absence of a manageable level of tension suggests that the organization (or some major segments of it) just might be asleep. The problem for all parties is one of recognizing a state of dynamic tension as a normal or even valuable condition (Monahan and Hengst, 1982, p. 269).

There are many sources of potential conflict between the superintendent and the board of education. If the two parties are to maintain and nurture a quality working relationship, they must
develop the mechanisms necessary to recognize areas of conflict, confront them, and resolve them. Conventional wisdom to the contrary, the best solution to conflict often is to face it and deal with it rather than turn away or smooth it over (Eddy, 1972, p. 15).

The nurturing of a changing and evolving working relationship such as the one between superintendent and board is a constant challenge to all involved. Both parties need to continually assess the effectiveness of the team and make necessary adjustments to keep the relationship a healthy one. As Dykes (1965, p. 104) states:

The board and the superintendent must continuously appraise their working relationships, eliminate the bad, and emphasize the good if they are to perform effectively the task of educational leadership. The matter is far too important to be left to chance.

The need for board and superintendent unity and harmony in view of the growing problems facing school districts is evident:

Constant attention to school issues and problems and the rapid rate of change in contemporary management technology produces myriad tensions between the board of education and the superintendent, thus necessitating periodic appraisals of the board and of its chief executive officer (Kowalski, 1976, p. 3).

The implication is for an ongoing, systematic evaluation program involving the superintendent and board of education as a way to enhance a good working relationship.

As changes have occurred in the school board/superintendent relationship, the chief executive has had to devote an increasing amount of time maintaining and nurturing relationships with the
governing board. This has necessitated the development by today's chief executive of both a knowledge of the components of the board/superintendent working relationship and a collection of methods to use to maintain and nurture the relationship (Miller, 1982, p. 96).

Sometimes the strategy is to ensure more contact with members of the board on a day-to-day basis so interactions are not limited to formal business occasions. Fielders (1979, p. 190) reports one urban superintendent gives roughly 26 percent of his attention to members of the board in an average week.

Virtually every author who addresses the subject of the working relationship between the school board and superintendent stresses its importance to the productive functioning of the entire school district. One of the yearbooks on the superintendency published by the American Association of School Administrators (1954, p. 25) includes the statement, "If you had to do a one-guage appraisal of a school system, you could do worse than to take a barometric reading of its school board/superintendent relationships." In his text on the school board, Goldhammer (1964, p. 34) writes, "Authorities generally agree that the most important relationship related to the effective operation of public schools is that of the school board and superintendent."

Mayer and Wilson (1972, p. 20) summarize the statements made in the literature about the board/superintendent relationship when they write:

It is almost trite to point out that the superintendent-board of education relationship is the
single most important relationship in the school district. Its effectiveness will permeate each and every aspect of the operation of the school district. In addition, many aspects of this relationship will affect the school district's relationships with the community.

It is clear, then, that basic to the development of an adequate evaluation design for the district superintendent is the presence of a good working relationship between the chief executive officer and the board of education. Although the development of this relationship can be difficult, it is a needed and important part of the evaluation process.

Some states require the board of education to conduct an evaluation of the superintendent and the roles-relationships of the board and superintendent are sketchily spelled out in the statute. A discussion of legally mandated superintendent evaluations is included later in this chapter. In the absence of such a statute, Goldhammer (1964, p. 235) observes:

A policy-making body cannot operate effectively without the recommendations and information provided by its professional executive officer. The executive officer has an obligation to evaluate for the board the degree to which he can effectively administer policy which the board adopts, and, correspondingly, the board has an obligation to evaluate the performance of its executive officer.

In their joint booklet Roles and Relationships: School Boards and Superintendents, the American Association of School Administrators and National School Boards Association (1980, p. 3) have this to say about the responsibility of school boards in appraising the performance of the superintendent:
To hold the superintendent responsible for the administration of the school through regular constructive written and oral evaluations of the superintendent's work. Effective evaluation is an ongoing effort and should be linked to goals established by the board with the assistance of the superintendent.

In another joint publication, the AASA and NSBA executive directors provide additional insight into the roles of the board and superintendent in regard to evaluation:

Today, many believe superintendent evaluation should be part of a planning process in which the school board has an integral role. Once needs are determined by the school board, mutual school board-superintendent objectives can be established. Using these objectives, superintendent evaluation becomes more than a report on what the superintendent did or did not do. The process becomes developmental, leading to improvement in programs and performance (Redfern, 1980, preface).

One of the most complete step-by-step discussions of the roles of the board and superintendent in the superintendent's evaluation is included in Planned Appraisal of the Superintendent (Booth and Glaub, 1978) developed for the Illinois Association of School Boards. This "cookbook" approach focuses primarily on the role of the school board in determining what to evaluate and how, developing a procedure to be followed, defining with the superintendent the expectations for the position, establishing school board standards for success, and outlines the appraisal cycle from developing measurable objectives to appraisal meetings, progress reports, and the annual performance review. Step-by-step procedures and guidelines for developing an evaluation program are also included in the joint AASA/NSBA publication Evaluating the Superintendent (Redfern,
Most writers agree that the evaluation plan adopted by the board should specify the superintendent's role as the evaluatee. Some plans require the superintendent to provide written documentation of accomplishments. Other approaches invite the superintendent to provide oral evidence of performance and to answer board members' questions. Some boards provide the opportunity for the superintendent to make additional information available during the course of the evaluation if questions or criticisms arise (Evans, 1981, pp. 25-30).

More insight regarding the role of the board of education can be gained from reviewing information about the role of evaluators in general. Stufflebeam (1971, p. 117) suggests two basic functions for the evaluator:

1. He is the eyes and ears of the decision-maker, giving information about the real world.

2. He asks the questions necessary to bring the evaluation model into the 'real world' and use it as a standard with which to check actual performance.

Stufflebeam goes on to say that the evaluator (board of education) supplies the client (superintendent) with information and informs the administrator when the criteria set for a desired situation are insufficient for him to tell whether they have been met. The evaluator assists the decision-maker in pinpointing his values
so that they can be best served by the evaluative decisions that are made.

Castetter (1971, p. 9) cites four objectives for the evaluator which relate to the important relationship between the board and the superintendent:

1. Develop appraisal methodology for determining goal achievement.
2. Help develop performance standards for the position.
3. Inform the administrator of how well he is doing and discuss his self-evaluation.
4. Provide the administrator with opportunities to grow and to satisfy individual and school needs.

Worthen and Sanders (1975, p. 266) suggest an extension of the first objective for the board as cited above:

Both Stake and Scriven have emphasized that it is the responsibility of the evaluator to see that objectives are well stated. It is the evaluator’s job to sit down with the client and help him to write clearly stated objectives.

This approach emphasizes the humanistic side of the evaluator(s), which cannot be neglected. The evaluator is more than a person(s) filling in a checklist, he is a facilitator or an extension of the evaluatee whose purpose is to help improve performance (Wills, 1976, p. 14).

The above descriptions of the role of evaluator and evaluatee applied in the context of the evaluation of the superintendent by the board of education continue to point out the interdependence and importance of the relationship between the parties.
One of the most difficult of the shared responsibilities of superintendents and boards is evaluation. But evaluation of the superintendent is more than a "necessary evil."

Drucker (1974, p. 632) writes that "in any large company, especially where ownership is so widely diffused that there is no controlling interest, it is the duty of the board to review top-management performance regularly and in depth." Cleveland (1972, p. 46) adds "it is a fair guess that before long a corporation or foundation which claims to be acting in the public's interest will be expected to demonstrate that its executives are accountable to a publically responsible board that participates actively in establish­ing and revising the organization's subjective human purposes." A public school district would certainly fall into such categories and the role superintendents and boards of education play in evalua­tion will only mirror what is happening in the world at large.

School boards must be able to appraise the performance of their superintendents in a constructive and effective manner if they are to delegate proper authority for the administration of school affairs to the superintendent and still maintain their accountability to local citizens and to the state (Booth and Glaub, 1978, p. 19).
Evaluation of public school superintendents has surfaced as a concern of school boards, communities, and superintendents throughout the country. National organizations serving superintendents and school boards voice support for such evaluations to be conducted. The American Association of School Administrators' continuing resolution readopted in 1983 states:

AASA believes that the evaluation of personnel is essential to good administration and encourages each educational unit to design and conduct an evaluation of all personnel. Personnel to be evaluated must be involved in the development of such a system. Accountability based on established and agreed to educational goals, appropriate and adequate support and sound evaluation procedures must be integrated in this system.

AASA urges boards of education to assume responsibility for the evaluation of the superintendent of schools. AASA further urges superintendents to assume responsibility for the evaluation of all administrators. AASA believes that the confidentiality of these evaluations must be guaranteed (AASA, 1983, p. 13).

The most recent National School Boards Association publication on the evaluation of the superintendent states:

Evaluation of a superintendent should occur each year, using several sources of judgment, and the results should provide a framework for the future (NSBA, 1982, p. 27).

Superintendent evaluation procedures are also often recommended by the state associations serving superintendents and school boards. In a 1982 survey of executive directors of state superintendent associations conducted by this writer, thirty-three
of fifty respondents indicated their organizations provide resources on the topic of superintendent evaluation to individual school districts.

Professional organizations not only develop official position statements on superintendent evaluation, but also reinforce their positions in association publications. An example of such support is reflected by this excerpt from "Ten Commandments for Boardsmanship":

5. Thou shalt engage in periodic evaluation. The single most important tool for the board and the superintendent is a periodic evaluation. It is also the most neglected. It is the board's responsibility to evaluate the superintendent's performance. It is the responsibility of the superintendent to see that appraisal takes place (Martin, 1976, p. 3).

Another important extension of official position statements developed by professional organizations is the local district level board policy on the evaluation of the board's chief executive officer. The professional organizations serving boards and superintendents indicate the commitment to superintendent evaluation should take the form of a written policy (Redfern, 1980, p. 5).

The National School Boards Association provides numerous resources to local school districts to assist in the development of such policies. Their Educational Policies Service provides sample board policies that are helpful as guidelines. State level association publications also often include such example policies (Evans, 1981, p. 118).
Codes of ethics also provide some direction and perspective for the evaluation of a school district's chief executive officer. The AASA Statement of Ethics for School Administrators indicates "an educational administrator's professional behavior must conform to an ethical code. It must be recognized that the administrator's actions will be viewed and appraised by the community, professional associates, and students." (AASA, 1981)

State level codes of ethics subscribed to by superintendents and boards of education also speak to superintendent evaluation as these examples from Ohio:

The school administrator shall request a job description from the employing board of education upon acceptance of contract and periodic evaluation of services during the contract. Boards of education recognize their especially critical responsibility for selecting the superintendent, defining the responsibilities, helping formulate goals and evaluating the performance regularly, without directly engaging in administrative processes (Ohio School Boards Association and Buckeye Association of School Administrators, 1981, p. 14).

The concepts inherent in a code of ethics have also been incorporated into other publications regarding the "rights" of administrators and superintendents of schools. In Bill of Rights for Administrators Shannon (1975, p. 6) includes "The right to a full and impartial evaluation of professional performance on a regular and continuing basis - fair and impartial evaluation of all aspects of performance of a school administrator is the key to sound administration."
The importance of the employment contract in defining rights of administrators, including superintendents is also cited in that publication by Shannon:

The employment relationship between a school administrator and a district is strictly contractual in nature. All the job security a school administrator has is in the employment contract, and the state laws and local school board regulations which are incorporated in the employment contract by reference (1975, p. 8).

The employment contract serves as a basis for both the superintendent and the board of education to reach certain goals. The contract is also basic to building a clear and rational relationship between the board and the superintendent. This can be especially true in the area of evaluation of the superintendent.

The joint AASA/NSBA publication *The Superintendent's Contract* (1980, p. 19) outlines how evaluation should be an important part of the employment contract and includes:

It is strongly urged that language be built into the contract which indicates that the evaluation process represents a dialogue between the superintendent and board and an examination of the performance of both parties to the contractual agreement.

The sample superintendent's contract included in the publication has a specific section on evaluation.

The employment contract is a reflection of how the board feels about the worth of the superintendent. Superintendents should recognize that the contract, along with district policies adopted by the board, represents a declaration of community expectations for the chief executive officer of the school system.
The employment contract may ultimately be the most important aspect of the evaluation process between superintendents and boards of education. Along with board of education policy, the contract is the most tangible and localized of the written documents just discussed. The professional organization position statements, association publications, and codes of ethics set the stage for these more tangible applications at the local school district level. However, they all play a part in the successful development and implementation of a district's evaluation program for their superintendent of schools.

**Status of Legally Mandated Superintendent Evaluations**

The environment in which schools are administered is legalistic (Bolton, 1980, p. 9). Laws pertaining to education are becoming more numerous and complex. State legislative bodies constitute an extremely significant force in the rapid spread of evaluation plans in school districts. Lawmakers have become intensely interested in having school systems be more "accountable." Legislatures have dipped far into defining what the evaluation process should cover (AASA, 1979, p. 63). Some legislatures and state boards of education have taken steps to require that school districts evaluate their teaching and administrative personnel (Olds, 1979, p. 7).

Virtually all the publicity about mandated evaluations has been focused on the evaluation of teachers. Even though a California law required evaluation of all certificated personnel,
the assumption evaluation was something for teachers only was so widespread the law had to be amended to spell out evaluation requirements for administrators and supervisors (Olds, 1977, p. 4). Very little, if any, attention has been given to the legally mandated evaluation of public school superintendents.

There has been a trend in recent years for state legislatures, state education agencies, courts, local boards of education, and local educational agencies to promulgate legislation, regulations, decisions, policies, and guidelines which affect the substance and processes of personnel evaluation. This trend has resulted in both pluses and minuses. Some external pressure can be useful; but on the whole, it is better for action to originate within the school system itself as a result of a perceived need (Redfern, 1978, pp. 105-106).

Unfortunately, local boards of education and superintendents have not heeded such advice. Witness this caution in a 1976 article in the Ohio School Boards Journal:

Board members and superintendents need to make strong philosophical and financial commitments toward staff evaluation and development programs. Don't wait until you are forced hurriedly into a legislative-mandated system. Begin today to develop a program for all staff including the superintendent (Harcum, 1976, p. 10).

The article was written at a time when mandated evaluation was being considered by the Ohio legislature. The author turned out to be a prophet when Ohio enacted such legislation for administrators, including superintendents, in 1980.
Legislative mandates for the evaluation of school managers are a reflection of similar concern in the greater society. Drucker (1980, p. 67) believes that within a fairly short time boards of directors will have the legal duty to appraise the management of publicly held companies.

The establishment of laws regarding evaluation of educational personnel (and programs in some states) is closely allied to the concern for accountability. The public wants evidence that personnel are effective in their jobs and, if they are not, that efforts are being made either to improve their performance or release them from their positions (Bolton, 1980, p. 9).

In the past dozen years, a quickening has occurred in the creation of laws requiring evaluation of teachers, administrators, and superintendents. Before 1971, six states required teacher evaluation; four required administrator evaluation; and none required the evaluation of the superintendent. In 1983, 26 states require that teachers be evaluated; 22 of these states also require that administrators be evaluated; and results of a survey of state executive directors of professional organizations serving superintendents conducted by this writer show that eleven states now legally mandate the evaluation of the chief executive officer of local public school districts.

Most laws address teacher and administrator evaluation simultaneously; in some cases though, administrator evaluation was
mandated a few years after teacher evaluation laws were passed (Wuhs and Manatt, 1983, p. 28).

Most legislative mandates are not specific in terms of the evaluation process to be followed. This seems to be well received by those directly involved.

In 1980 an idea long supported in principle, if not in practice by many board members and school superintendents became law in Ohio . . . The law wisely omits references to the details of the evaluation procedures to be established, thus leaving to local boards the important and challenging task of evolving an effective appraisal plan for their chief executive (Evans, 1981, p. 68).

In order to assist local boards of education and superintendents in developing evaluation programs, some state professional organizations have published resource materials on the topic. It is not always clear whether the materials were developed in response to a need or because of the legislative mandate. In any event, authors of the publications sometimes indicate the materials reflect the legislative mandate and acknowledge that many boards may for the first time be engaging formally in the process of evaluating their superintendents (Evans, 1981, p. ii).

To complement and extend the information regarding superintendent evaluation available from the AASA study, The American School Superintendency, 1982, this writer surveyed the executive directors of the professional organizations serving superintendents in each of the fifty states. The survey focuses on the topics of legal mandates, state assistance, and the level of quality of superintendent evaluations as perceived by the directors. All of
the state executive directors, or their designees, responded to the survey. A copy of the survey questionnaire is included as Appendix B.

Eleven state directors responded that their state legislature had enacted a law mandating the evaluation of the superintendent in local public school districts in their state. Thirty-nine of the directors reported such a legal mandate does not exist in their state at this time.

Of the eleven states where the evaluation of the superintendent is so mandated, the executive director of South Dakota reported the enactment of the earliest such law in 1971. The most recent state law requiring the formal evaluation of the chief school executive was enacted in July 1983 by the Mississippi State Legislature.

A formal job description is part of the state law in California, Louisiana, New Jersey, and Washington. The state laws in Connecticut, Kansas, Mississippi, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas do not require a formal job description as part of the mandated evaluation of superintendents. California, Louisiana, New Jersey, and Washington state laws also specify a formal job description serve as the basis for the superintendent's evaluation.

Legally mandated superintendent evaluations are completed annually in California, Connecticut, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey (for tenured superintendents), Ohio, Texas, and Washington. The laws in Oklahoma (for non-tenured superintendents)
and South Dakota require evaluations semi-annually. Non-tenured superintendents in New Jersey must be formally evaluated three times annually, while tenured superintendents in Oklahoma are formally evaluated only once every three years. None of the executive directors in states requiring superintendent evaluations report such evaluations occur only at contract renewal time.

State superintendent associations and state school board associations were reported most often by the executive directors as providing the impetus for state laws requiring the formal evaluation of public school superintendents. State superintendent professional organizations were cited in Connecticut, Kansas, Ohio, and Washington, while state school board associations were cited in New Jersey, Ohio, South Dakota, and Washington. The Kansas law was also influenced by individual superintendents and school boards.

Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas executive directors reported that the state teachers association provided some of the state teachers association provided some of the impetus for their superintendent evaluation laws. It was also reported the state legislature provided some of the impetus in California and Mississippi, and was the sole force for the legal mandate in Louisiana. The associations serving administrators other than superintendents in Ohio worked with the superintendent's organization in securing that law; while the state board of education in South Dakota provided some of the impetus in that state.
None of the executive directors responding indicated the law in their state applied to the state superintendent or commissioner.

Eight of the eleven executive directors with laws in their state responded they felt the law mandating the formal evaluation of local district superintendents was beneficial. The executive director in Texas felt the law was not beneficial, while the Louisiana and Mississippi executive directors were undecided about the benefit of the law.

None of the executive directors responding indicated the law in their state has been the target of any legal challenges.

The executive directors in Georgia and Wisconsin responded such a law requiring the formal evaluation of public school superintendents was pending in their states. Laws may be in effect in those states by this time. None of the other fifty state executive directors or their designees indicated any pending legislation in their state.

Only the Arizona and Wisconsin executive directors reported legislation requiring superintendent evaluation being proposed in their state. The Arizona Superintendents Association has proposed such legislation, while "middle management" was listed by the executive director from Wisconsin.

Six executive directors from the thirty-nine states presently without a law mandating superintendent evaluations responded they believe such a law should be enacted in their state.
They are serving the superintendent associations in Alaska, Arizona, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, and North Carolina. The executive director in Alabama indicated he was not sure whether such a law should be enacted.

None of the fifty executive directors responded that their associations have a formal position regarding a law requiring the evaluation of superintendents.

Eight of the executive directors responded the state superintendent or commissioner is formally evaluated in their state. They are serving the superintendent associations in Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, South Dakota, Texas, and Vermont. The explanation for some of the "no" responses might be reflected in the response of the executive director from Oklahoma. He indicated the state superintendent in that state is elected by popular vote and therefore is "evaluated" in that manner.

The executive directors reported that superintendents in Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oklahoma, and South Dakota are able to gain tenure as superintendents. One director responded he wasn't sure whether superintendents had that option in his state.

Table 2.1 reflects the current status of state laws requiring the formal evaluation of public school superintendents.

Thirty-three of the executive directors responded their state associations provide resources on the topic of superintendent evaluation to individual school districts. Of those executive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year Enacted</th>
<th>Job Description Required</th>
<th>Frequency of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1977/1980</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey (Tenured)</td>
<td>1976 (1979)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3/Yr.; (Annually)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma (Tenured)</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2/Yr.; (1/3 Yrs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2/Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
directors who answered resource materials are provided, twenty-seven indicated sample materials such as evaluation forms are included. Personal consultations are provided in twenty-four states, workshops for school board members in twenty states, workshops for superintendents in seventeen states, evaluation booklets in thirteen states, and direct evaluation assistance is provided in California, Idaho, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island.

When asked how they would rate the overall quality of superintendent evaluations conducted in the individual school districts in their state, only the executive directors in Louisiana, New Mexico, and Washington responded they felt the overall quality was high. Fourteen executive directors rated the superintendent evaluations in their state as average quality. The superintendent evaluations in eleven states were cited as low quality. Thirteen of the executive directors responded they had insufficient information to answer the question. Nine executive directors did not mark any of the available responses.

No clear-cut differentiation between states that do or do not have laws mandating superintendent evaluation and whether they provide resource materials, or rate evaluations completed in their state as high quality, is apparent.

Although it is yet to be determined if state mandated superintendent evaluations improve the quality of evaluation programs in individual local school districts, it is clear the number of state legislatures requiring a formal evaluation of
local public school district chief executives continues to increase.

**Job Expectations, Job Descriptions, and Criteria for Evaluation**

The superintendent cannot be properly evaluated until he or she understands what is expected by the board of education (Evans, 1981, p. 74). The most important part of appraisal is to determine precisely what it is that you wish to appraise (Booth and Glaub, 1978, p. 26). As Redfern (1978, p. 39) states:

> Understanding what is expected in job performance is essential not only in fulfilling responsibilities, but in evaluating the effectiveness in doing so.

> ... in what form will duties and responsibilities be formulated?
> ... who makes these determinations?
> ... are job descriptions the best means for describing job content?
> ... are responsibility criteria useful for this purpose?
> ... can general criteria be formulated and made applicable to all classifications of personnel?

Unless job content is well defined, it will be difficult to evaluate performance successfully.

Administrative evaluation systems are based upon the assumptions that there are standards of administrative effectiveness, and that administrative performance can be measured in terms of these standards. Without these two prerequisites, administrative evaluation has no meaning (Nygaard, 1974, p. 5).

Speicher (1971, p. 9) identifies three approaches in defining the administrative role or the standard of effectiveness:
1. The characteristics or traits (input) approach which defines administrative effectiveness in terms of personal attributes.

2. The process-behavior approach which defines administrative effectiveness in terms of specific functions.

3. The administrative outcomes (output) approach which defines administrative effectiveness in terms of the relative accomplishment of educational or administrative objectives.

In all evaluation of human performance, it is necessary to be concerned with criteria or expectations, situational factors and performance (Hawson and Franco, 1965, p. 36). Role expectations can be defined as an evaluative standard or anticipated behavior applied to a role incumbent by the role partners (Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958, p. 5). If the role incumbent meets the role partner's expectations, the role partner is satisfied. If the role incumbent does not behave as anticipated, the role partner feels deprived (Parsons, 1951, p. 23). Similarly, Getzels (1958, p. 153) proposes that roles have certain obligations and responsibilities which may be termed role expectations, and when the role incumbent puts these obligations and responsibilities into effect he is said to be performing his role. To engage in any evaluation process, especially involving the superintendent, without establishing the basis for assessment could turn these efforts to political or popularity based evaluation.

The school superintendent is a newcomer to the professional scene. Unlike his fellow practitioners in medicine, law, and the church, he or she cannot draw upon centuries of tradition and long
established canons of professional conduct. His role and the scope and nature of his work in the matrix of society have not yet been clearly defined through the long view of history (Burbank, 1968, p. 3).

The search for successful performance in the role of school superintendent is compounded by the nebulous nature of the post, by the hundreds of different opinions of what constitutes success, by the fact that no two environments in which superintendents operate are identical, and by the fact that no two persons capped with the title perform in identical fashion or are cut from the same cloth (Wilson, 1979, p. 4).

What makes an effective leader? What should be the expectations for a superintendent of schools? The answer could depend on who you ask. The species that goes by the title "manager" has such diverse characteristics that we often wonder whom and what we're talking about (Meidan, 1981, p. 9). School systems and their administrators are being bombarded on all sides by demands to satisfy the expectations of parents, students, school boards, government agencies, to name only a few. The fact that many of these expectations are conflicting by nature adds to the complexity of the administrator's task (Bolton, 1980, p. 1). Nowhere in education is this more true than with the superintendency.

A district superintendent cannot be all things to all persons, yet that often seems to be the expectation. Various groups within a pluralistic society hold different values and consequently hold different expectations for school administrators (Culbertson,
Jacobson, and Reller, 1960, p. 15). Again, in a school district this can be especially true with the chief executive officer.

Lipham (1964, p. 25) states:

A major source of conflict for the leader of an organization is the situation in which he frequently finds himself attempting to fulfill simultaneously the expectations of two or more reference groups which may be contradictory in nature.

Role conflict can be defined as any situation in which the incumbent of a focal position perceives that he is confronted with incompatible expectations (Gross, et al., 1958, p. 5). These conflicts of expectations between different groups, between superintendents and various community and school groups (including the board of education), and the conflicting expectations held by individuals creates a momentous task for educational administrators who must effectively make decisions resolving role conflicts (Culbertson, et al., 1960, p. 17).

With the growing awareness of the great variation in the expectancies regarding the superintendency, the question has been raised whether the position is an impossible one. Has there been a tendency to regard the superintendent as the one who can resolve inevitable conflicts - and then to condemn him/her when they are not resolved? (Morphet, et al., 1974, p. 325)

Certainly it is true that the superintendency is one of the most difficult positions conceivable because of the impact of expectancies. Also, educational leaders, driven by a desire for evaluative feedback, that rarely occurs, set numerous personal
expectations for themselves. Some of these "self inflicted" goals can have deleterious psychological effects (Bridges, 1977, pp. 203-204). This can lead to managerial role stress.

Role stress can result when traditional role expectations do not necessarily reflect what managers do in actual practice. The necessary starting point in reducing managerial role stress is therefore the identification of key managerial behaviors.

The identification of key managerial behaviors is seen as important in determining realistic expectations for any person in a leadership role. In terms of the superintendency, school districts must arrive at consensus regarding the role and function of the superintendent prior to effectively evaluating the performance in the role (McGrath, 1972, p. 197). The alert superintendent wants to know what his board expects from him.

Booth and Glaub (1978, p. 26) recommend:

The school board and the superintendent must sit down together and sort through the multitude of possible factors that signify success or failure in school management. Then they must agree on those factors which represent the board's expectations for the superintendent and serve as the criteria upon which they will judge his performance. Then both the board and superintendent will be fully aware of what the board considers important (and unimportant). Neither should find surprises in the appraisal process.

Dykes (1965, p. 37) suggests that the superintendent's job is what he and his school board perceive it to be. However, Buchanan (1981, p. 16) reports no statistically significant agreement among school board members of any single expectation of the superintendent's role:
A school superintendent cannot logically assume that there will be marked agreement, or even substantial agreement, among his school board members or between himself and his board members regarding evaluative standards for his attitude and behavior as to the superintendent's function in his occupational situation.

Thirty years ago Reeder (1954, p. 22) expressed the need for boards to have an agreement with the superintendent regarding his duties as well as those of the board. He further added that the agreement should be in writing. But superintendents and boards often fail to negotiate performance expectations as many of the writers on the subject of superintendent evaluation suggest. Johnson (1980, p. 1) indicates there are two problems in that regard: expectations that have been made explicit, but without criteria or a time-table for evaluation; and expectations that have remained implicit despite their importance.

Brinkman (1973, p. 15) believes the various expectations for the superintendent can readily be categorized into six areas:

1. Governing Board-District Superintendent Relationships
2. Instructional Leadership
3. Finance Leadership
4. Personnel Leadership
5. Community Relationships
6. Personal Leadership

These major job expectation areas are relatively consistent throughout the literature. They are sometimes expanded upon. For example, in his dissertation "Expectations for the School
Superintendency Role, Shanks (1966, pp. 307-308) cites fourteen basic expectations for the school superintendent.

In the joint AASA/NSBA publication Selecting a Superintendent (1979, pp. 35-36), a list similar to Shank's is included with "be a skilled politician in order to work effectively with his or her many publics" added, a reflection of the emerging political dimension of the job.

The lists of job expectations for the superintendency seem endless. It is impossible to determine all the expectations that a board may have for the superintendent, or for any one superintendent to meet all the different expectations. It may also be impossible for a board to evaluate all the assigned expectations for their chief executive officer. Booth and Glaub (1978, p. 42) speculate:

School boards getting into superintendent appraisal for the first time soon discover that they cannot evaluate everything about the superintendent or the superintendent's job. Many aspects of the job are so routine that it proves pointless to spend time debating the exact degree of success or failure. It is helpful, therefore, to make some distinctions in how to assess different facets of the superintendency.

To assist boards of education and superintendents in sorting out the importance of various expectations established for a superintendent, Booth and Glaub (1978, pp. 66-67) suggest dividing the expectations into three categories: minimal responsibilities, reasonable expectations, and special expectations. This helps differentiate between expectations from those functions which a superintendent must perform if the school district is to operate lawfully (minimal responsibilities), to those functions which the
superintendent expects to perform - and which the board expects him to perform - beyond the minimal duties (reasonable expectations), and functions which reflect a school district's peculiar needs (special expectations). They also include a format in their publication for determining what functions of the superintendent best fall into each category.

Even with such a division and establishment of priorities, an administrative situation may develop which fixes too large a responsibility on one person. Certainly the expectations for the superintendency are changing, if not unreasonably overwhelming. The duties of the superintendent of schools continue to become more complex, more challenging, more exhausting, more diversified and more precarious as society and our schools head toward the twenty-first century (AASA, 1979, p. 3).

How can the complex and every-changing expectations be put in a workable format for the superintendent and board and serve in a meaningful and measurable way in the evaluation of the chief executive officer's performance? Some believe that can best be accomplished with the development and utilization of a job description:

These expectations should be written down as a position or job description to serve as a guideline to the superintendent in performing the duties of that office and as a basis to assess outcomes. The job description is a 'public' document which also has the value of informing others of the expectations for the holders of any given position (Evans, 1981, p. 74).
The development (or refinement) of a job description may be an initial and essential ingredient for a successful superintendent evaluation system. Bolton (1980, p. 44) writes "the job description should be used as a basis for discussion about the priorities, significant elements of the job, and elements which have changed since prior discussions. Used in such a way, it will serve as a reminder of the comprehensiveness of the job." More specifically, it should call attention to the wide range of duties and responsibilities of the superintendent.

An effective job description has seven characteristics:

1. It identifies the job title
2. It states the qualifications required for the job.
3. It makes clear the job's position in the chain of supervision.
4. It relates the job to its ultimate client - the student - and his goals.
5. It presents the major performance responsibilities that make up the job.
6. It sets forth the terms of employment and the evaluation criteria for the job.
7. It provides for review and acknowledgement by the incumbent of the details of the job description (Booth and Glaub, 1978, p. 54).

National and state professional organizations serving superintendents and boards of education provide resources to school districts for developing superintendent job descriptions. For example, the National School Boards Association provides a model job description as part of their Educational Policies Service.
Lack of good, written job descriptions represent a severe management handicap. Under these conditions, there can be a complete lack of understanding about what services actually are being provided by an individual. However, the job descriptions in a school district, including the superintendent's, need to be continually reviewed and revised due to changing job requirements since job descriptions easily become inadequate. When a statement is not a fair description of the work being performed, it cannot be used successfully in connection with sound evaluation (Olds, 1977, p. 19).

The development of appropriate job descriptions and delineation of job functions of the superintendent can be a problem, as cited as early as 1960:

Professional studies of the administrator's duties are also misleading in their oversimplification of the administrative process. Through an apparent attempt to condense the kaleidoscopic activities of the superintendent into a handy package for classification purposes, their conclusions are scholarly but highly generalized (Wilson, 1960, p. 23).

School districts depend to varying degrees on job descriptions in their management and evaluation practices. While a job description can be a beneficial tool in managing an organization, a school board or superintendent can expect too much from it (Hughes, 1968, p. 40).

The National School Boards Association (1982, p. 43) suggests the following pitfalls and cautions regarding job descriptions:
1. Watch out for fiction and flattery in job descriptions. Avoid long and trivial lists of what's done, or inflating language.

2. Don't let job descriptions become straitjackets. Jobs are dynamic. Needs change. New people may bring talents to a job that can and should change the nature of a given job. Thus it is imperative to change and update job descriptions.

3. Don't put people to work unnecessarily. The best job description system in the world is a failure if, upon completion, it is allowed to sit on a shelf.

Campbell (1970, p. 107) would not agree with a limiting view of defining job expectations through a job description for administrators, including the superintendent. He believes:

A measure of any given manager's effectiveness should be based on a careful definition of the total domain of his job responsibilities along with statements of critical behaviors believed necessary for using available and potential resources in the best possible way.

The job description by itself is usually not a sound basis for appraising the superintendent's performance. The responsibilities listed in the job description are necessarily broad, for that is the nature of the superintendency.

Redfern (1978, p. 41) includes the job description as only one of six methods for defining the job of school administration:

1. Checklist or rating scale lists
2. Lists of desired behaviors
3. Characteristics of successful performance
4. Performance standards
5. Job descriptions

6. Responsibility criteria and descriptors.
He goes on to say that each method has some advantages and disadvantages and suggests that the assets and liabilities of each of the six methods of defining the job should be carefully weighed. The ease or difficulty of carrying out the evaluation process will be determined, to some extent, by the method used to define the job content (Redfern, 1978, p. 46).

Whatever method is used to define the job content of the superintendent, clearly defined criteria are necessary in order to have an effective evaluation program.

Some authors view the criteria to be used to judge the performance of leaders of organizations, like superintendents of schools, limited to one factor:

As a general rule, the higher the manager's grade, the fewer criteria there are by which to evaluate performance. Toward the top of the organizational hierarchy, we have those managers whose success or failure is identifiable with the success or failure of the autonomous units themselves (Meidan, 1981, p. 11).

What important attributes should be considered when developing the criteria upon which the chief executive officer of a school district is evaluated? In a benchmark publication on the superintendency, Griffiths (1966, p. 63) says "probably the most important single characteristic of a successful school administrator is high mental ability." Not everyone agrees.
Buchanan (1981, p. 89) found in his study of the evaluation of superintendents that educational leadership is the most important criteria, with personal characteristics being least important. Lilienthal (1967, pp. 32-32) reinforces Buchanan's statement by saying "the manager must possess the personal, emotional, and imaginative qualities that move other people, that enable him to motivate and induce them not only to agreement, but action."

In his study of successful superintendents, Wilson (1979, p. 10) reports the single most important talent displayed by those superintendents is their expertise in human relations. Goldhammer's (1964, p. 40) earlier study also reflects superintendents not seeing themselves as directors of their systems, but as the individual whose function it is to mediate between groups and to link the schools to the community. McGrath (1972, p. 145) supports that view and reports the most critical areas of performance for school superintendents are his/her relationships with the community, the board, and the professional staff.

Superintendents responded in a study conducted by Yates (1981, pp. 87-88) that keeping the board of education informed about problems of the district was the most important criteria to be considered in their evaluation.

Pitner (1978, p. 123) applied the analytical approaches developed by Mintzberg (for his study of manager behaviors) to the
study of three suburban school superintendents and concludes that:

The superintendent is someone who acts as an information manager within the social system of which his school is a part. By information manager, it is suggested that the superintendent controls the acquisition, retention, and dissemination of information.

This conclusion would lead a board of education to apply the criteria of how well the superintendent manages information as the primary factor in evaluating performance.

Some believe that evaluation criteria or competencies are causally linked to performance standards—that is, there is a cause-and-effect relationship between the specific competencies and the superior performance of a manager. Furthermore, these fundamental competencies are generic—that is, possessed in some degree by all managers (Hayes, 1980, p. 2).

As early as 1933 in the study of the American superintendent conducted by the National Education Association, Department of Superintendence, criteria for the evaluation of educational leadership were discussed:

There are also certain commonly recognized individual or personal characteristics exemplified by leaders. Among these aspects of individual leadership are: (1) philosophy, (2) health, (3) study, (4) research, (5) leisure, (6) socialization, (7) creativeness, (8) courage, and (9) scholarship (National Education Association, Department of Superintendence, 1933, p. 324).

In most cases, those who write about the criteria necessary for the evaluation of the chief executive officer of a public school
district speak in terms of multiple criteria, just as in the 1933 report. Carol (1972, p. 13) lists the following criteria used to evaluate the superintendent of schools:

1. Educational leadership and knowledge
2. General effectiveness of chief school officer/superintendent (CSO)
3. Recruitment, employment, supervision of personnel
4. Community/CSO relationships
5. Board/CSO relationships
6. Staff/CSO relationships
7. Plans and objectives of CSO
8. Management functions
9. Curriculum and programs
10. General district performance
11. Personal characteristics of CSO
12. Budget development, passage, implementation
13. Student/CSO relationships
14. Graduate employment records.

Carol reports the evaluative criteria used by the majority of the boards in her study were the relationships with staff, community, and students, and general effectiveness of the chief school officer.

Carpenter (1964, pp. 269-273), McGrath (1972, p. 192), and Yates (1981, pp. 87-88) also developed lists of criteria to assess the performance of superintendents similar to Carol's.
In an article on the topic of expectations that superintendents and boards of education share, Johnson (1981, p. 6) has this to say about the criteria for evaluation of the public school superintendent:

To sum up, these expectations are universal: competent leadership; decisiveness; good community relations; mutual support; negotiated expectations; integrity and credibility; keeping an open mind; issues, not personalities, no surprises; and loyalty.

It seems there are as many criteria to use to evaluate the chief executive officer of a public school district as there are superintendents of schools. Not only that, but the criteria can be overwhelming, border on the ridiculous, and thus lead to observations such as the following:

A superintendent needs the practicality of Betty Crocker, the inventiveness of Gloria Steinem, the wisdom of Solomon, the hide of Dumbo, the sensitivity of an antenna, the tenderness attributed to women, and a backbone of dull-plated steel (Mullins, 1975, p. 29).

The appropriate criteria to be established for the evaluation of a superintendent of schools may well depend on the situation and the actors involved.

What is suggested is that any given superintendent is not a man for all seasons. Respected professional to friend and stubborn bureaucrat to critic, the big-city school chief could not easily adjust to seasonal changes. The fit between the times, the local political context, and the dominant concept of leadership may well determine whether a school man can do an effective job. There are fall, summer, spring, and winter superintendents - to stretch the metaphor - none for all seasons (Cuban, 1978, p. 29).
In the joint AASA/NSBA publication *Selecting a Superintendent* (AASA, 1979, pp. 35-36), the authors state:

Yet each school district, each board, has its own specific needs, its own specific knowledge of the situation at hand, its own basic list of intangibles it is seeking in a superintendent of schools.

Maybe the answer doesn't relate to expectations or criteria at all, but is situational in nature and has more to do with "timing." Simon (1957, p. 187) suggests that the most important thing about organizations is to have the right man in the right place at the right time. The historical development of the superintendent illustrates how difficult this is, particularly when the social and political environments shift so rapidly. Many superintendents fail because they are either the right man in the wrong place or the wrong man in the right place. Success depends upon a good match between man and job (Buchanan, 1981, p. 15).

Booth and Glaub (1978, p. 9) caution that the role of the superintendent is not etched in stone, neither should the criteria used for evaluation be so inflexible.

Pol (1976, p. 16) provides a frame of reference that indicates the need to continue revising the criteria upon which superintendents are evaluated and substantiates the view that each superintendent's setting is unique, thus precluding the identification of an absolute role for all superintendents. He states:

Schools are social organizations exposed to both internal and external forces that continuously change and reshape their organizational structure. Therefore, role expectations also change and it becomes
necessary to be aware of those changes and assess them so new areas or components of competence can be identified, developed, and redefined for role incumbents. Because this is a dynamic process, role definitions cannot remain the same for a long period of time.

Not only can the criteria for the evaluation of superintendents be localized in terms of setting and constantly be changed and reshaped, but much of what superintendents are expected to do today may be very different for the chief executive officer of school districts in the future:

The future executive will be brainy, low-key, collegial, optimistic, and one thing more - he will positively enjoy complexity and constant change (Cleveland, 1972, p. 89).

Drucker (1980, p. 68), in looking at the business world, may also have some insight into what today's superintendents should be doing in regard to their future and the future of the school districts they lead:

Performance in management, therefore, means in large measure doing a good job of preparing today's business for the future. This is where the measurement of management performance – or at least the appraisal of it – is needed the most, especially in turbulent times.

This certainly would apply to the superintendents in today's American public school districts.

There are many different terms used to label what is expected from the person occupying the position of superintendent of schools. Whether one uses the term job expectations, job description, management tasks, duties, responsibilities, role, functions, performance standards, or criteria, each individual board of
education and superintendnet needs to reach agreement on the basis upon which evaluation will take place. Once that agreement takes place, the other pieces of an effective evaluation program for the chief executive officer of the school district can then take shape.

**Procedures, Frequency, and Methods for Superintendent Evaluation**

Procedures utilized in the evaluation of superintendents of schools may vary from quite formal processes established through board policy and administrative guidelines to rather casual and informal exchanges (Miller, 1982, p. 63). Formal evaluation plans are seen as planned and structured, while informal evaluations are viewed as unplanned and unstructured (Evans, 1981, p. 80). While an informal evaluation procedure is based on subjective observations with no written feedback and limited if any discussion, a formal evaluation involves a written assessment of the superintendent's job performance discussed in a meeting between the superintendent and the board of education. Some school boards and superintendents may use a combination of formal and informal procedures.

Both the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators recommend a formal approach to the evaluation of the superintendent.

For too long, superintendent evaluation was extremely informal. 'So long as everything
is OK, you won't hear from us.' Never sure how the school board viewed his (her) performance, the superintendent could not help but feel a twinge of insecurity.

Gradually, it became obvious that there were definite advantages to systematic, written evaluations (Redferen, 1980, pp. 1, 8).

Fitzwater (1973, p. 26) also echoes the need for formal evaluation procedures if the evaluation is to be a positive activity of a forward-looking nature. Dickinson (1980, p. 34) agrees with that position:

Casual, unspecified evaluations of a superintendent don't work. They won't head off misunderstandings that develop between a board and its chief executive officer and they don't facilitate the efficient conversion of board policy into school system practice. What you need is an evaluation process that's formal, specific, and structured -- and one that follows a set timetable.

Fowler (1977, p. 22) suggests that superintendents fail in their performance for several reasons and when problems between board and superintendent arise they must be willing to meet and follow procedures that can lead to resolution of the problem. The first procedure he suggests is an annual evaluation program where the school board formally measures the superintendent's performance. Wilson (1980, p. 29) reports in his study of "untracked" superintendents that regular and formal evaluation of the superintendent's performance by the board is a crucial factor in avoiding untracking.
Unquestionably, the trend among boards of education across the country is away from informal evaluation arrangements, which leave much to chance, toward those practices with more structure. However, as long as a formal procedure for administrator evaluation is not implemented, the informal will prevail (Evans, 1981, p. 80).

Informal procedures for evaluation seem to remain more typical than formal procedures even though board members and superintendents alike recommend more formalized approaches to improve the process. As cited earlier, about thirty percent of the superintendents responding to the 1982 AASA national survey say they are formally evaluated by their board of education. But just over thirty-seven percent of the superintendents indicate they are evaluated informally. About twenty-five percent say they are evaluated using both procedures (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 33).

In her study of New Jersey superintendents and boards, Carol (1972, pp. 7-10) found that sixty-two percent of the districts responding used informal rather than formal evaluation procedures. Sixty-five percent of the superintendents and board presidents in those districts expressed a desire to formalize their procedures. Jones (1979, p. 182) found similar results seven years later when he also surveyed superintendent evaluation practices in New Jersey. Sixty-four percent of the superintendents and seventy-five percent of the board members responding were still using informal, verbal
appraisals. When asked for suggestions to improve existing evaluation processes, both superintendents and board presidents listed formalizing the process as the top priority for improving the process.

When evaluation is conducted on an informal basis, written documentation may or may not exist. Carol (p. 9) found that informal procedures of evaluation varied even more widely than formal evaluation procedures. Usually the evaluation process involved observation of the chief executive by the board throughout the year and comments made by people to the board about the superintendent. Then at some unspecified time the board members would meet and discuss what they had been told and had seen. Carol noted that usually this meeting is unplanned and may be the direct result of a crisis.

In another study conducted in California involving school districts that reported they formally evaluated their superintendents, only forty-three percent of those districts could actually produce a written document (McGrath, 1972, p. 184). Yates (1981, p. 61) found in Illinois that only thirty-two percent of the responding school districts used a written evaluation procedure to assess the performance of their chief executive officers.

The message in reviewing the above studies is clear. Many superintendents and boards of education continue to rely on informal evaluation procedures while espousing the virtues of a more formal process. They believe evaluations should be formal, in
writing, and be conducted on a regular basis, but evidently have some difficulty in practicing what they preach.

Redfern (1980, pp. 7-8) reflects the evolving nature of the formal evaluation of superintendents of schools in the AASA publication *Evaluating the Superintendent*:

The following continuum depicts past practices and the emergence of improved techniques. Actual dates for 'then' and 'now' would vary from one school system to another:

**THEN**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOW**

A = No planned procedures; reliance upon word-of-mouth assessments

B = Informal assessments; minimal feedback to superintendent

C = 'Report Card' type evaluations; heavy reliance upon trait rating

D = Refinement of checklist rating techniques; more feedback to superintendent

E = Better definitions of executive duties/responsibilities; emergence of performance standards; pre- and post-assessment conferences

F = Use of performance objectives; more emphasis upon results achieved

G = Reciprocal evaluation techniques (two way assessments); improvement in performance made a high priority in the evaluation process.

School systems are at various stages along the continuum. Some evaluation practices are unrefined, but considerable improvement has taken place during the last ten years. However, in many cases, much remains to be done.

Boards of education not only vary to the degree they evaluate their superintendent formally or informally, they also
vary on the frequency of their evaluation. About seventy percent of the superintendents responding to the 1982 AASA national survey say they are annually evaluated by their board of education. Eight percent report semi-annual evaluations, while eleven percent say they are evaluated at contract renewal time. Five percent of the superintendents report being evaluated at other times, two percent say they do not know how often they are evaluated, and another five percent say they are never evaluated (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 33).

Buchanan (1981, p. 89) indicates in his study that forty-one percent of the districts reported evaluating their superintendent annually. Thirteen percent also reported a continuous evaluation of their chief executive officer.

Both the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators recommend at least an annual evaluation with some interim steps to enhance communications (Redfern, 1980, pp. 15-16).

In some cases, the frequency of the superintendent's evaluation is a part of the requirements found in state legal mandates:

A scheduled evaluation of the superintendent should occur annually at a time of the year consistent with state legal mandates necessitating board action on reemployment and salary considerations. In setting the time of year for superintendent appraisal, boards of education in Ohio must take into consideration the legal requirement that the superintendent must be notified on or before March 1 in the year his/her contract expires if the superintendent is not to be reemployed (Evans, 1981, p. 72).
Resource publications developed by superintendent and/or board professional organizations at the state level sometimes include recommendations regarding how often the superintendent should be evaluated:

The evaluation should be conducted at regular intervals (once a year, every six months, etc.). One or two progress interviews in the interim would give the board the opportunity to inform the superintendent whether or not his or her efforts should be directed differently, and these could help the superintendent to make the necessary changes (Washington State School Director's Association, 1974, p. 8).

It is important not to conduct an evaluation of the superintendent of schools once a year and then forget about it. Evaluation, to be effective, must be continuous (Dittlof, 1982, p. 41).

While it is generally accepted that the need for continuous evaluation of the superintendent exists, the method of such evaluation varies greatly. That a need exists is given credence by Gross (1958, p. 141) when he states:

What is required is some device whereby superintendents can gain greater insights, understandings, and needed help in their efforts to exert educational leadership in their schools and in their communities.

There is emerging evidence that boards and superintendents are now working together to design well-structured and useful techniques for the evaluation of the chief executive officer (Redfern, 1980, p. 7). However, it is easy to fall into the trap of believing that all administrative efforts and responsibilities
can be measured by some handy-dandy test, yardstick or checklist (Olds, 1977, p. 22).

Heller (1978, p. 7) addresses the variety of instruments available for judging and measuring administrative performance:

After reviewing evaluation instruments, I was able to draw two general conclusions; (1) the lists of instruments available is lengthy, and (2) the variables used for measuring performance vary from school district to district.

By and large, many of the evaluation instruments being used today were developed from concepts at least fifty years old (Greene, 1972, p. 1). The first instrument used to record superintendent performance was developed by Ayer (1929, p. 39). The instrument contained over one-hundred items referred to as "duties of the public school superintendent." One such duty was "to make friendly calls on board members," Maybe times haven't changed that much.

Douglas McGregor, the "father" of modern executive performance evaluation, was so disturbed about the preoccupation of evaluators in designing elaborate evaluation forms that he advocated, more than twenty years ago, a new start with one plain sheet of paper for recording significant outcomes for the final evaluation report (Olds, 1977, p. 19).

However, because the factors that determine overall effectiveness are varied, it follows that the criteria and techniques used for measurement also need to be varied (Meidan, 1981, p. 58). All techniques and methods for appraising managerial performance
have their strengths and limitations. Consequently, one key for truly effective appraisal is to use the techniques and methods selectively and with discrimination (Meldan, p. 56).

Redfern (1980, pp. 9-13) identifies seven techniques or methods for the evaluation of the superintendent of schools. They include:

1. Essay Evaluations
2. Graphic Rating Scale
3. Forced Choice Technique
4. Work Standards
5. Performance Standards
6. Evaluation-by-Objectives

He indicates some form of work or performance standards, along with specific objectives, are being used with increasing frequency, but states:

School boards, however, probably will be inclined to use a variety of techniques, as determined by their own views and preferences. Good evaluation can be achieved in various ways provided the process is thoughtfully planned, cooperatively implemented, and completed in a professional manner (Redfern, p. 13).

Nygaard refers to five general techniques or methods for evaluating administrative behavior:

1. Graphic rating scales - The administrator is evaluated according to how frequently a behavior is observed. An example would be a typical checklist of behaviors.
2. Essay appraisals - The evaluator writes a narrative description of the administrator discussing strengths, weaknesses, and potential.

3. Field review - Essay and graphic ratings by several evaluators are combined into a systematic review process.

4. Forced-choice rating - The evaluator must choose from two or more statements that best describe the administrator's behavior.

5. Critical incident appraisal - Administrator behavior is recorded at critical periods or when significant incidents occur (Nygaard, 1974).

Booth and Glaub (1978, p. 11) and Evans (1981, p. 81) limit the methods for evaluating school administrators, including the superintendent, to rating scales and performance objectives. Booth and Glaub state:

Basically, there are two popular systems for evaluating the superintendent - and a multitude of variations thereof. Checklists and rating scales are by far the most common devices used in evaluation. Boards that limit superintendent appraisal to a checklist should expect it to serve only as an indicator of basic abilities or as a way to educate board members about the superintendency.

Written objectives represent the other approach to superintendent appraisal which is gaining in popularity because of its orientation toward results and future growth. Most such systems are derived from the widely-heralded system called 'management by objectives' or MBO. Properly written objectives contain both deadlines for completion and measures for determining the superintendent's success or failure.

According to Bolton (1980, pp. 65, 70-72), information can be collected in one of three ways: observing behavior, asking
questions, and examining written documents. Each of these ways may be used in the evaluation of administrators. He then cites the following types of rating scales that might be used as methods to collect the desired information: rank ordering, forced distribution, absolute categories, verbal descriptors, degree or existence, and extent of agreement.

Barraclough (1974, p. 17) points out that, from an accuracy standpoint, rating scales may be subject to a high level of invalidity:

Since the evaluator(s) is stating his opinion of how an administrator measures up to a set of standards, the evaluation is highly subjective. Many instruments are poorly designed. The administrator is rarely, if ever, consulted in establishing the standards against which he will be measured. In addition, (the trait of) performance standards are inflexible and do not allow for changes in circumstances or specific tasks.

But performance objectives are also not without their faults and shortcomings. Combs (1972, p. 6) cautions against total dedication to (and thus misuse of) the performance objectives approach. He points out that such behavioral objectives are written for a specific reason and cannot account for other aspects of job performance.

In her study of superintendent evaluation, Carol (1972, p. 12) inquired about the following informational methods used to evaluate the chief executive officer and reports the percentage of school districts using each method:

1. Board and/or board committee discussions in executive session 60 percent
2. Observation and association of board with chief school officer at meetings and work sessions 25 percent

3. Discussion of board members or president with chief school officer 18 percent

4. Written ratings or appraisals by board members 7 percent

5. Assessment of special, monthly and/or annual reports of chief school officer 5 percent

6. Evaluation against prior year's activities 4 percent

7. Comparison with other districts 1 percent

Redfern (1972, p. 7) is a strong advocate of self-evaluation, and states that it "is the starting point of a comprehensive assessment of performance effectiveness." He notes that the administrator's assessment of his or her own accomplishments and failures necessitates measuring behavior by personal goals as opposed to comparing oneself with others. Olds (1973, p. 6) agrees and believes that self-evaluation may eventually become the single most important factor in the entire evaluation process in education.

What are the best methods for evaluating the superintendent? In discussing the appraisal of managerial performance, Meldan (1981, p. 56) says the evaluators tend to use techniques that are popular, comfortable to apply, or "traditional" within a particular organization. Little thought is given to the total usefulness of the effort. A great deal of time can be wasted in seeking for or
developing the "perfect" evaluation instrument, with the thought being that the instrument is the heart of the evaluation system (Olds, 1977, p. 19).

However, it is apparent that while the instrument used to record summary evaluation information may be a necessary part of the method to evaluate the chief executive officer of a school district, it alone will not produce success. The way in which one implements the total evaluation system, the criteria one uses, and the soundness of the data collected are also extremely important. While the evaluation method chosen by a school board is important, the way it is accomplished is critical (Redfern, 1980, p. 3).

Relationship to Overall District Evaluation Program and Operation

School boards and superintendents are cognizant of the expectation to provide a system of accountability for their schools. Districts are making efforts to implement a total evaluation system to accomplish that. Unfortunately, the emphasis has been only on selected levels within the organization. Boards of education have just begun expanding their efforts upward to the chief executive officer in the last decade:

They are beginning to realize that it is futile to initiate accountability measures for teachers and principals while stopping short at the superintendent's door and even at the school board's door. Measuring accountability cannot be effective if it is instituted at selected levels of a hierarchical organization (Carol, 1972, pp. 13-14).
School boards need to consider the evaluation of the superintendent as part of the overall evaluation program and operation of the school district. The evaluation of the superintendent and other members of the administrative team should be seen as an important component in a larger system-wide plan of personnel appraisal and accountability. The plan for evaluating the superintendent should be linked in philosophy and procedure with the overall evaluation plan (Evans, 1981, p. 71).

Bolton (1980, pp. 134-135) places major emphasis on the concept that the evaluation system for administrators, including the superintendent, ought to be a functional subsystem of the overall management strategy for the school district. He states:

Probably the most important aspect of the evaluation system is whether it is being used by the top leaders in the school system. Research information indicates that high-level leaders who support and model the processes desired obtain better implementation results (of the overall evaluation program) than those who do not. Because highly accepted systems do not automatically permeate an organization, and because training alone will not communicate to administrators that certain processes are desired, it is essential for the total environment of the organization to support the function of evaluation.

The National School Boards Association in their publication The School Personnel Management System: Administrator’s Handbook (1976, p. 57) further supports the practice of a comprehensive district-wide evaluation plan, including the chief executive officer:
The second rule: don't stop with teacher evaluations. Evaluations should not be confined to assessing teacher performance. All operators and all operations - including the board's - should be subject to periodic if not continuing appraisal. A broad sweeping full evaluation system should be installed in all school districts.

As important as it is for the evaluation of the superintendent to be an integral part of the overall evaluation program of the school district, it is imperative that such an evaluation relates to the overall goals and objectives of the school district:

The most that the organization (school system) asks is that evaluation take place in relation to cooperatively developed, predetermined performance objectives that are designed to achieve the overall goals of the school system (Redfern, 1976, p. 6).

A consideration of the need for evaluation should not be made separately from the overall mission of the school system. Too often the evaluation system is viewed as something entirely separate from the mission of the organization (Olds, 1977, p. 47), and such a perspective gives no direction whatsoever to evaluation. Unless the evaluation system contributes directly to accomplishing the major goals of the organization, it will be viewed as a necessary evil at best or a useless appendage at worst (Bolton, 1980, p. 14).

Basic to the process of the evaluation of the district superintendent is the identification and definition of the purposes of the school organization (Hagman and Schwartz, 1955, p. 267). Evaluation of the superintendent begins with the consideration of
goals to which the school district is committed (California Association of School Administrators, 1973, p. 7).

The process of evaluating the outcomes of the educational program, and the superintendent's leadership, will be facilitated if the board has thought through and stated the goals of education for the community. The written goals serve as ready reminders of what the schools are trying to accomplish and they provide a framework for decision making, resource allocation, and as a way for the board to inform the superintendent of its expectation for his leadership (Evans, 1981, pp. 76-77).

Much of the organization's ability to achieve its objectives stems directly from the competence of its managers (Meidan, 1981, p. 8). In an individual school district organization, the superintendent is in a very crucial and difficult public position in American education. In many cases he is viewed as the most visible cause of the success or failure of a school system to meet its obligations to its community. Superintendents, in fact, equate the assessment of their performance with that of their entire school district (Pitner and Ogawa, 1981, p. 63). The school superintendent is the educational leader presiding over one or more institutions and, as such, is responsible for all that goes on there (Goodlad, 1979, p. 100).

Assuming that evaluation results in the improved competency of an individual, the successful evaluation of the district superintendent should result in improved operating practices.
in the school district as a whole (Reopelle, 1974, p. 5). Evaluation of the superintendent is a valuable and worthwhile contribution to school district success (McGrath, 1972, p. 157).

Previous Research Studies on the Evaluation of the Superintendent

We seldom examine leadership at high levels in the organization - the level of leadership where organizational impact is most likely. We have little data on the leadership behavior of corporate presidents, chief executives, boards of directors, cabinets, or the like (McCall and Lombardi, 1978).

When the position of superintendent was created it gave little promise of developing into an office of significance (Gilland, 1935, p. 277). Almost 150 years after the establishment of the superintendency there are now over 15,000 chief executive officers of America's public school districts. It would seem evaluation of the performance of these school leaders would be the topic of numerous studies throughout the history of the position. Such is not the case.

The comprehensive literature search conducted by this writer resulted in fifteen studies being identified in which "superintendent evaluation" was specifically a part of the title. Most of the studies are state-wide in scope and span a thirty year period from 1952-1982. All the studies but one were conducted in the last decade of that time period. Other research efforts related to the superintendency that include some findings in regard to evaluation practices are also referred to in this section.
Only two studies (Buchanan, 1980 and Miller, 1982) include an overview of other research completed on the topic of superintendent evaluation.

It is difficult to ascertain when the term "evaluation" was first used in the field of education. Feyereisen, Fiorino, and Nowak report the term appeared in the educational literature in the 1930's (National Education Association, 1969, p. 67). We know as early as 1933 the status report on the American superintendency included a chapter on the evaluation of the superintendent (National Education Association, Department of Superintendence). Yet, the first significant research effort in the area of superintendent evaluation was not conducted until 1952.

The first major research effort was conducted by Griffiths (1952). In an attempt to determine the attitude of school board members, he asked two specific questions: 1) Do you have any method of evaluating your superintendent at the present time?, and 2) Do you feel an instrument for the evaluation of your superintendent is needed? Of those responding, 82 percent indicated their boards had no method of evaluating their superintendent, and 53 percent of that group saw no need for such an instrument.

Griffiths concluded:

1. There is no instrument for the evaluation of the superintendent of schools at this time.
2. There is an expressed need for an instrument of evaluation.
3. Of those administrative practices which discriminate "very significantly" between
successful and unsuccessful superintendents, the most discriminating deal with human relations and the least discriminating deal with more technical and nonpersonal areas of administration.

In 1952 and 1953, Gross conducted a study of 105 superintendents and 508 school board members in Massachusetts to determine how they felt about their jobs. One of the research questions was "How good a job are school superintendents doing?" School board members indicated superintendents did an excellent or good job in the areas of financial administration and school-plant management. Areas in which they rated the chief executive officer as fair or poor were public relations and curriculum planning.

No significant difference was reported by Gross between ratings received by the superintendent in regard to type and size of the town or city government. However, differences were found in individual characteristics of the superintendents. They were:

1. The older the superintendent, the lower his rating is likely to be.

2. The longer he has been employed in the field of education, the lower his rating is likely to be.

School board members also ranked personal characteristics as the key factor they associated with a superintendent doing a job well. Gross emphasized "the higher the superintendent is rated on personal characteristics, the higher the overall rating he is likely to receive."

Other findings in the study were:

1. Those boards who gave their superintendents a higher rating are made up of members who are
more satisfied with the way their board functions.

2. School boards who rate their superintendent highly on job performance are more likely to adhere to professional standards.

3. If their superintendent is doing a fine job, the board will follow his lead as a professional educator.

4. If the board approves of the performance of the superintendent, the feeling will be mutual.

Gross concluded his findings with the statement, "Superintendents in communities who have elected relatively poor school boards do not seem to do as good a job as superintendents in communities who have elected good school boards."

Halpin (1958) conducted an investigation of fifty Ohio superintendents to determine the relationship between the superintendents' perceptions on two specific dimensions of leader behavior developed through research at The Ohio State University. Halpin's research findings included:

1. Board members show considerably less than perfect agreement describing how the superintendent behaves, a finding which casts serious doubt upon how much board member agreement we can expect to find among independent evaluations of the superintendent's effectiveness.

2. In evaluating the superintendent, consideration must be given to all relevant reference groups.

The most extensive study of school boards and their relationship with their superintendents was conducted by Ziegler and Jennings (1974). Data was collected by means of personal
interviews with 490 board members and 82 superintendents across a national sample of 83 school districts. Although the findings were published in 1974, the data was collected in 1968.

Ziegler and Jennings concluded superintendents control educational decision making and school boards merely legitimatize policy recommendations. A substantial body of research during the 1960's and early 1970's agreed with that conclusion. The implication for superintendent evaluation is the specter that the board of education serves largely as a "rubber stamp" approving the actions of their chief executive officer.

McCarty (1971) wrote of the obstacles encountered by boards when they begin to contemplate institutionalizing evaluation procedures. He said given the differences in school environments, it is difficult to measure the superintendent's contribution on an objective continuum. Beyond this, education itself is beset by many conflicts about its purposes and priorities which make scientific appraisal difficult. He also believed the role behavior of the individual superintendent is uniquely his own and difficult to catalogue and analyze satisfactorily.

McCarty's study also included research into the problem of power in educational governance and concluded structures and roles are interrelated. School boards and superintendents, he felt, should have agreed upon a set of objectives at the beginning of the school year which they jointly hope to accomplish. These objectives should have been detailed in a manner allowing reliable
measurement. At the end of the school year the superintendent and board should have set a sufficient time for an extended conference focusing upon how much overall progress had been attained. Each board member should have individually ranked the order in which the objectives had been met.

If the performance of the superintendent was rated as satisfactory, his contract should have been renewed and his salary increased accordingly. If the superintendent's performance was not up to standard, salary was not to be increased. If the rating was unsatisfactory, the superintendent might fail to have his contract renewed. The superintendent's continued evaluations would have increased his performance or he would have been discharged.

Also in 1971, the Educational Research Service conducted their third of what would be five similar reports on the evaluation of administrative and supervisory personnel including, but not exclusively, superintendents.

The ERS Report cited two earlier surveys conducted during 1964 and 1968. The first survey identified only 50 plans for appraising administrative personnel, and some of those plans were quite informal. The 1968 survey of all school districts in the country enrolling 25,000 or more students and a selected group of thirty-one smaller systems uncovered 62 formal programs for administrative evaluation. One must remember that the districts responded if they had evaluation programs for any of their
administrators, and such a response may or may not have meant the chief executive officer was included.

In the 1971 ERS survey, 154 out of the 192 districts enrolling over 25,000 students responded. Eighty-four systems reported they had formal procedures for assessing the performance of their administrative/supervisory personnel. This represented 54.4 percent of those responding, while only 39.5 percent responded accordingly three years earlier. Again, superintendents were not separated out as an independent group so it is impossible to determine the exact number or percentage of chief executive officers who were evaluated formally, or considered evaluated at all, in the districts surveyed.

There were three studies conducted in 1972 dealing directly with the evaluation of superintendents. Information from a fourth study on the topic of dismissal also provides insight into the evaluation process, or lack thereof.

Carol's study (1972) serves as a benchmark, and with the exception of Griffith's work two decades earlier, began a ten year period in which over ten other research efforts on the topic of superintendent evaluation were spawned.

Three percent of the 207 New Jersey school districts in Carol's study indicated their use of formal procedures to evaluate their chief school officers; 62 percent used informal procedures, and 29 percent used no specific procedure. Of those districts reporting no evaluation procedure, 20 percent indicated no need to
develop one. Of the method used to evaluate the chief school officer, 60 percent of the board members indicated discussion in executive session followed by observation and association at meetings and work sessions.

The evaluative criteria used by the majority of the boards included the relationship with staff, community, and students, and general effectiveness of the chief school officer.

Carol concluded the evaluation process will not deliver on its promise unless a board and its superintendent:

1. understand the problems and are willing to devote ample time to plan and implement a procedure, and

2. preserve and modify the process as experience dictates appropriate changes.

California provided the setting for the second research study conducted that year specifically concerned with superintendent evaluation. McGrath (1972) conducted a study in selected school districts to determine which districts used formal procedures to evaluate the performance of their chief executive officer, how the evaluations were conducted, whether they were successful, and what functions were evaluated using what criteria.

One-hundred-thirteen districts in the study formally evaluated their superintendent. This led McGrath to conclude formal evaluation was not widespread in California. In fact, only 43 percent of those districts reporting formal evaluations could actually produce the written instruments when requested.
Other findings of the McGrath study included:

1. School board chairpersons and superintendents agreed the most important functions of the superintendent lay in the areas of community relations, board relations, and staff relations.

2. Superintendents and board chairpersons stressed the need for a task-oriented, total and objective attainment approach to evaluation of the superintendent.

3. Both superintendents and board chairpersons stressed the importance of role consensus in the evaluation process.

4. Sixty percent of the evaluation policies in the districts where they existed were initiated by the superintendent.

5. Superintendents and board chairpersons were concerned about the lack of board expertise in the area of evaluation.

6. Sixty-four percent of surveyed districts used checklists for evaluation purposes.

7. Salary determination was the primary administrative reason for evaluation with contract renewal, continued employment, and improved functioning of the superintendent next in importance.

McGrath recommended:

1. School districts should develop reasonable goals and objectives prior to undertaking any evaluation program.

2. Formal evaluation of the superintendent should not take place until role consensus has been achieved.

3. Educational programs should be designed to train the members of governing boards to evaluate the superintendent.

4. School boards associations should devote space in their publications and time at their conventions to the process of developing and improving school board member expertise in evaluation.
5. Additional research and study should be conducted to consider the development of evaluation standards for the effectiveness of the superintendent.

Graighead (1972) conducted a study of Texas school districts in an attempt to develop a rating scale for school board members in that state to evaluate a superintendent's performance. Some of the conclusions of the study were:

1. Five percent of the 1,100 school districts in Texas used rating scales to evaluate the performance of the superintendent. This compared to 67 percent for teachers, 40 percent for principals, and 36 percent for supervisors.

2. A rating scale designed for evaluating the superintendent's performance should give the greatest consideration to personal qualities such as leadership.

3. Members of school boards, college professors, and superintendents do not believe church attendance, attendance at PTA meetings, attendance at extra-curricular activities, or memberships in organizations such as Rotary Club should be included on the rating scale.

The importance of the evaluation process for the district superintendent cannot be overstressed. In a study of factors affecting the dismissal of superintendents in Indiana and Illinois, Sitter (1972) found six of the seven boards of education studied did not engage in any objective evaluation of the superintendent's performance. The seventh board engaged in a belated evaluation of the superintendent at his insistence.

Brinkman (1973) conducted his research in California and developed a superintendent evaluation model. The model is one of eight included in Chapter VI. He concluded that in forty-three school districts where evaluation procedures had been judged to be
superior, the working relationship between the board and superintendent had improved.

In 1974 the Educational Research Service (ERS) conducted another national survey and issued the report, *Evaluating Administrative Performance*. The introduction to the report indicates it is based upon: (1) a search of relevant books and articles published since 1970, (2) a selective review of the research that has formed the experimental basis for current evaluation theories and practices, and (3) surveys of state-mandated and local school district evaluation programs. A large portion of the report deals with purposes of administrative evaluation, the evaluation process including different methods, an update on state-mandated evaluations (a recent phenomenon at that time), and samples of local school district evaluation procedures.

Whereas the 1971 ERS survey primarily concentrated on school districts of over 25,000 students, the 1974 survey included all school systems enrolling 12,000 or more students and a group of 201 selected smaller systems. Sixty percent of the questionnaires were completed and returned from 472 districts.

No data was collected on the number and percentage of districts using a formal evaluation program for their administrators, although the author states "available evidence indicates that the percentage of formal evaluations have continued to increase since 1971." The data collected concentrated on the use of
management-by-objectives (MBO's), and particularly on evaluation procedures based on performance objectives.

Half of all the districts responding to the 1974 ERS survey indicated they used a management-by-objectives approach, while 29 percent said they utilized an evaluation-by-objectives procedure to appraise the performance of their administrators. As in earlier ERS studies, the results were collected for all administrators in the responding districts, not just their chief executive officer.

Differences in size of districts were reflected in the results. Sixty-eight percent of districts of 100,000 or more students used a management-by-objectives approach, while only 40 percent of the smaller districts reported such use. The span in regard to evaluation-by-objectives was not as great with 32 percent of the larger school districts compared with 23 percent of the smaller districts reporting use of that evaluation procedure.

State mandated evaluation programs were reported in California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington. This list varies from that developed by this writer through the survey of state superintendent organizations cited earlier in this chapter. The ERS list includes state mandated programs of administrator evaluation that may or may not include the superintendent, while the list in this writer's study only refers to state mandated programs for the evaluation of the chief executive officer.
Reopelle also studied superintendent evaluation in 1974 in selected southern California school districts. He found some differences in perceptions of superintendents and school board presidents from different types of school districts regarding the value of evaluation in improving board-superintendent relations. District superintendents of rural, town, or small cities indicated the evaluation process contributed less to the competency of the superintendents than indicated by the presidents of boards of education in that setting. In suburban or urban settings, district superintendents indicated the evaluation process contributed more to the competency of the superintendent than indicated by the board presidents.

Other findings of the study included:

1. There is no commonality in the types of evaluation instruments used to assess the performance of the district superintendent.

2. Presidents of boards of education believe a need exists for the evaluation of the district superintendent to a greater degree than believed by the district superintendents.

Reopelle also came to the conclusion that in using a check-list type of instrument to evaluate the superintendent, emphasis should be placed on the assessment of the district superintendent's relationship with the governing board.

During the 1974-75 school year, the Michigan Association of School Administrators completed a survey of superintendent evaluation practices utilized in their state. They found 45 percent of the responding school districts did not have any type of formal
evaluation of their chief executive officer. Thirty-six percent reported having some kind of formal evaluation, while 19 percent of the districts indicated they had neither a formal nor an informal evaluation program for the superintendent. As with some of the other studies reviewed, the superintendents who responded indicated a high rate of interest in an organized program to evaluate their performance.

Bolton conducted a study of administrative evaluation practices in the state of Washington in 1975. He concluded administrators who responded to the study considered job descriptions as the most important factor in their evaluations. Job descriptions were also reported as the most common factor currently used for evaluation purposes. An interesting finding indicated management-by-objectives was ranked third in terms of use, but ranked only sixth in terms of the administrators' (principals, supervisors, and superintendents) importance to their evaluation.

Bolton suggested the information can be helpful when considering evaluation practices in local school systems, but cautioned "normative practice is not always correct practice. Decisions about the type of evaluation plan should be made on the basis of what makes sense in each local situation." The information in Bolton's Washington study was collected from all types of administrators, not just superintendents.

One of the few studies on the legal status of the school superintendent in terms of termination of employment was conducted
by Doerksen in 1975. Court cases relevant to the discontinuance of employment of superintendents since 1954 were summarized and analyzed, thereby formulating guidelines for the orderly termination of employment of district superintendents. Some of his findings included:

1. The turning point in the litigation of superintendents versus boards of education occurred in 1954. Prior to that time, the courts consistently ruled the board had the authority to dismiss superintendents at its pleasure; cause need not be established. Subsequent decisions, perhaps because of the Brown decision, have been more favorable for superintendents.

2. Courts are not always in harmony with one another in ruling on dismissals. This may result from lack of clear precedent, differing state statutes, and the loathness of courts to adjudicate board-superintendent disputes.

3. Boards and superintendents possess inadequate knowledge of orderly discontinuance of employment of superintendents.

4. The employment relationship between boards and superintendents is sometimes extra-legal.

5. Of the forty-five cases reviewed, twenty-five verdicts were favorable to boards. Nineteen judgments were rendered in favor of superintendents. One decision held for a group of citizens.

The fifth Educational Research Service report on administrative evaluation practices written by Kowalski was published in 1976 and entitled Evaluating Superintendents and School Boards. As the title indicates, the report concentrated on the chief executive officer and his or her "bosses." The format was somewhat similar to the 1974 ERS Report, but with some differences. Beside adding a section on school boards, the report included suggested procedures
recommended by state professional organizations representing superintendents and school boards, but did not include a section on state mandated programs. Both of the last two ERS reports include an extensive bibliography.

Sixty-eight of its subscribing school systems sent their formal procedures for evaluating the superintendent to ERS. Fourteen of those districts reported procedures for the evaluation of the board of education.

Four types of superintendent evaluation procedures were reported in the 1976 ERS Report: (1) Evaluations based on performance objectives, (2) Checklist and rating scale inventories, (3) General administration forms used with all administrative staff including the superintendent, and (4) Informal evaluations.

Thirty-five of the school districts used some kind of a performance-objectives-based evaluation process, ten districts utilized a narrative format for evaluating the superintendent, seven used a checklist or rating scale, five employed a combination of checklist and a narrative report, and eleven did not put the evaluation in written form but met at the end of the year in executive session to discuss the superintendent's work during the year.

The 1976 ERS Report indicated the emergence of more formal procedures for the evaluation of the superintendent and gave attention to the evaluation of boards of education. The report also reflected initial involvement of state associations serving
superintendents and school boards in providing resource materials regarding the evaluation of superintendents.

In another research study on superintendent evaluation reported in 1976, Brown found in the state of New York only seventy-seven chief school officers of the 450 participating in the study responded that formal evaluation procedures were utilized by their school districts. In those districts which reported a formalized evaluation system, there were two types of systems utilized. A checklist was employed by twenty-seven districts, and the remaining districts reported an assessment of performance or goals was used.

Over 50 percent of the respondents in Brown's study indicated a formalized job description was in their contract or in written board policy. Seventy-five superintendents had contracts which included procedures for evaluating their performance. Most of the evaluation reported took place in an executive session of the board on an annual basis.

Three studies of the evaluation practices utilized with the superintendent of schools were reported in 1978. They were completed in the states of North Carolina, Illinois, and Connecticut.

Grill surveyed selected superintendents and chairpersons of school boards in North Carolina. Some of his findings included:

1. Fifty-four percent of the administrative units used informal evaluation procedures; 9 percent used formal evaluations based on task performance; 9 percent used formal evaluations based on predetermined standards;
and 34 percent did not evaluate the superintendent.

2. The evaluation process was generally regarded as valuable to the improvement of the superintendent's competency by chairpersons and superintendents.

3. Superintendents were not in agreement with the chairpersons that school board members possess sufficient knowledge and expertise to evaluate the competency of the superintendent.

In 1978, Roelle completed an analysis of the evaluation practices for superintendents of school districts in Lake County, Illinois. In the school districts utilizing a formal evaluation process he found both board of education presidents and superintendents agreed the two most important purposes in the evaluation of the superintendent were the attainment of district goals and objectives and improvement of board-superintendent relations.

At the same time, Gramitt (1978) was studying evaluation practices involving Connecticut public school superintendents. He found superintendents and board members were in agreement that the evaluation process had made a contribution to the improvement of the superintendent's competencies in all areas of his/her relationship between the superintendent and the board of education.

A 1979 study by Jones in New Jersey not only confirmed the earlier findings by Carol in the same state, but also provided additional data on the alarming "state of the art" regarding the informal nature of superintendent evaluation practices. He found sixty-four percent of the superintendents and seventy-five percent of the board members responding were still using informal, verbal
appraisals. When asked for suggestions to improve existing evaluation processes, both superintendents and board presidents listed formalizing the process as the top priority for improving the process.

The first of two interesting research efforts trying to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful superintendents was also reported in 1979. In each study there are implications for the evaluation of the chief executive office.

Wilson (1979) used a jury method to identify successful superintendents and then interviewed them to find out if there are identifiable special characteristics and talents common to successful school superintendents. The research was conducted in Ohio and involved sixteen superintendents from various sizes and types of school districts.

Eleven of the boards of education conducted an annual evaluation of their superintendents, but five did not. One superintendent responded he requests an appraisal only if the evaluation is negative.

Although a majority of the superintendents reported being evaluated, there was no common pattern to the evaluation process in Wilson's study. Several boards used a formal assessment instrument, but others merely discussed the superintendent's performance. Two of the group were evaluated in a management-by-objective technique. Where evaluation occurred, most of the superintendents had to take
the initiative in getting some plan started. Wilson reported one of the superintendents resorted to resigning each year to force an appraisal.

In another study on the topic of successful and unsuccessful superintendents, Zickafoose (1979) collected her information from superintendents and school board members in West Virginia. She found evaluations conducted by boards of education were critical to the success of a superintendent. Boards of education who evaluated their superintendents in some manner and discussed strengths and weaknesses with them had more successful superintendents. Written evaluations were particularly valuable. The working relationships between superintendents and boards of education were reported to be more stable when evaluations were conducted annually.

In a sequel to his research on successful superintendents, Wilson examined another group of Ohio superintendents in 1980 whose contracts were either not renewed by their board of education, or who experienced enough pressure from their boards they retired, left the superintendency all together, or resigned to seek a different locale from which to work. Wilson called this group of ten superintendents "untracked" since his intensive review of their individual situations convinced him they were not all unsuccessful.

One of the findings of the study, after combining data with his earlier study, was regular and formal evaluation of the superintendent's performance by the board is a crucial factor in
avoiding untracking. While a majority of the successful superintendents were evaluated annually by their boards, "a shocking fourteen of the untracked had never been formally evaluated by their board." He linked the two studies by providing a set of recommendations to aspiring successful superintendents. One of those recommendations was to insist upon regular (at least annual) evaluation by the board of the superintendent's performance, preferably in writing and ideally on a target achievement plan.

Another study conducted in 1980 dealt with the topic of superintendent turnover. The study was conducted in Illinois by Theis and involved superintendents answering questions about the previous district in which they were employed, with the board presidents from the previous district also responding.

Only one-fourth of the superintendents responded their previous board had a written policy for evaluation of their performance and 19 percent mentioned this was done in writing. Boards met with the superintendent in 76 percent of the cases to discuss their performance. Sixty-seven percent of the superintendents indicated the previous board established expectations for their performance, but only 21 of 76 superintendents indicated this was done in writing. Eighty-six percent of the board presidents answered expectations were established, but only 32 of 94 respondents indicated this was done in writing.

Among implications cited in the study, Theis included the statement superintendent turnover will continue until boards of
education have a written policy and a formal written evaluation of the superintendent so that increased remediation can be offered to the superintendent when it is needed.

Superintendent evaluation was not a topic included in a needs assessment of members of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) in 1981, but some insights can be gained from the data regarding superintendents' perceptions of evaluation of staff in general, given other problem areas they face on a day-to-day basis. Seventy-one potential problem areas were listed in the survey instrument and 547 AASA members responded whether the item was likely to become a major problem, a minor problem, or little or no problem. In addition, the problem areas were ranked in terms of degree of concern as perceived by the responding AASA members.

Evaluating teachers and administrative personnel ranked twelfth and fourteenth, respectively. However, those rankings compared to fifth and seventh in a similar needs assessment survey conducted in 1974-75. This may mean evaluation is now less important to AASA members, or evaluation has been replaced by more pressing concerns. Somewhat surprisingly, given much of the literature on superintendent evaluation, administrator-board relations were only ranked thirty-sixth, although that topic was up from forty-second in 1974-75 and the survey item did not specify superintendent-board relations.

Two research studies on the topic of superintendent evaluation were completed during 1981 in the states of Indiana and Illinois.
The first was conducted by Buchanan and involved the superintendents, board presidents, and the most senior member of the boards of education in 62 randomly selected school districts in Indiana. The following conclusions were based on the findings of the study:

1. One important source of information regarding the superintendent's performance is administrators.

2. A second important means of obtaining information about the superintendent's performance is his/her reports and presentations.

3. The most important criterion in evaluating the superintendent is educational leadership. The least important is personal characteristics.

4. Superintendents are evaluated annually, continuously, and informally. This conclusion was supported by 82 percent of the subjects who evaluated their incumbent informally; 41 percent reported an annual rating; and, 13 percent indicated continuous evaluation. When evaluation occurs, results are discussed with the superintendent, but written notification is given less than 30 percent of the time.

5. The most important purpose for evaluating the superintendent is to identify weak areas. The least important is to support general dissatisfaction.

6. Board members, presidents, and superintendents were satisfied with all elements of evaluation. This conclusion was supported by an 80 percent affirmative score from all subjects and 10 percent showing a desire to change.

Yates (1981) surveyed all of the public school superintendents in Illinois regarding the procedures and criteria used for evaluating the chief executive officers in that state. Fifty-nine percent of the 1,013 surveys were returned. In addition, surveys
were sent to the board presidents throughout the state with 26 percent return.

Findings included:

1. Nearly all (94.5 percent) of the responding districts evaluate superintendents in varying degrees of formality. Large districts and districts with large percentages of urban population were more likely to utilize written evaluations than smaller districts or districts with smaller percentages of urban population.

2. More formalized evaluation practices were utilized in districts where the superintendent was employed on a multi-year contract, previously employed in a district with superintendent evaluation, a member of the Illinois Association of School Administrators, or the district board of education was a member of the Illinois Association of School Boards.

3. Superintendents felt evaluations should be closely related to their job descriptions, should be performed annually, and the results discussed in an executive session of the board.

4. Superintendents and school board presidents were in general agreement in reference to the importance attached to selected procedures and criteria for superintendent evaluations.

5. Although some differences existed between the importance attached to evaluation procedures and percentages of reported utilization of those procedures, there was a high correlation in the rank of importance and the rank of utilization of those procedures. For example, the evaluation criteria of "keeping the board of education informed about problems of the district" was ranked first by the superintendents in terms of importance and was also ranked first in terms of actual utilization.

Yates reached the conclusion procedures and criteria for assessing the performance of superintendents were identified in his study and could be utilized by school districts in designing a formal evaluation system for their chief executive officer.
Although there was no differentiation in Yates' results between formal and informal evaluations, the impression was given that superintendent evaluation in Illinois was effectively being accomplished. It is interesting to note one of the most comprehensive and sophisticated resource publications reviewed by this writer was developed by Booth and Glaub (1978) for the Illinois Association of School Boards.

The most recent research reviewed by this writer took place in Colorado in 1982 and was conducted by Miller. The purpose of the study was to determine how superintendents in that state viewed the working relationship between the chief executive officer and the board of education. One hundred-seventy-one superintendents were involved in the study in a combination survey/interview design. In addition, the board presidents who worked with the twenty superintendents who were interviewed also completed a survey.

Superintendents were asked to rate the level of presence of twelve components of an ideal working relationship between a board and its superintendent. The executives were then asked to rate the presence of these same twelve components in their working relationship with their boards. The difference in the actual versus the ideal rating of each component then provided the discrepancy between an ideal working relationship and the actual working relationship perceived by the superintendent.

Miller concluded that despite a body of literature suggesting the need for and value of evaluation as a component of an effective
working relationship between boards and superintendents, little
evaluation of the chief executive officers was occurring in Colorado
school districts.

As 171 superintendents rated the presence of each of the
twelve components in their working relationship with their board of
education, evaluation was rated as least present of all the components.
In turn, only one superintendent interviewed considered it a
strength and, conversely, the group cited evaluation as the most
prevalent weak component. Miller stated "it appears that superinten­
dent evaluation today in Colorado is no more prevalent than it was
ten years ago in the state of New Jersey as reported by Carol."

Hence, the review of literature involving research studies
on the evaluation of the superintendent comes full circle back to
Carol's benchmark study of over a decade ago with little change in
the "state of the art" of appraisal of the chief executive officers
in America's public school districts, at least as reported in the
literature.

**Summary of Research Studies**

Thirty-three studies were reviewed in this section. Twenty-
five were conducted on a state-wide or multi-state basis, while
eight involved respondents from throughout the United States.
Thirteen dealt specifically with the evaluation of the superintendent,
while the others included information pertinent to the topic. The
studies were reviewed chronologically to provide the reader with a
sense of the evolving "state of the art" of superintendent evaluation over the thirty year period.

Most of the studies (10) were conducted in the Great Lakes Region of the country. Every other region of the country has produced research on the evaluation of the public school superintendent in the last ten years, although this writer was unable to review the dissertation completed in the Plains Region (Smith, 1975). In addition, a dissertation from New York (Vogt, 1977) and one from North Carolina (Brown, 1977) were not part of the review of literature presented because of an inability to obtain the documents.

The phrase "the more things change, the more they stay the same" could apply when a summary of the research on the evaluation of the chief executive officer of a public school district is attempted. In 1952 Griffiths reported that 82 percent of the districts in his national sample had no method of evaluating their superintendent. Thirty years later, Miller identified evaluation as the weakest component among those deemed necessary for an effective superintendent/school board working relationship. The AASA study, Carol, and Grill each reported anywhere from 19 percent to 34 percent of school districts not having an evaluation procedure for the superintendent. In the 1982 AASA study (Cunningham and Hentges) in which this writer served as a member of the research team, and from which the data is gleaned for this study, just over 37 percent of the superintendents responded they are evaluated informally.
Another 8 percent responded they are not evaluated or don't know if they are evaluated by their board of education.

The highest percentage of formal evaluations was reported in the AASA study (34 percent) with Grill, Brown, McGrath, and Carol reporting anywhere from 18 percent down to 3 percent of the school districts in their studies using such a procedure. Superintendents in the 1982 AASA study reported 30 percent of the districts utilizing a formal evaluation procedure.

Conversely, Buchanan reported a high of 82 percent of the districts in his study utilized informal evaluation procedures, while Grill, Carol, and Jones reported anywhere from 54 percent to 64 percent using such procedures. On the other extreme, Yates reported 94.5 percent of the school districts in his study conducting some sort of superintendent evaluation.

Carol, McGrath, Sitter, Kowalski, Jones, Wilson, Buchanan, and Yates all proposed formal procedures should be utilized in the evaluation of the chief executive officer of a school district. AASA, Reopelle, and Theis cited the school board presidents in their studies also seeing such a need for formal evaluation.

McCarty, Carol, Wilson, Zickafoose, Buchanan, and Yates all proposed evaluation be conducted annually.

There was little agreement among the researchers in regard to the most important reason for superintendent evaluation. Even a greater disparity exists among the researchers on the question of the criteria to be used in the evaluation. While Gross reported
personal characteristics are key factors in a superintendent being successful, Buchanan reported the subjects in his study saw personal characteristics as the least important evaluation criteria. Reopelle and Yates listed relations with the board of education as an important criteria, while no other criteria was listed by more than one researcher as being the most important.

Carol, McCarty, McGrath, Nygaard, Kowalski, and Brown all believe a management-by-objectives or performance objectives method for evaluating the superintendent ought to be used. Brown reported the highest percentage of use of goals or objectives (65 percent) as a basis for the superintendent's evaluation, while the ERS reports included the other users of that method (50 to 53 percent).

Four researchers reported percentages of their respondents using the checklist method of evaluating the superintendent. The reported use ranged from a low of 5 percent in Graighead's study up to 64 percent indicated by McGrath. Kowalski (10 percent) and Brown (10 percent) also specifically reported the checklist method.

McCarty, Carol (60 percent), Kowalski, Brown, and Buchanan all indicated discussion of the superintendent's evaluation in an executive session as a method employed by the districts they surveyed.

Human relations/public relations were reported by Griffiths, Gross, Carol, and McGrath as important expectations boards of education had for the chief executive officers in the districts included in their studies.
Bolton, Brown, and Yates all reported the job description was and/or should be an important part of the superintendent's evaluation.

McGrath and Wilson both reported the evaluation program identified in their studies were mostly initiated by the superintendent rather than the board of education. Both McGrath and Grill alluded to concern over the lack of board knowledge and/or expertise in evaluating the superintendent.

Finally, Brinkman, Reopelle, Grill, Gramitt, and Zickafoose all resorted that the evaluation process improved the working relationship between the superintendent and the board of education.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The main purposes of this study are: (1) to compare evaluation practices among five groups of superintendents serving school districts of different sizes, (2) to compare, through the development of profiles, three groups of general local district superintendents who report they are evaluated only "formally," only "informally," and "both formally and informally," and (3) to compare, through testing hypotheses concerning differences in demographic data, selected characteristics of the two groups of general local school district superintendents who are formally or informally evaluated.

This chapter will detail the methods used to collect and process the data utilized to accomplish the objectives of the study.

Research Design

The overall research design of this study is that of a descriptive survey. The primary end sought in descriptive survey research is to describe present status. Such research provides an accurate description of the incidence and distribution of phenomena. Descriptive survey research provides a framework or structure in which to search for accurate information about the
characteristics of particular subjects, groups, institutions, or situations (Van Dalen, 1979, p. 285). A major intent of such research involves being able to make generalizations about the population under study.

This study inherits both the strengths and weaknesses of descriptive survey research. It has the advantage of wide scope and obtains a great deal of information from a large population. On the other hand, survey research does not ordinarily penetrate very deeply below the surface. The scope of the information sought is usually emphasized at the expense of depth. This research seems best adapted to extensive rather than intensive research. Survey research takes time and money. Such research also uses sampling and is naturally subject to sampling error (Kerlinger, 1973, pp. 422-423).

This particular descriptive survey research is a combination of exploratory and hypotheses testing approaches. That is, the first goal of the study is to examine "what is," while the second is to determine measures of association between variables uncovered.

Data Collection

As indicated in Chapter I, this study draws upon the perceptions of the nation's public school superintendents regarding their own evaluation. Data is drawn from the study of The American School Superintendency, 1982 sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators. This writer was invited to assist in the AASA
study with a research team composed of three faculty members from The Ohio State University and three other graduate students.

The study progressed through the six stages of the survey process (Weisberg and Bowen, 1977, pp. 1-57). These stages of survey design and data collection are: (1) statement of study objectives, (2) preparation of study design, (3) sampling, (4) questionnaire construction and pretesting, (5) surveying, and (6) coding-categorizing the responses.

The first two stages, statement of study objectives and preparation of study design, were greatly influenced by the historical background of the AASA studies of the superintendency. Such studies of the superintendency have been conducted in each decade since the 1920's, with the exception of World War II decade of the 1940's. The objective of the 1982 AASA study was to provide an update of the characteristics of the American public school superintendent and the role of the chief school administrator in the 1980's. The study design had previously involved mail questionnaires and because of the desire to collect a considerable amount of data from superintendents throughout the United States in the most economical manner, the study design was not changed.

The universe for the sample was 15,214 American public school superintendents. The size of the sample was recommended by the Educational Research Service and the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration of AASA. The universe included general superintendents (chief executive officers) and chief
officers for intermediate school districts. For the sake of convenience, the term "superintendent" and/or "chief executive officer" has been used throughout the AASA study and this research effort. It should be noted that the sample was derived from a universe of all public school systems in the United States and was not restricted to those superintendents belonging to AASA or any other professional organization.

As indicated in Chapter I, the sample was stratified into five major categories:

- **Group A** - Superintendents serving high enrollment school districts with more than 25,000 students
- **Group B** - Superintendents serving moderate enrollment school districts ranging from 3,000 to 24,999 students
- **Group C** - Superintendents serving low enrollment school districts ranging from 300 to 2,999 students
- **Group D** - Superintendents serving very low enrollment school districts with fewer than 300 students
- **Group E** - Chief school administrators of intermediate school districts including county school districts, joint vocational schools, educational service units and similar districts known by a wide variety of titles.

The five major strata were sub-divided to provide the opportunity for even more detailed analysis of data based on district size. The size of the universe and sample by enrollment strata is shown in Table 1.1, Chapter I on page 21.
Considerable time and effort was spent on the fourth stage, questionnaire construction and pretesting. The framework for the 1982 AASA questionnaire was the instrument used in the 1971 AASA study. The primary focus was on maintaining comparability with that and earlier studies while accommodating new questions of both contemporary value and those of interest to the members of the research team. The questions on evaluation of the superintendent in the 1982 AASA survey utilized in this study were not asked in previous AASA studies and did reflect a contemporary issue as well as an interest on the part of this researcher.

Committees, one an ad hoc group of Ohio superintendents and the other the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, reviewed and pretested the questionnaire at various stages in its development and provided valuable assistance and advice. The final product of that stage is included as Appendix A of this study.

The next stage, the actual collection of responses, was accomplished via the mails. Of all the local school superintendents in the United States, more than 2,000 received questionnaires. Of those, more than half (56 percent) responded. Thus, nearly 10 percent of all school superintendents in the country are included in the study. The response rates for the various enrollment strata are shown in Table 1.1, Chapter I on page 21.

Groups A, B, and C all had high response rates of approximately sixty percent. Groups D's and E's response rates were lower.
but still at an acceptable level of about forty percent. The overall response rate, as well as those for the subsamples, are considered to be adequate by some survey research experts, good to excellent by others (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p. 13). These response rates are encouragingly higher than the expected return rates reported by some authors (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 414).

These favorable return rates may be explained by Selitiz (1971, pp. 241-242), who states:

There are many factors that influence the percentage of returns to a questionnaire. Among the most important are: (1) the sponsorship of the questionnaire; (2) the attractiveness of the questionnaire format; (3) the length of the questionnaire; (4) the nature of the accompanying letter requesting cooperation; (5) the ease of filling out the questionnaire and mailing it back; and (6) the nature of the people to whom the questionnaire is sent.

The AASA questionnaire, while of such length that it took nearly an hour to complete, was professionally prepared and was endorsed by the American Association of School Administrators, a respected professional association representing the nation's superintendents. A return, postage-paid, envelope was included with the questionnaire.

The final stage, coding and categorizing the response, was accomplished with the help of the Polimetrics Laboratory, a research support group located in the Department of Political Science of The Ohio State University. This organization provided both technical assistance with the questionnaire format and also the data processing.
expertise necessary to organize the massive amounts of data generated from the survey.

In developing the 1982 national profile for the American school superintendent, the data were analyzed in two ways. First, a National Unweighted Profile was computed based on the raw data from the respondents. It is possible, however, for differences in sample sizes and the number of respondents in the various categories of superintendents to influence unduly the raw data and result in a skewed picture of the superintendency. Therefore, a National Weighted Profile (NWP) was computed which took into account statistically the differences in sample size of the enrollment strata for general superintendents as well as the percentage of respondents in each stratum.

Weights assigned for the National Weighted Profile include: Group A - 0.1576, Group B - 0.7830, Group C - 1.2730, and Group D - 1.0902. The National Weighted Profile provides a more accurate description of American public school superintendents and permits more valuable comparisons between the 1982 data and the weighted profile developed for the 1971 study. The National Weighted Profile is used throughout this study.

**Data Processing**

The 1415 questionnaires that were returned were checked and the data was professionally key-punched on to computer cards. Funds for this and other data processing functions were provided as
part of a Spencer Foundation grant that provided financial support for the 1982 AASA study.

The computer language used for the statistical analysis was the "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (SPSS). SPSS is a "packaged program" specifically designed to compute those statistics typically used by social scientists. Most of the computer commands for the SPSS program are in standard English, so the program is relatively easy to learn and use.

The SPSS program was ideally suited to convert the raw data from the responses to the research questions posed in Chapter I into a form that enabled the researcher to summarize the relevant data and test hypotheses. The research questions that examined a comparison of superintendent evaluation practices within five groups of school districts of different types and sizes were processed using frequency data. The "profiles" of general superintendents according to the degree of formality of their evaluation were developed using frequency data and reporting means, medians, and modes. The hypotheses tested as part of the third purpose for this study involved frequency data analyzed by using the chi-square technique.

The SPSS program has the flexibility to provide the basic statistical data required in this study, as well as more complex statistical information.

The large amount of data from the 1982 AASA study is stored on magnetic discs. Access to the data was made through the use of the computer facilities at The Ohio State University. The actual
data processing for this study was a matter of defining and entering appropriate variable labels.

The first purpose of the study involved questions relating to evaluation cited in the first chapter and ordering the necessary cross-tabulations to control for the variable of school district size or type. A statistical format using a chi-square method was used to analyze appropriate questions. In cases where the chi-square method was not appropriate, research question responses were reported by percentages in rank order.

The chi-square test compares the observed distributions with the distributions which would be expected if there were no relationships between the two sets of categories examined. The test shows whether the observed distribution is sufficiently different from the expected distribution to be an unlikely occurrence. A significant chi-square test only establishes statistical relationship. It does not tell which categories are influencing which, if any. Data is required and reflected in the narrative accompanying each table in this study to indicate which superintendent group(s) appear to have caused the significant difference among groups.

The profiles developed as part of the second purpose involved frequency data reported in percentages with means, medians, and modes indicated where appropriate.

The chi-square technique was also used as a test for statistical significance in testing the hypotheses related to the third purpose of the study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF
DATA RELATED TO THE FIRST
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The first purpose of this study is to compare the evaluation practices among five groups of superintendents, the four groups of general local superintendents serving school districts of various student enrollments and intermediate district superintendents. As a means of accomplishing this purpose, attention is given to examining the superintendents' perceptions in regard to ten evaluation practices.

Levels of significance are established at .05 for each of the research questions related to this purpose using the chi-square method to analyze data. Primary attention is given to those research questions for which that level of significance is reflected as reported in table form. Information from research questions for which the data is not statistically significant is only shared in narrative form.

When the chi-square technique is inappropriate to analyze data, the information is reported through frequency tabulations and the listing of responses in priority order by superintendent group.
When the total N in a table does not match the N of total superintendents responding in the study as a whole, the missing responses are "don't knows," "other," or the data represent a selected subgroup.

**Frequency of Evaluation**

The first evaluation practice examined involves how often boards of education evaluate the job performance of superintendents. Responses to this question are reported in Table 4.1 and reflect statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) among the superintendent groups.

**TABLE 4.1 HOW OFTEN BOARDS OF EDUCATION EVALUATE SUPERINTENDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Annually</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Renewal</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 64.25, df = 12; p = .0001$

Superintendents in all five groups are most often evaluated on an annual basis, a frequency recommended in six of the research
studies (McCarty, 1971; Carol, 1972; Wilson, 1979; Zickafoose, 1979; Buchanan, 1981; and Yates, 1981) cited in Chapter II. Eight out of ten of the superintendents in school districts with moderate student enrollments (Group B - 3,000 to 24,999) report being evaluated annually, while only six out of ten intermediate superintendents (Group E) indicate being evaluated that frequently.

The percentage of superintendents reporting semi-annual evaluations increases from a low of 4 percent indicated by the intermediate group to almost 12 percent of the chief executives in Groups A (over 25,000 students) and B. More superintendents from very small school districts (Group D - less than 300 students) report evaluations at contract renewal time. Intermediate superintendents are more likely than any of the other four groups to never be evaluated.

**Evaluation Procedures**

Superintendents were asked to respond to a research question relating to the degree of formalness of their evaluation. Responses to this question are reported in Table 4.2 and reflect statistically significant differences \( p < .05 \) among the superintendent groups.

None of the groups have a majority of the chief executive officers reporting only a formal evaluation procedure. This is consistent with previous research studies (Carol, 1972; McGrath, 1972; Michigan Association of School Administrators, 1974-75;

TABLE 4.2 DEGREE OF FORMALNESS IN SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Formalness</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal &amp; Informal</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 78.92, \text{ df} = 8; p = .0001 \]

Boards of education in larger districts utilize formal evaluation procedures with their chief executive officers more often than their counterparts in smaller school districts. Intermediate superintendents report being formally evaluated to a slightly lesser degree than the general local superintendents from low enrollment (Group C = 300 to 2,999 students) districts.

If the superintendents who report the use of both formal and informal procedures are considered along with those evaluated only formally, three out of four of the chief executives serving high or moderately high enrollment (Groups A and B) school districts are evaluated using formal procedures of some kind.
The very low enrollment school districts have the highest percentage of superintendents evaluated informally with six out of ten of the chief executive officers reporting such an evaluation procedure. Only one out of four large district superintendents are evaluated in that manner. Only the superintendents serving school districts with very low enrollments have a majority of their group reporting a particular procedure. As indicated, informal evaluation procedures are used by a majority of that group.

Approximately one out of three general superintendents from high or moderate enrollment districts report being evaluated both formally and informally. Again, the relationships in regard to district size apply with about one in four low enrollment and intermediate district superintendents and only one in five very low enrollment district superintendents reporting such combination procedures.

Need to Develop a Formal Evaluation Procedure

Superintendents who responded that they were not currently formally evaluated were asked to indicate whether they see a need to develop a formal procedure and if they believe their board of education sees such a need. Among the five groups of superintendents there is a significant difference (p < .05) in regard to the superintendents' perceptions of their board's view of a need for a formal procedure. The chi-square factor found in regard to the superintendent's own perception of need for a formal evaluation
procedure approaches a level of significance but not enough to indicate a difference statistically between the superintendent groups.

Responses to these questions are reported in Tables 4.3 and 4.4.

**TABLE 4.3** NEED TO DEVELOP A FORMAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE AS VIEWED BY SUPERINTENDENTS NOT CURRENTLY FORMALLY EVALUATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Formal Procedure</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.56, df = 4; p = .1089 \]

**TABLE 4.4** BOARDS' VIEW OF NEED TO DEVELOP A FORMAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS NOT CURRENTLY FORMALLY EVALUATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Formal Procedure</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 11.14, df = 4; p = .0250 \]
Two out of three of the chief executive officers in the larger school districts who are not currently formally evaluated indicate a need for a formal evaluation procedure. Superintendents in the very low to moderate enrollment districts reflect a 46 to 48 percent interest in formal evaluation procedures, while only 38 percent of the intermediate superintendents who are not now formally evaluated see such a need. These results do not vary greatly from a study (Griffiths, 1952) completed thirty years ago where 53 percent of the superintendents responded they did not feel a need to be evaluated.

Superintendents in each group see more value in a formal evaluation procedure than they perceive their board would see in such a procedure. For example, even though 67 percent in the high enrollment districts see such a need, only 30 percent of those same superintendents perceive their boards of education to be in agreement with them.

Differences in responses to both questions vary according to size and type of district with the chief executive officers from districts with higher student enrollments seeing more of a need for formal evaluation procedures and perceiving their board would feel the same way. Again, the intermediate superintendent group responds most like the general superintendents serving low enrollment school districts.

More than half of the superintendents in each group, with the exception of the high enrollment district group, see no need to
develop a formal evaluation procedure and are evidently satisfied with their current less than formal evaluation process. This may reflect their own opinions or may be related to their perception of their boards' lack of interest in a more formal approach. The latter perception is most graphically expressed in Table 4.4 by the responses of the general superintendents serving low enrollment school districts where only one in ten superintendents, not currently formally evaluated, think their boards would favor a more formal procedure.

**Reasons for Superintendent Evaluation**

Performance evaluation may be undertaken for a number of reasons. Superintendents were asked to select the two most important reasons for their evaluation by the board of education. The percentages of superintendents choosing each reason as a first or second choice by group were selected out, summed, and then ranked ordered to determine comparisons among the groups. Such a comparison is shown in Table 4.5.

Superintendents in each group rank "providing periodic and systematic accountability" as the most important reason for their evaluation. The range among groups runs from 43 percent of the general local superintendents serving very low enrollment school districts to 67 percent of the chief executive officers from high enrollment school districts selecting that response. While "establishing relevant performance goals" ranks second with the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Evaluation</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Group E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Performance Goals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess Performance by Standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Areas for Improvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Salary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Out Strengths</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal Evidence</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification for Permanent Status</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NC - Not chosen as one of the two most important reasons for evaluation
superintendents from the three largest enrollment groups, such a reason for evaluation is ranked no higher than fourth by the superintendents serving very low enrollment school districts and the intermediate superintendents.

As indicated in Table 4.5, three reasons were not chosen (NC) by any of the superintendents serving the largest school districts. The reasons not chosen by that group, and evidently not seen as relevant, include "document dissatisfaction," "establish dismissal evidence," and "determine qualification for permanent status." It is encouraging that most of the reasons ranked highest by superintendents in each group are positive in focus, while those not chosen or ranked lowest can be seen as more punitive and/or negative.

Criteria for Superintendent Evaluation

At a more definitive level than reasons for their evaluation, superintendents were asked to respond to a research question related to the degree to which certain criteria are factors in their evaluation. Respondents selected from a list of ten criterion. Statistically significant differences are reflected among the superintendent groups on five criteria, while no statistical differences are evident on the other five criteria.
Criteria with no Significant Difference Among Groups

School district enrollment and whether the respondent is a general local superintendent or an intermediate superintendent make no difference as to the importance of "general effectiveness of performance" as a criterion for evaluation. Overall, 91 percent of all superintendents responding indicate general effectiveness of performance is an important factor in their evaluation.

"Personal characteristics" are seen as an important factor or somewhat important factor by over 90 percent of all superintendents responding. However, there is no statistical difference among the five superintendent groups in regard to this criterion for their evaluation. This also applies to "management functions," although 80 percent of all superintendents responding do feel this criterion is an important factor in their evaluation.

School district enrollment and whether the respondent is a general local superintendent or an intermediate superintendent also makes no difference as to the importance of "recruitment, employment, and supervision of personnel" or "staff/superintendent relationships."

Educational Leadership and Knowledge

There is a significant difference ($p < .05$) among the five groups of superintendents in regard to their views of "educational leadership and knowledge" as an important factor in their evaluation.
The degree to which each superintendent group views this criterion as an important factor in their evaluation is shown in Table 4.6.

TABLE 4.6 EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND KNOWLEDGE AS A FACTOR IN SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important Factor</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat a Factor</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Factor</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 28.65, \text{ df } = 8; p = .0004 \]

There is a wide disparity between the way that superintendents in school districts with the largest enrollments and those serving the smallest districts view the importance of "educational leadership and knowledge" in their evaluation. While 87 percent of the high enrollment district superintendents see this criterion as an important factor in their evaluation, only 67 percent of their counterparts serving the smallest school districts share that view.

The chief executive officers serving the high enrollment school districts and the intermediate superintendent group share a
common perception on the response to this question, one of the few times throughout the whole study.

Budget Development and Implementation

School district enrollment and whether the respondent is a general local superintendent or an intermediate superintendent does make a difference \((p < .05)\) as to the importance of "budget development and implementation" as a criterion for evaluation. The degree to which each superintendent group views this criterion as an important factor in their evaluation is shown in Table 4.7.

**TABLE 4.7 BUDGET DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION AS A FACTOR IN SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important Factor</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat a Factor</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Factor</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\chi^2 = 22.83, df = 8; p = .0036\]

The superintendents serving low enrollment school districts (Group C) view the criterion of "budget development and
implementation" as a more important factor in their evaluation than any other group. In fact, approximately three out of four superintendents in that group place such importance on this criterion, while about two out of three superintendents in each of the other four groups share that view.

Board/Superintendent Relationships

Many of the research studies (Brinkman, 1973; Reopelle, 1974; Grill, 1978; Gramitt, 1978; Zickafoose, 1979; and Miller, 1982) cited in Chapter II emphasize the importance of board/superintendent relationships relative to the evaluation of the superintendent. Three out of four of all superintendents in this study also see this criterion as an important factor in their evaluation. However, the disparity between the way superintendents serving high enrollment districts and their counterparts from the very low enrollment (Group D) districts view this aspect of their evaluation is great.

Responses to this question are reported in Table 4.8 and reflect statistically significant differences (p < .05) among the superintendent groups.
"Board/superintendent relationships" is judged by every one of the responding superintendents serving the largest school districts as a criterion that is always a factor in their evaluation. That kind of unanimous response occurred in only one other research question in regard to criteria for evaluation. The same group of superintendents also unanimously responded that "general effectiveness of performance" is always a factor in their evaluation.

Almost nine out of ten of the superintendents from high enrollment districts indicate that board/superintendent relationships is an important factor in their evaluation. This contrasts drastically with their counterparts serving the smallest districts (Group D) where only two out of three superintendents give this factor that much importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important Factor</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat a Factor</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Factor</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 - 32.45, df = 8; p = .0001 \]
Student/Superintendent Relationships

Responses from the chief executive officers in the study result in a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) among the groups in regard to the importance of the evaluation criterion of "student/superintendent relationships." The degree to which each superintendent group views this criterion as an important factor in their evaluation is shown in Table 4.9.

**TABLE 4.9 STUDENT/SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIPS AS A FACTOR IN SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important Factor</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat a Factor</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Factor</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 100.34$, $df = 8; p = .0001$

Superintendents in four of the groups view the importance of the above criterion similarly with one out of six respondents considering "student/superintendent relationships" as an important factor. However, the superintendents serving the smallest school
districts see this criterion as much more important, with four out of ten in Group D making such a choice.

Superintendents in very small school districts may be closer to students in more of an executive head/principal role. This may account for this criterion playing a greater role in their evaluation than it does for their colleagues in larger districts who are further removed from student contact or the intermediate superintendents (Group E) whose organizational unit seldom has a student enrollment. Even then, 10 percent of the superintendents serving very low enrollment districts (Group D) do not view "student/superintendent relationships" as a factor at all in their evaluation.

Community/Superintendent Relationships

The fifth criterion for the evaluation of the superintendent for which a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) results among the responding groups is "community/superintendent relationships." The degree to which each superintendent group views this criterion as an important factor in their evaluation is shown in Table 4.10.
### TABLE 4.10  COMMUNITY/SUPERINTENDENT RELATIONSHIPS AS A FACTOR IN SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Group A Percent</th>
<th>Group B Percent</th>
<th>Group C Percent</th>
<th>Group D Percent</th>
<th>Group E Percent</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important Factor</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat a Factor</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Factor</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 26.29, \text{ df } = 8; \ p = .0009 \]

Just over half of the superintendents serving low enrollment, very low enrollment, and intermediate districts report this criterion as an important factor in their evaluation. Contrastingly, almost two out of three superintendents serving moderate enrollment districts (Group B) reflect such a view and almost eighty percent of the chief executive officers from the largest school districts report "community/superintendent relationships" as an important factor in their evaluation. However, very few superintendents in any of the groups see this as not being a factor at all in their evaluation.
Methods of Superintendent Evaluation

Fourteen methods of superintendent evaluation were listed in the research question related to that evaluation practice. Superintendents were asked to select the two most important methods used in their evaluation by their board of education. The percentages of superintendents choosing each method as a first or second choice were selected out, summed, and then rank ordered to determine comparisons among the five groups.

Superintendents in each group rank "meeting of board and superintendent" as the most important method used in their evaluation by the board of education. The range among groups indicating such a method is most important as their first choice runs from 46 percent of the general local superintendents serving moderate enrollment districts (Group B) to 33 percent of the intermediate superintendents. These percentages are somewhat lower than the sixty percent of the superintendents indicating such a choice in Carol's (1972) study cited in Chapter II.

The methods used in their evaluation selected as most important by each of the superintendent groups are reflected in Table 4.11. Comparisons among the responding groups can be ascertained by a review of the differences in rank order indicated.

There is general agreement among the superintendents in this study that an "executive meeting of the board members only" is the second most important method used in their evaluation. Only
TABLE 4.11 METHODS USED IN SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION IN RANK ORDER BY SUPERINTENDENT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Group E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Bd./Supt.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Bd. Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Forms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed Upon Criteria</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Evaluation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation by Board</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of Board</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. can Respond</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating each Criteria</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess Reports</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. can Eval. Board</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare Districts</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. Consists Others</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NC - Not chosen as one of the two most important methods
the intermediate superintendent group selected such a method as other than their second choice and they selected it as third in importance. The range on the second choices runs from 39 percent of the general superintendents from very low enrollment districts (Group E) to 27 percent of the general superintendents from moderate enrollment districts (Group B).

None of the methods is ranked as most important by more than half of the respondents in any of the superintendent groups. The disparity among groups increases as one looks beyond the first two choices. For example, superintendents from the smaller school districts and intermediate superintendents report "observation by the board at meetings" as one of their top four choices. Their counterparts in larger districts select that method as no higher than seventh in importance.

The superintendents serving school districts with the largest student enrollments did not choose two methods of evaluation as important in the process followed by their boards of education. The methods not chosen by any of the respondents from that group are "comparison with other districts" and "board consults with others."

**Expectations of Board Members for Superintendents**

Boards of education may have numerous expectations for their superintendent. Six expectations for superintendents were
listed in the research question related to the evaluation of performance. The chief executive officers were asked to select two of the primary expectations that board members hold for them. The percentages of superintendents choosing each expectation as a first or second choice by group were selected out, summed, and then rank ordered to determine comparisons among the groups. Such comparisons are illustrated in Table 4.12.

**TABLE 4.12 PRIMARY EXPECTATIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS FOR SUPERINTENDENTS IN RANK ORDER AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Group E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Mgmt.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Dvlpmt.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Superintendents from school districts with high or moderate enrollments rank "human relations" as their boards' primary expectation for the chief executive officer. On the other hand, the superintendents serving school districts with smaller student enrollments and the intermediate superintendents rank "finance" as their boards' primary expectation.

"Internal management" is ranked as the second or third expectation for all superintendent groups. Surprisingly, curriculum development ranks last or next to last as an expectation as perceived by the chief executive officers serving school districts in all five groups.

**Use of a Formal Job Description**

A practice related to evaluation of superintendents examined in this study involves the use of a formal job description. A clear definition of role and expectations is a recommendation in many of the studies (Brown, 1976; Bolton, 1980; and Yates, 1981) cited in Chapter II. A formal job description was often suggested.

Responses to the research question asking superintendents whether they have a formal job description or not are reported in Table 4.13 and reflect statistically significant differences (p < .05) among the superintendent groups.
The larger the school district the more likely the superintendent is to have a formal job description. While over 86 percent of the chief executive officers serving high and moderate enrollment districts have a formal job description, only six out of ten of the respondents who serve the smallest districts (Group D) report formal job descriptions. Three out of four of the intermediate superintendents have a formal job description, a percentage comparable to the superintendents serving districts with low student enrollment (Group C).

The final evaluation practice examined as part of the first purpose of the study involves whether those superintendents who have a formal job description are evaluated against the criteria in the description. Responses to this question did not reflect statistically significant differences among the superintendent groups.
It is interesting that a majority of the superintendents in each group who responded they do have a formal job description report they are evaluated against the standards established in that description. The range among groups runs from a high of 68 percent of the general local superintendents serving districts with moderate enrollments to 59 percent of the superintendents from the largest as well as the smallest districts indicating such a practice. The responses to this research question are the only instance related to the first purpose of the study where the percentages attributed to the superintendents serving the largest and smallest districts are similar.

In Chapter IV, ten evaluation practices were examined to determine differences among five superintendent groups, the four general local superintendents and the intermediate superintendents. In Chapter V, comparisons will be drawn among three groups of general local superintendents based on the formalness of their evaluations. A profile using eleven selected personal and professional characteristics will be developed for each group. Three hypotheses about the superintendents who are evaluated only formally or only informally will be tested using profile data.
CHAPTER V

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA RELATED TO THE SECOND AND THIRD PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The second purpose of this study is to compare three groups of general local superintendents: those who report they are evaluated only formally, only informally, and both formally and informally. This is accomplished by developing a profile for each of the three groups of superintendents using eleven selected personal and professional characteristics.

Much of the review of literature in Chapter II relates not only to whether superintendents were evaluated or not, but also to the degree of formalness of the evaluations. Using the total sample of general local district superintendents responding to the 1982 AASA survey, this writer divided the sample into three groups based on the degree of formalness in the superintendents' evaluations. The group sizes are comparable enough to allow comparisons. Three-hundred-and-seventy-eight superintendents report being evaluated formally, four-hundred-and sixty-eight superintendents are informally evaluated, and three-hundred-and-twenty-three chief executive officers report they are evaluated using a combination of formal and informal evaluation procedures.
The profiles developed in this phase of the study use frequency data for the three groups of superintendents reported in percentages and/or means, medians, and modes where appropriate. Of course, the "average" superintendent or superintendency does not exist. However, common characteristics can be determined by computing means and medians (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982). All data reported in this phase of the study relate to only the general local superintendents responding to the 1982 AASA study and are based on the formality of the procedure used in their evaluations.

**Selected Characteristics of Superintendents Based on the Formalness of Their Evaluation**

**Age**

The first personal characteristic used in developing the profiles is age. Responses to this research question are reported in Table 5.1 and compare superintendents based on the degree of formality of their evaluation.

**TABLE 5.1 AGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS BASED ON FORMALNESS OF EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Age in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>30-64</td>
<td>48.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>28-65</td>
<td>48.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>27-76</td>
<td>48.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the mean age, the group of superintendents who report they are evaluated using only a formal procedure are slightly younger than the other two groups.

Sex

Responses to the research question related to the sex of the chief executive officers and the degree of formalness of their evaluation are shown in Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female Subgroup Alone</th>
<th>Male Subgroup Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 9 out of 10 of the superintendents in each group are male consistent with the ratio found in the total sample of the study. However, it is interesting to note that when the male and female subgroups are considered separately the highest percentage of female superintendents are formally evaluated with lesser percentages using the other procedures. On the other hand, when looking just at the males, the largest percentage of that group of superintendents is evaluated using only informal procedures.
Years Served in the Superintendency

A professional characteristic used in developing the profiles of the three groups of superintendents involves years served in the superintendency. Responses to this research question are reported in Table 5.3 in the form of mean, median, and mode years served as a chief executive officer.

TABLE 5.3 YEARS SERVED AS A SUPERINTENDENT BASED ON FORMALNESS OF EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Years as a Superintendent Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>1-31</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>1-35</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>1-47</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the mean years served, superintendents who are evaluated formally have occupied the position of chief executive officer of a public school district for a shorter time period than their counterparts in the other two groups.

Number of Superintendencies Held

The number of superintendencies held is the fourth personal or professional characteristic used in developing profiles of the three groups of superintendents based on the degree of formalness of
their evaluation. Responses to this research question are reported in Table 5.4

TABLE 5.4 NUMBER OF SUPERINTENDENCIES HELD BASED ON FORMALNESS OF EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number of Superintendencies Held</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the mean number of superintendencies held, superintendents who are either evaluated only formally or using both formal and informal procedures report holding slightly fewer superintendencies than their counterparts who are only evaluated informally.

**Career Orientation of the Superintendent**

Superintendents were asked to respond to a research question relating to career orientation and whether they were appointed or elected to their present superintendency from inside the same district or from outside the district. Those superintendents who report appointment or election from inside the same district are considered "place-bound" while those indicating they were selected from outside the district are labeled "career-bound" as both terms are defined in Chapter I. This professional characteristic is used
in developing the profiles of the three groups of superintendents with their responses reported in Table 5.5

**TABLE 5.5 CAREER ORIENTATION OF SUPERINTENDENTS BASED ON FORMALNESS OF EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Career Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place-Bound Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three groups have more of a career-bound orientation with seven out of ten of the chief executive officers who are formally evaluated reporting such a path to their present superintendency. However, those superintendents who report only an informal evaluation procedure tend to be more place-bound in their career orientation than the other two groups.

**Membership in Professional Organizations**

Membership in selected professional organizations is another professional characteristic used in the developing the profiles. The two professional organizations included are the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the state professional organization serving responding superintendents. Responses to this
research question are reported in Table 5.6 and compare superintendents who are evaluated only formally, both formally and informally, or only informally.

**TABLE 5.6 PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS OF SUPERINTENDENTS BASED ON FORMALNESS OF EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Professional Organization Memberships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AASA Member Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large majority of all three groups belong to both AASA and their state professional organization, but higher percentages belong to their state association than the nationally based AASA. The differences among groups in regard to state association membership is not great. However, while three out of four of the chief executive officers evaluated only formally or those using both formal and informal procedures are AASA members, only six out of ten of the superintendents evaluated only informally report such a membership.

**Highest Earned Degree Held**

The seventh personal or professional characteristic used in developing the profiles of the three groups of superintendents is
the highest earned degree held. Responses to the research question related to this characteristic are shown in Table 5.7.

**TABLE 5.7 HIGHEST EARNED DEGREE HELD BY SUPERINTENDENTS BASED ON FORMALNESS OF EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Highest Earned Degree Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over half of the superintendents evaluated only formally have an earned doctorate or additional education beyond the doctorate. The doctorate level or higher is also indicative of the educational training of 47 percent of the superintendents who are evaluated using both formal and informal procedures. On the other hand, 53 percent of the chief executive officers who report an informal evaluation procedure indicate the master's degree or master's degree plus as their level of professional training.

**Usefulness of Educational Research**

Superintendents were asked their opinion about the usefulness of educational research. This professional characteristic is
used in developing the profiles of the three groups of superintendents and their responses are reported in Table 5.8

**TABLE 5.8 OPINIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS ABOUT THE USEFULNESS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BASED ON THE FORMALNESS OF EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Opinions about Educational Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly or Usually Useful Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost six out of ten of the superintendents evaluated only formally view educational research to be highly or usually useful. A similar view is held by 54 percent of the chief executive officers who are evaluated using both formal and informal procedures. On the other hand, half of the superintendents evaluated informally view educational research as only occasionally useful.

From a researcher's perspective, it is encouraging that practitioners leading America's public school systems reflect the degree of respect for educational research shown in their responses. Very few of the superintendents in any of the three groups view educational research as not useful.
Size of District Served

District size is included as demographic data utilized in developing the profiles of the three groups of chief executive officers. The responses to this research question are shown in Table 5.9

TABLE 5.9 STUDENT ENROLLMENTS OF DISTRICT SERVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS BASED ON THE FORMALNESS OF EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Size of District Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Enrollment Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest percentage in each superintendent group are serving low enrollment school districts consistent with the ratio found in the total sample of the study. However, it is interesting to note that when the enrollment groups are considered separately that superintendents serving high enrollment school districts are more likely to be formally evaluated. On the other hand, the chief executive officers in moderate enrollment districts are more likely to be evaluated using both formal and informal procedures, and the superintendents in low and very low enrollment school districts indicate use of informal procedures.
Social Structure of District Served

The social structure of the district served by each of the three groups of superintendents is another important characteristic considered in the development of profiles. The superintendents' responses to the research question related to this characteristic are shown in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10 Social Structure of District Served by Superintendents Based on Formalness of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Social Structure of District Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Urban Center Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and Informal</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest percentage of superintendents serving any one type of school district are informally evaluated and in non/urban suburban school districts. When the social structures are considered separately superintendents serving school districts in major urban centers are more likely to be formally evaluated. The highest percentage of their counterparts in city districts are also formally evaluated. On the other hand, suburban district superintendents are more likely to be evaluated using both formal and informal
procedures and the highest percentage of the chief executive officers serving non-urban/suburban districts are informally evaluated.

Geographic Region of District Served

One geographic factor is considered in the development of profiles of the three superintendent groups based on the degree of formalness in their evaluations. The chief executive officers' responses to the research question related to the geographic region in which the school district they serve is located are reported in Table 5.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Region</th>
<th>Formal Evaluation Percent</th>
<th>Both Formal and Informal Evaluation Percent</th>
<th>Informal Evaluation Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountains</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The highest percentage of superintendents serving any one geographic region are informally evaluated and in the Southeast region of the country. When the evaluation procedures used are considered separately, the highest percentage of superintendents evaluated only formally are serving school districts in the New England region. On the other hand, the highest percentage of superintendents evaluated using both formal and informal procedures are serving school districts in the Far West region.

Profiles of Three Superintendent Groups Based on the Formalness of their Evaluation

A compilation of the selected personal and professional characteristics results in a profile for each of the three superintendent groups compared as part of this purpose of the study.

General local superintendents who are evaluated only formally are more likely to be male than female, just as with the other two groups. However, it is interesting to note that when the female subgroup is considered separately the highest percentage of those superintendents are formally evaluated with lesser percentages using the other procedures. Of the total group of general local superintendents who are evaluated formally, they average 48.15 years of age, have served an average of 8.75 years in the superintendency, and have held 1.68 superintendencies. They are more likely to be promoted from outside the school district and be career-bound, belong to both AASA and their state professional organization, have
an earned doctorate, and see educational research as highly or usually useful. A superintendent in the group that is formally evaluated would most likely be serving a high enrollment city school district in the New England region of the country.

General local superintendents who are evaluated both formally and informally average 48.55 years of age, are more likely to be male than female, have served an average of 9.14 years in the superintendency, and have held 1.68 superintendencies. They are more likely to be selected from outside the district and be career-bound, belong to both AASA and their state professional organization, have an earned doctorate, and see educational research as highly or usually useful. A superintendent in the group that is both formally and informally evaluated would most likely be serving a moderate size city school district in the Far West region of the country.

General local superintendents who are evaluated informally average 48.84 years of age, are more likely to be selected from outside the district and be career-bound (although a higher percentage of this group is place-bound than the other two groups), and belong both to AASA (the percentage is lowest in this group) and their state professional organization. They have training beyond a master's degree and see educational research as occasionally useful. A superintendent in the group that is informally evaluated would most likely be serving a very low enrollment non-urban/suburban school district in the Southeast region of the country.
The general local superintendents who are evaluated formally are slightly younger and have served less years in the superintendency than their counterparts in the other two groups. There is no difference between the three groups in terms of sex and the number of superintendencies held. Although a majority of the superintendents in each of the three groups have a career-bound orientation and belong both to AASA and their state professional organization, the superintendents who are informally evaluated tend to be more place-bound and less likely to be a member of AASA than their counterparts.

Superintendents who are evaluated formally and those who are evaluated using both formal and informal procedures have similar professional training levels, highly value educational research and are more likely to serve city school districts. The three groups differ totally in terms of the likely size of district served and the region of the country in which their school district is likely to be located.

A comparison of the three groups of superintendents based on the degree of formalness of their evaluation using the data from each of the profiles is reflected in Table 5.12.

The second purpose of the study compared three groups of superintendents based on the formalness of their evaluation procedures and resulted in the development of profiles for the three groups. The last section of this chapter examines the data in still another form through the testing of hypotheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
<th>Evaluation Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Both Formal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>younger</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Male)</td>
<td>least often</td>
<td>equally often</td>
<td>most often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Female)</td>
<td>most often</td>
<td>equally often</td>
<td>least often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as a</td>
<td>least</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>least</td>
<td>least</td>
<td>most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>career-bound</td>
<td>career-bound</td>
<td>equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>AASA &amp; state</td>
<td>AASA &amp; state</td>
<td>AASA &amp; state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td>doctorate</td>
<td>doctorate</td>
<td>master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of</td>
<td>highly or useful</td>
<td>highly or useful</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>usually useful</td>
<td>usually useful</td>
<td>useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of District Served</td>
<td>high enrollment</td>
<td>moderate enrollment</td>
<td>very low enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Structure of District</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>non-urban/suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of District Served</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third purpose of this study is to compare selected characteristics of two groups of general local superintendents: those who are only evaluated formally and those who are only evaluated informally. This is accomplished by testing three hypotheses concerning differences in selected demographic data. Levels of significance are established at .10 for the hypotheses and are analyzed using the chi-square technique.

Hypothesis 1 - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to be younger, newer to the superintendency, and career-bound.

There is a significant difference ($p < .10$) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those evaluated informally in terms of age. For 12 degrees of freedom the chi-square test at a 10 percent error level is 18.55. The obtained value of chi-square is 31.93 resulting in the statistically significant difference ($p = .6880$) between age and the degree of formalness in the superintendents' evaluation. As noted in Table 5.1, those superintendents who are evaluated formally average 48.15 years of age, while 48.84 years old is the average age of those superintendents evaluated informally.

There is a significant difference ($p < .10$) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those evaluated informally in terms of years in the superintendency. For 18 degrees of freedom the chi-square test at a 10 percent error level is 25.99.
The obtained value of chi-square is 28.19 resulting in a significant difference \( (p = .4129) \) between newness to the superintendency as measured in years and the degree of formality in the superintendents' evaluation. As noted in Table 5.3, those superintendents who are evaluated formally average 8.75 years in the superintendency, while 10.56 years is the average tenure in the position for their counterparts who are evaluated using only an informal procedure.

There is a significant difference \( (p < .10) \) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those evaluated informally in terms of career orientation. For two degrees of freedom the chi-square test at 10 percent error level is 4.60. The obtained value of chi-square is 8.39 resulting in a statistically significant difference \( (p = .0150) \) between career orientation and the degree of formality in the superintendents' evaluation. As noted in Table 5.5, 69 percent of the superintendents evaluated formally are career-bound, rather than place-bound, in their career orientation. On the other hand, 59 percent of the superintendents evaluated informally report a career-bound orientation. The group of superintendents who are evaluated formally are more likely to be career-bound, although both groups have a majority reporting a career-bound orientation.

Given the above analysis of the data, Hypothesis 1 is supported in all three areas tested. Superintendents who are
evaluated formally are more likely to be younger, newer to the superintendency, and career-bound.

**Hypothesis 2** - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to have attained a doctorate, value educational research, and be a member of AASA and the state professional organization serving superintendents.

There is a significant difference ($p < .10$) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those evaluated informally in terms of their attainment of a doctorate degree. For 18 degrees of freedom the chi-square test at a 10 percent error level is 25.99. The obtained value of chi-square is 29.93 resulting in a statistically significant difference ($p = .0382$) between attainment of the doctorate degree and the formalness of the superintendents' evaluation procedure. As noted in Table 5.7, 42 percent of the superintendents evaluated formally have earned the doctorate degree while only 25 percent of their counterparts who are informally evaluated report such a degree level.

There is a significant difference ($p < .10$) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those informally evaluated in terms of the value they place on educational research. For four degrees of freedom the chi-square test at a 10 percent error level is 7.79. The obtained value of chi-square is 12.23 resulting in a statistically significant difference ($p = .0157$) between the degree of formalness of the superintendents' evaluation and the value they place on educational research. As noted in Table 5.8, 57 percent of the superintendents evaluated formally consider
educational research highly or usually useful. On the other hand, less than half of the superintendents evaluated informally share such an opinion.

There is a significant difference (p < .10) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those evaluated informally in terms of membership in the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). For two degrees of freedom the chi-square test at a 10 percent error level is 4.60. The obtained value of chi-square is 27.03 resulting in the statistically significant difference (p = .0001) between AASA membership and the degree of formality in the superintendents' evaluation. As noted in Table 5.6, 76 percent of the superintendents who are formally evaluated belong to AASA while only 62 percent of those who are informally evaluated report such membership.

There is no significant difference (p < .10) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those evaluated informally in terms of membership in their state professional organization. As noted in Table 5.6, 87 percent of the superintendents evaluated formally belong to their state professional organization. Similarly, 86 percent of their counterparts who are informally evaluated hold such membership. It is interesting that the highest percentage (93 percent) of superintendents belonging to their state professional organization is found in the third group who report being evaluated using both formal and informal procedures.
Given the above analysis of the data, Hypothesis 2 is supported in three of the four areas tested. Superintendents evaluated formally are more likely to have attained a doctorate, value educational research, and be a member of AASA. However, a similar percentage of superintendents who are evaluated informally belong to their state professional organization.

Hypothesis 3 - More superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to serve a larger urban or city school district.

There is a statistically significant difference ($p < .10$) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those evaluated informally in terms of the size of the district they serve. For 8 degrees of freedom the chi-square test at a 10 percent error level is 13.36. The obtained value of chi-square is 78.92 resulting in the statistically significant difference ($p = .0001$) between size of the district served and the formalness of the superintendents' evaluation. As noted in Table 5.9, the highest percentage of superintendents serving high enrollment districts report being formally evaluated with less than half the percentage being informally evaluated.

There is a significant difference ($p < .10$) between those superintendents who are evaluated formally and those evaluated informally in terms of the social structure of the district served. For eight degrees of freedom the chi-square test at a 10 percent error level is 13.36. The obtained value of chi-square is 53.50
resulting in a statistically significant difference \( (p = 0.0001) \) between the social structure of the district served and the degree of formalness of the superintendents' evaluation. As noted in Table 5.10, the highest percentage of superintendents serving major urban centers and city school districts are evaluated formally, while less than half the percentage of superintendents in major urban centers and less than one-third the percentage of superintendents in cities are being informally evaluated.

Given the above analysis of data, Hypothesis 3 is supported in all three areas tested. More superintendents who are evaluated formally are more likely to serve a larger urban or city school district.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The 1982 AASA study of the American public school superintendent included questions regarding evaluation practices utilized with the chief executive officers of our nation's school districts. Earlier studies conducted by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and its predecessor, the National Education Department of Superintendence, did not deal with how, or whether, superintendents were evaluated. Data were utilized from the 1982 AASA study to probe current practices in the evaluation of the American public school superintendents as perceived by the superintendents themselves.

One purpose of the study was to ascertain from superintendents their perception of the "state of the art" in the first part of this decade regarding superintendent evaluation and how practices compare by size and type of district served. In addition, characteristics of superintendents who are formally and/or informally evaluated were explored. More specifically, the purposes of the study were three fold:

1. To compare ten evaluation practices among five groups of superintendents, the four groups of general local superintendents serving
school districts of various sizes and types and the intermediate district superintendents.

2. To compare three groups of general local superintendents: those who report they are evaluated only formally, only informally, or both formally and informally. This was accomplished by developing a profile for each of the three groups of superintendents using selected personal and professional characteristics.

3. To compare selected characteristics of two groups of general local superintendents, those who indicate they are only evaluated formally and those only evaluated informally, by testing the following hypotheses involving differences in demographic data:

Hypothesis 1 - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to be younger, newer to the superintendency, and career-bound.

Hypothesis 2 - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to have attained a doctorate, value educational research more highly and be a member of AASA and the state professional organization serving superintendents.

Hypothesis 3 - More superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to serve a larger urban or city school district.

This researcher was a member of the 1982 AASA study research team and assisted in the survey instrument design to include the evaluation questions utilized in this study. The survey instrument was mailed to a stratified selected sample of American public school superintendents involving 2,533 chief executive officers. Of those more than half (56 percent) responded. Thus, nearly ten
percent of all public school superintendents in America were included in this study.

The data from the survey instrument questions related to evaluation were key punched onto computer cards and stored on magnetic discs in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program format. The computer facilities of the Polimetrics Laboratory, Department of Political Science at The Ohio State University were used to generate the frequency distribution and statistical analysis necessary to answer the research questions and test the hypotheses.

General Findings and Conclusions

For nearly sixty years, the American school superintendency has undergone close scrutiny, not only in the eyes of the public, but also in the eyes of educational researchers. Several surveys have been made of the status and characteristics of those who hold this important public position. Few surveys have been concentrated however on the evaluation of their performance as this study does. A general summary of findings and conclusions follows. Unless otherwise noted, the findings and conclusions apply to superintendents in each of the groups surveyed.

1. Evaluation of the superintendent has come a long way in the thirty years researchers have been examining the practice. If one combines the responses of general local superintendents who report the use of a formal evaluation procedure with the
chief executive officers who indicate using formal and informal procedures, three out of four of the superintendents are evaluated using formal procedures of some kind. This shows a remarkable evolution toward a more formal approach to the evaluation of our country's educational leaders.

2. Those superintendents evaluated using both formal and informal procedures are more like the superintendents evaluated only formally than their counterparts evaluated using only informal procedures. This suggests a continuum with formal evaluation procedures reflecting the highest degree of sophistication. Figure 6.1 represents this continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Both Formal and Informal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Sophistication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 6.1 SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION PROCEDURE CONTINUUM

3. The emergence of state legislatively mandated superintendent evaluation programs has had a great impact on evaluation practices utilized with superintendents. Much of the evolution toward more formal evaluation of superintendents can be attributed to the expanding number of such state laws.

4. Evaluation of the American public school superintendent in the first part of the 1980's is:
- usually conducted annually
- accomplished through a meeting of the superintendent with the governing board

- more formal than at any time in the position's history, but still not predominately formal only

- done primarily for the reason of providing accountability

- based most on the criteria of general effectiveness of performance

- conducted with the governing board's primary expectation involving skill in human relations if the chief executive officer serves a larger school district or knowledge of finance if the superintendent is serving a smaller or intermediate school district

- accomplished with the superintendents having formal job descriptions and those descriptions serving as a basis for their evaluation.

5. The superintendent evaluation practices utilized in the larger school districts are more refined than their counterparts with smaller student enrollments. This is reflected in the higher percentage of chief executive officers serving larger districts reporting a formal job description with more frequent and formal evaluation practices that involve fewer methods and reasons for evaluation. The dimensions of the evaluation program and process are better defined.

6. Two hypotheses of the study were supported and the third hypothesis was supported in three of the four areas tested. The two hypotheses supported were:

Hypothesis 1 - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to be younger, newer to the superintendent, and career-bound.

Hypothesis 3 - More superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to serve a larger urban or city school district.
The hypothesis supported in three of the four areas tested was:

Hypothesis 2 - Superintendents who report they are evaluated formally are more likely to have attained a doctorate, value educational research more highly, and be a member of AASA and the state professional organization serving superintendents.

The superintendents who are evaluated formally are more likely to have attained a doctorate, value educational research more highly, and be a member of AASA. However, a similar percentage of superintendents who are evaluated informally belong to their state professional organization.

7. There is great variation among the superintendencies reflected in the public school districts of America and the diversity among our educational leaders is exemplified in the differences in expectations among selected superintendent groups. For example, the larger the school district the more important it is for the superintendent to demonstrate educational leadership and work closely with the community in external matters. In contrast, their counterparts serving smaller or intermediate districts view internal matters such as student/superintendent relationships and budget development and implementation as more important.

8. Even with the diversity in expectations, there is agreement among the groups of general local superintendents based on district size and the intermediate superintendents surveyed on the most important reasons for evaluation. The reasons ranked in the top
four for each of the five groups surveyed include providing accountability, establishing goals for performance, assessing performance with standards, and identifying areas for improvement. These all involve a positive rather than negative focus, a good sign with the current tensions reported between boards and superintendents.

9. There is agreement among the groups of general local superintendents and intermediate superintendents on the most important methods used in superintendent evaluation. A meeting of the board and superintendent is ranked first by all groups. An executive meeting of the board only is ranked second by all groups but the intermediate district superintendent who ranked it third. Responses among the groups begin to vary to some degree beyond the first two choices as most important methods of evaluation.

10. Superintendents are not expected to be instructional leaders or look to the future as much as they are being expected to be managers of people in the current environment. Curriculum development and planning are ranked lowest in terms of the primary expectation of the governing board by every group of general local and intermediate superintendents except those serving the two largest enrollment districts. On the other hand, human relations and internal management are ranked first or second by all the superintendents serving the smallest districts and the intermediate superintendents. The responses
on curriculum development might be explained through answers by superintendents in another part of the 1982 AASA study of the superintendency in which superintendents indicate a staff member with expertise in curriculum would be the most needed staffing addition to their administrative team.

11. A well-defined superintendent evaluation program with a clear definition of roles and expectations can minimize the effect of the personalities of the superintendent and the board on the process. Superintendent evaluation may depend most on the group of people serving on the governing board conducting the evaluation at any point in time. No amount of evaluation, no program or process can guarantee that evaluation occurs appropriately, but a clear procedure is imperative to channel the perspectives of those involved.

12. The evaluation process can be important to the improvement of the competencies of the superintendent. An effective evaluation process should provide impetus for staff development opportunities to establish and/or enhance desired competencies.

13. A sense of complacency is projected by the superintendent not currently being formally evaluated. Except for such superintendents serving districts in the largest student enrollment group, a majority of the superintendents not currently being formally evaluated see no need to develop formal procedures and believe their boards are also not in favor of instituting a more formal evaluation process.
14. Even though the number of female respondents is much smaller than their male counterparts, it is interesting that the percentage of the female superintendent subgroup who are evaluated only formally was much greater than the percentage of the male subgroup reporting such an evaluation procedure.

15. It is surprising that a small number of superintendents did not know how they are evaluated and seem indifferent to the importance of superintendent evaluation. Such indifference may have led indirectly to the initiation of action in regard to superintendent evaluation such as state laws mandating such evaluation.

A Suggested Model for the Evaluation of the Superintendent

The review of literature completed for this study uncovered a number of models for the evaluation of the superintendent. Rather than include these models in the chapter dedicated to the review of literature, selected models are included in Appendix C. Information gained in the review of literature and the analysis of data from this study is also reflected in a suggested model for the evaluation of the superintendent developed by the writer and included in this section of this chapter.

Various models for the evaluation of the superintendent have been developed. The models include everything from a theoretical framework to a sixteen page operational model which can be used as an evaluation instrument for assessing the performance of a
superintendent. The authors (Brinkman, 1973; Reopelle, 1974; Lifham, 1976; Olds, 1977; Booth and Glaub, 1978; Bolton, 1980; Redfern, 1980; and Bellon 1980) who have developed models for the evaluation of the superintendent realize such models can only serve as a guideline:

The proposed model for the evaluation of the superintendent is not intended as a final answer to the need for such an instrument but rather as a format that, potentially, can be adapted by a district for its use. Each district must base the evaluation of the chief administrator on its unique needs. The model can only serve as a pattern (Brinkman, 1973, p. 96).

That statement could apply to each of the models for the evaluation of the superintendent. The models provide a variety of frameworks now available to boards of education and superintendents looking for direction in developing an evaluation program for their particular school district.

The following suggested model for the evaluation of the superintendent is proposed in an effort to tie together previous research and writings on the topic with current findings reflected in this study.
The process proposed in the suggested model would begin with a broad based development of annual district objectives solicited from the professional staff, parents, and members of the community. Community leaders would play an important role in helping the board of education and superintendent set organizational priorities for the district for the year.

Once the district objectives are established (6-10 in number), the superintendent and board would meet in an extended session to develop or review the superintendent's position description (the basic criteria on which he/she will be evaluated), identify leadership processes (communication, etc.) to be given attention, and operationalize the district objectives into a
specific work plan with timelines, resources needed, and conditions for accomplishment. The work plan would be developed for the superintendent and the board with shared responsibilities.

The actual evaluation process would be formal, on-going with written interim evaluations and conferences in executive session held three times during the year. Input would be provided by significant others such as administrators in the district, community leaders, etc., about the performance of the superintendent and the board. The evaluation would be reciprocal and take into account any state laws and board policies.

Staff development for both the superintendent and the board of education members would play a very important role in this model. As new skills or information become necessary to meet district objectives, the superintendent and/or board must be offered and take advantage of staff development opportunities.

The evaluation process would include both a formative and summative dimension with the process recycling and repeating itself each year. Information gained from one year would be used to build upon for the following year. Results of the evaluation would be used to determine contract status and salary. Such a model incorporates many of the desirable aspects of a superintendent evaluation system exemplified in the literature and desired based on the findings of this study.
Recommendations

J. M. Hanks became superintendent of the Ysleta school district the year the stock market crashed. That small bit of American history is not significant until one realizes superintendent Hanks was the focus of an article in *Executive Educator* in 1979 highlighting his fifty years' as chief executive officer of the Ysleta school district! The author closed the article by saying:

> Nope, nobody has a bad word to say about Jess Mack Hanks. And maybe that's what it takes to be a superintendent in the same school district for fifty years (Levin, 1979, pp. 15-17).

How did Hanks survive, and in fact flourish, as a superintendent that long? What new skills and expectations did he experience during his tenure? What does the future hold for today's superintendents who desire just a small number of the years Hanks spent in his position? What will the process of evaluating superintendents look like in the future?

The nature of the superintendency has changed and will continue to change in the years to come (Griffiths, 1966, p. 91). The developing nature of the position was aptly described over thirty years ago:

> The evolution of the superintendency is not complete. It never will be complete in a free and changing society as long as the schools remain free and decentralized. What new form it will take, what new techniques and philosophies it will develop in the next 100 years, depend upon the hard facts of history yet
unwritten, upon the functions which are assigned to public schools, but most of all perhaps upon the professional vision, enterprise, statesmanship, and courage of individuals who will comprise the generations of superintendents still to come (American Association of School Administrators, 1952, p. 64).

It is with this legacy and look to the future that the following recommendations are offered.

**Recommendations for Educational Decision Makers**

1. School districts should implement superintendent evaluation practices including at least an annual evaluation based on agreed upon criteria/expectations related to a formal job description, and conducted in an executive session involving the board of education and the superintendent.

2. Superintendent evaluation models as well as successful programs already in place need to be widely distributed through AASA and NSBA and their state affiliates. The state level may be most effective since more superintendents report belonging to their state professional organization.

3. State professional organizations serving superintendents, in conjunction with state school board associations, should provide leadership in establishing well-thought-out laws to require superintendent evaluation programs in those states where such a law does not presently exist. Appropriate laws could bring consistency and order to superintendent evaluations in school districts where that is not now the case.
4. Staff development opportunities should be tied to the evaluation of the superintendent. Any valid evaluation program should provide resources for the person being evaluated to enhance and/or develop needed competencies.

5. Staff development programs should be established for board of education members through their professional organizations in regard to conducting the evaluation of their superintendent. Such training could be mandatory for new board members.

6. Greater attention needs to be given to the process used in the selection of superintendents. Researchers have found the manner in which boards select superintendents has a great deal to do with whether the board was satisfied with the superintendent's performance after he or she had been on the job a year or two.

7. University personnel training educational administrators should pay particular attention in planning their preparation programs to the new skills superintendents indicate are needed in order to continue to be effective.

8. Superintendent evaluation program components should be expanded to include significant others such as administrative subordinates, community leaders, and parents in addition to the board of education.

9. The education profession needs to further explore the concepts of management audits, merit pay, and competency testing and their applicability to the evaluation of the superintendent.
Recommendations for Further Research

1. Consideration needs to be given to the continuum of formality in superintendent evaluation and whether such a continuum does exist and reflects an evolution of evaluation practices.

2. Additional study related to expectations held for the superintendent by both internal and external constituencies needs to be conducted. Board/superintendent relationships and the expectations held by parents, community leaders, and non-parent community members need to be examined.

3. This study did not examine "affective domain" criteria for the evaluation of the superintendent. Such study would provide information about a necessary, but neglected, aspect of the chief executive officer's performance.

4. Additional models for the evaluation of the superintendent and boards of education need to be developed incorporating the best current knowledge about effective evaluation practices.

5. Small case studies need to be conducted to examine the impact of evaluation on the performance and professional career of the superintendent. Do superintendents who are evaluated in an organized fashion improve their performance, provide more accountability in what they accomplish, get fired, or have a better or worse relationship with their board of education? More follow-up research on the results of superintendent evaluation is necessary.
6. Further research should be conducted comparing states that do and do not have laws mandating superintendent evaluation in terms of contents of the laws and evaluation practices.

7. The questions related to evaluation practices included in the 1982 AASA study of the superintendency should be replicated in the next ten year study conducted by AASA. Such replication will allow a determination of trends in evaluation practices used in appraising the performance of America's superintendents.
APPENDIX A

1982 AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
NATIONAL STUDY OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Note: Your participation in this study is an extraordinary service to your profession that goes beyond normal expectations. The depth and breadth of this research project is significantly greater than typical status reports.

Without your help the project will fail! Please feel free to use administrative assistance in completing the demographic data.

This questionnaire was developed with the assistance and advice of the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, AASA.

Directions

Your questionnaire is identified by a code number to simplify recordkeeping and follow-up procedures, in reporting the results, no individual identity will be divulged. Only groups statistical responses will be cited. Respondents confidentiality is assured.

Attempt to answer every question and, please, make every answer a sincere one. In the event none of the alternatives provided for a question corresponds exactly to your position or opinion, you are asked to select that alternative which comes closest to the answer you would like to give.

Circle the number of the proper alternative using either pen or pencil. If you change a response please be sure that the change is legible and clear in order to facilitate data processing.

Place your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and mail it. Your cooperation and assistance in this significant study is greatly appreciated.

1. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. What is your sex?
   1. Male
   2. Female

2. What is your age? __________ years old.

3. With what ethnic group would you identify yourself?
   1. White (non-Hispanic)
   2. Black (non-Hispanic)
   3. Chicano/Hispanic
   4. Asian/Pacific Islander
   5. Native American
   6. Other (Specify): ____________________

   (Indian, Eskimo)

4. What is your present marital status?
   1. Single
   2. Married
   3. Divorced or Separated
   4. Widowed

5. Which of the following categories best describes the type of community in which you spent most of your life prior to your college years?
   1. Rural
   2. Town or small city
   3. Suburban city in a metropolitan area
   4. Large urban center or city

6. Which of the following categories best describes the size of the community in which you spent most of your life prior to your college years?
   1. Under 2,500 in population
   2. 2,500 to 9,999 in population
   3. 10,000 to 99,999 in population
   4. 100,000 or more in population

7. Politically, do you consider yourself to be a(n):
   1. Independent
   2. Democrat
   3. Republican
   4. Other (Specify): ____________________
8. Was one or both of your parents active in the PTA/PTO?
   1. Yes  2. No  3. Don't recall

9. How does your present standard of living compare to that of your parents when they were your age?
   1. The same as your parents  2. Lower than your parents  3. Higher than your parents

10. Which category best describes the educational level of your father? (Select only one)
    1. Did not complete elementary school  5. Graduated from college
    2. Completed elementary school  6. Graduated from professional school
    3. Graduated from high school  7. Technical or Trade school
    4. Some college  8. Don't know

11. Which category best describes the educational level of your mother? (Select only one)
    1. Did not complete elementary school  5. Graduated from college
    2. Completed elementary school  6. Graduated from professional school
    3. Graduated from high school  7. Technical or Trade school
    4. Some college  8. Don't know

12. In general, do you believe that the children of today's superintendents will enjoy, as adults, a standard of living:
    1. Equal to your standard of living  2. Better than your standard of living  3. Lower than your standard of living  4. Don't know

11. CAREER DATA/PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

13. At what age were you employed in your first full-time position in public education? ____________ years old.

14. In what type of school was your first full-time position in public education?
    1. Elementary school  4. College/University
    2. Junior high/middle school  5. Vocational/Technical school
    3. High school  6. Other (Specify): ________________

15. What subject(s) did you teach in your first full-time teaching position in education? (Circle as many as apply).
    01. Elementary  09. Art
    02. Science  10. Foreign Language
    03. Mathematics  11. Music
    04. Social Science  12. Vocational education
    05. English, Drama, Journalism  13. Counseling and Guidance
    06. Health, Physical Education  14. Driver Education
    07. Business Education  15. Vocational-Technical
    08. Industrial Arts

16. What extracurricular activities were you responsible for in your first full-time position in education? (Circle as many as applicable).
    1. Coaching Athletics  4. School newspaper or annual
    2. Dramatics  5. Music group outside of school only
    3. Class Advisor  6. Other (Specify): ________________

17. How many years of classroom teaching experience have you had? Do not include years as full-time administrator or supervisor. _______ years.

18. At what age were you appointed to your first school administrative or supervisory position other than the superintendent? _______ years old.

19. What was the nature of your first administrative or supervisory position other than the superintendent? (Select only one)
    1. Assistant principal  5. Assistant Superintendent
    2. Principal  6. State Department of Education
    3. Supervisor  7. Other (Specify): ________________
20. How many public school superintendencies have you held including your present one? 

21. How many years have you served (in total) as a superintendent including 1961-62? 

22. In how many states have you served as a public school superintendent? 

23. Were you elected or appointed to your present superintendency? 
   1. Elected 
   2. Appointed 

24. Were you appointed or elected to your present superintendency from: 
   1. inside the same district 
   2. Outside the district 

25. How many years in length is the full term of your present contract or letter of appointment with your school board? 

26. In the chart below, provide the following information for each superintendency you have held:
   - Age at the time of appointment to the position 
   - Tenure means total number of years in the position 
   - Enrollments = total elementary-secondary pupil enrollment (estimate) 
   - Salary at the beginning of the superintendency (including perks) 
   - State the school district is/was located in 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Superintendency</td>
<td>(Include 1961-62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Superintendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. In which of the following types of positions have you had one full year or more of experience? (Place a check in the appropriate blanks): 
   a. Elementary teacher 
   b. Elementary ass't. principal 
   c. Elementary principal 
   d. J.H./Middle sch. teacher 
   e. J.H./Middle sch. ass't. principal 
   f. J.H./Middle sch. principal 
   g. High school teacher 
   h. High school ass't. principal 
   i. High school principal 
   j. Supervisor or consultant 
   k. Director 
   l. Asst./Assist. superintendent 
   m. College or university teacher 
   n. Other (Specify):
34. Which of the following combinations of educational experiences best describe your career pattern prior to the superintendency? (Select only one).

1. Teacher only  
2. Principal only  
3. Central office only  
4. Teacher and principal  
5. Teacher and central office  
6. Principal and central office  
7. Teacher, principal, and central office  
8. Other (Specify): 

35. Have you spent your entire educational career in one school district?

1. Yes  
2. No  

36. In what positions were you employed outside of public education for a period of one year or more since graduation from college? (Check those positions that apply).

a. No non-educational employment  
b. Military  
c. Other (Specify): 

37. At what age did you first decide that you wanted to become a school superintendent? ______ years old.

38. How long did it take you to obtain your first superintendency once you were certified and actively sought such a position?

1. Less than 1 year  
2. 1 year  
3. 2 years  
4. 3 years  
5. 4 years  
6. 5 or more years  

39. What is your perception of the most important reason you were employed by your present board of education? (Select only one).

1. My personal characteristics/qualifications  
2. The board/community wanted some specific programmatic or curricular improvements made in the school district  
3. The board/community was looking for a person to solve some specific problems (i.e., closing schools, RIFting, desegregation, etc.)  
4. Other (Specify): 

40. Do you consider yourself to be a mentor?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Uncertain, don't know  

41. Do others come to you for career advice on a regular basis?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Uncertain, don't know  

42. Do you, or did you ever, have a mentor?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. Uncertain, don't know
51. From your perspective, which of the following factors might inhibit your effectiveness as superintendant? (Select no more than one)

01. Lack of time
02. Too much added responsibility
03. Inadequate financing of schools
04. Too many insignificant demands upon superintendant
05. Limits on personal or professional capabilities
06. Too many controls placed on superintendant
07. Inexperienced, unqualified, or ill-prepared staff members
08. Difficulty in relations with school board members
09. District too small
10. Not enough administrative staff members
11. Racial/Ethnic problems
12. Drug problems
13. Clerical staff
14. Philosophical differences with board/community
15. Collective Bargaining
16. Some
17. Other (Specify): ____________________________
18. No opinion

52. During what period of service as a superintendant do you believe you were/will be most effective?

1. Early years
2. Middle years
3. Recent years
4. Years that lie ahead
5. Don't know

53. What, in your opinion, is the status/presence of the position of the superintendant as an educational or community leader in your school district? (Select only one)

1. Decreasing in importance and influence
2. Remaining about the same as it was 10 years ago
3. Increasing in importance and influence
4. Don't know

54. If you had to do it all over again, would you choose a career as/in:

1. School superintendent
2. Another educational administrative or supervisory position
3. Classroom teacher
4. Guidance counselor
5. College professor
6. A position outside the field of education
7. Other (Specify): ____________________________
8. Don't know

55. If you have held more than one superintendency, please list below the reason you left your last superintendency __________________________________________________________

56. Please check the professional organizations in which you are an active member in good standing: (Check all that apply)

a. AASA   d. State Professional Association(s)
 b. NEA   e. Other (Specify): ____________________________
 c. AASB    f. ASCD

57. __________ ASBO
58. __________ NASSP
III. SCHOOL BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT/COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS (from the perspective of your present position)

57. Who takes the lead in the development of policy? (Select only one).
1. School board
2. School board chairperson
3. Superintendent
4. Shared responsibility

58. How is board member orientation handled? (Select only one).
1. Superintendent
2. By experienced school board members
3. Through shared responsibility
4. New board members are not oriented
5. Other (Specify):

59. Who prepares the agenda for board meetings?
1. Superintendent
2. Board chairperson
3. Shared responsibility
4. Other (Specify):

60. What is the average length of service of your present board members? ___________ years.

61. Are board members appointed or elected?
1. Appointed
2. Elected

62. How many members of each sex serve on your board?

a. Males b. Females

63. How many current board members belong to each of the following ethnic groups? (Fill in the blanks with the appropriate number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicana/Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. In your opinion, is community participation in school district decision making:
1. More important in 1981 than in 1971
2. Less important in 1981 than in 1971
3. About the same
4. Don't know

65. Does your board view citizen participation:
1. Favorably
2. Unfavorably
3. Take it or leave it
4. Don't know

66. In your opinion what is occurring in regard to the desire of parents and/or community members to participate in the decision making process?
1. Parents/community are becoming more willing to participate.
2. Parents/community are becoming less willing to participate.
3. Parent/community willingness to participate remains about the same as it has been over the past few years.
4. Don't know.

67. What do you see occurring in regard to the desire of students to participate in the decision making process?
1. Students are becoming more willing to participate.
2. Students are becoming less willing to participate.
3. Student willingness to participate remains about the same as it has been over the past few years.
4. Don't know
68. Check below the areas in which you involve parents or other citizens in a planning-advisory capacity in your school district.

a. Objectives and priorities for the school  
b. Program changes and new programs being considered  
c. Student activities  
d. Student behavior, rights and responsibilities  
e. Finance and budget  
f. Evaluation of programs  
g. Evaluation of personnel  
h. General administration  
i. Fund raising  
j. Other (specify) __________________________

69. How often does your board evaluate your job performance? (Select only one).

1. Annually  
2. Semi-annually  
3. At contract renewal time only  
4. Never  
5. Other (specify): __________________________

70. What kind of procedure does your board use for evaluating your job performance? (Select only one).

1. Formal  
2. Informal  
3. Both of these  
4. I am not evaluated  
5. Don't know  
6. Other (specify): __________________________

71. If you are not formally evaluated, do you see a need to develop a formal procedure?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. I do not know  
4. Other (specify): __________________________

72. If you are not formally evaluated, does your board of education see a need to develop a formal procedure?

1. Yes  
2. No  
3. I do not know  
4. Other (specify): __________________________

73. In your opinion, which of the following are reasons for your board evaluating you? (Select the two most important).

1. To provide periodic accountability  
2. To establish evidence for dismissal  
3. To identify areas needing improvement  
4. To point out strengths  
5. To document general dissatisfaction with your performance  
6. To help you establish relevant performance goals  
7. To assess present performance in accordance with prescribed standards  
8. To comply with board policy  
9. To determine qualifications for permanent status  
10. To determine salary for the following year  
11. Other (specify): __________________________

12. Don't know  
13. Question does not apply  

74. For each of the following criteria, please indicate the degree to which each criterion is a factor in your evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat a Factor</th>
<th>Not a Factor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. General effectiveness of your performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Your personal characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Educational leadership and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Management functions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Recruitment, employment and supervision of personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Budget development and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Board/superintendent relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Staff/superintendent relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Student/superintendent relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Community/superintendent relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75. Which of the following methods are used in your evaluation by the board? (Select the two most important.)

01. Discussion at executive meeting of board members only
02. Discussion at a meeting of the board and the superintendent
03. Rating forms used individually and/or collectively
04. Written evaluation presented to the superintendent
05. Criteria for the appraisal developed in advance by the board
06. Criteria previously agreed to by the board and the superintendent
07. The superintendent is rated on each criterion
08. Board consults others before completion of its evaluation
09. Observation and association of board and the superintendent at meetings, other times
10. Assessment of the superintendent's written reports
11. Evaluation against goals and objectives for past year
12. Comparison with other districts
13. The superintendent has the opportunity to respond to board evaluation
14. The superintendent has the opportunity to measure the performance of the board
15. Other (Specify):
16. Don't know
17. Question does not apply

76. From your point of view, which of the following are your board's primary expectations of you as a superintendent? (Select only two.)

1. Skill in human relations
2. Knowledge of finance
3. Intangible aspects
4. P.A. - community relations
5. Curriculum development
6. Planning
7. Other (Specify):

77. Do you have a formal job description?

1. Yes
2. No

78. If you have a formal job description, are you evaluated against the criteria in the description?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. Does not apply

79. As superintendent, what do you see as the most difficult problem your board members face as board members? (List only one.)

80. Listed below are some individuals/groups which may be sources of information to school board members for decision-making purposes. From your perspective how much weight do board members give information from each of these groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Very great weight</th>
<th>Considerable weight</th>
<th>Some weight</th>
<th>Little weight</th>
<th>No weight at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. District superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Central office staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers' organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Social interest groups in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Local parent structure in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. School board organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Greater visibility of the superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Increasing attacks on the superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Use of drugs and alcohol in the schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changes in values and behavioral norms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Special education/Title IX issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Accountability/Episodic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Community involvement in school districts decision making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Affirmative Action Programs/Title IX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Student discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Planning and goal setting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Administrator-board relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Developing and funding instructional programs for new alumni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Staff recruiting/recruitment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Personal time management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Parent equity and responsibility about their own children including child abuse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Student rights in terms of due process requirements and campus imposed procedures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Compliance with state and federal record keeping requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Obtaining timely and accurate information for decision making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>School facilities for handicapped students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Staff and administrator evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### V. Professional Preparation

123/150-41  61. What is the highest earned degree you hold? (Select only one)
   01. Less than B.A.  
   02. Bachelor's Degree  
   03. Master's degree in education  
   04. Master's degree  
   05. Master's degree plus some additional work  
   06. Master's degree plus some additional non-education work  
   07. Less than degree (Specify)  

123/152-43  64. In each of the following areas did you major as an undergraduate? If you
   majored in more than one, choose the one with the most hours. (Select only one).
   01. Agriculture  
   02. Business  
   03. Education (other than pre-K)  
   04. Fine Arts  
   05. Humanities (e.g., literature, history, etc.)  
   06. Inner (Specify)  

123/154-45  65.-67. What was your major field of study for each of your graduate programs?
   (Specify)

123/156-47  Educational administration  
   and supervision  
   62. Educational administration  
   63. Educational supervision  
   64. Physical education  
   65. Mathematics or fine arts  
   66. Science or engineering  
   67. Business  
   68. Fine Arts  
   69. Humanities  
   70. No program listed  

123/158-49  68.-70. Please provide the following information only for graduate programs of study
   associated with administrative/management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>125/154-41</th>
<th>125/156-45</th>
<th>125/158-47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. Age at the start of degree study</td>
<td>62. Master's</td>
<td>63. Less than graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Age at completion of degree study</td>
<td>64. Master's</td>
<td>65. Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Did you receive a fellowship or assistantship?</td>
<td>66. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Indicate total amount of fellowship or assistantship award</td>
<td>67. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Was previous degree program associated with administrative or management field?</td>
<td>68. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Did you receive stipend or tuition?</td>
<td>69. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Did you receive an additional loan or other financial assistance from your employer?</td>
<td>70. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Did you receive any benefits?</td>
<td>71. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Did you pay your own expenses?</td>
<td>72. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Did you need any loan to complete your degree?</td>
<td>73. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. If yes, how much did you borrow?</td>
<td>74. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Years of administrative experience when degree was received</td>
<td>75. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Indicate number of semesters at or above quarter in full-time study</td>
<td>76. 1.00 1.00 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 186. Stress Tolerance - Environment

The atmosphere is often characterized as a stressful situation. Do you, or have you, felt...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high stress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High stress</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little stress</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace amount (none)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 187. Stress Tolerance - Family

Listed below are a number of things women sometimes trouble themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worry about the future</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry about the past</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry about the present</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry about the future</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 188. Stress Tolerance - Social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Situation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going to a formal dinner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a casual dinner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a party</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a social event</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 189. Stress Tolerance - Financial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Situation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting money</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home repairs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 190. Stress Tolerance - Physical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Situation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exercising</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating poorly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping poorly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being ill</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 191. Stress Tolerance - Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Situation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working too hard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working too little</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working too much</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working too little</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 192. Stress Tolerance - Personal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Situation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being alone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being unloved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being unloved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being unloved</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 193. Stress Tolerance - Professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Situation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being criticized</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being praised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being ignored</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being unappreciated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

EVALUATING SUPERINTENDENTS: STATE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR/SUPERINTENDENT ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS' SURVEY INSTRUMENT
**EVALUATING SUPERINTENDENTS**

**SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR ASSOCIATIONS**

**STATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Completing Survey</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The data collected through this survey will be used only for the purposes of this research project. Please check the most appropriate answer to each item. When you have completed the survey please place it in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope and return it to:

John Imbesater  
1601 Naughton Drive  
Newark, Ohio  43055

Thank you for your time and consideration.

**PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSE UNLESS INDICATED OTHERWISE**

**STATE LAW REQUIRING SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION**

1. In your state is there a law requiring boards of education to formally evaluate the superintendent?  
   - **YES**  
   - **NO**

   If yes, complete questions 2 through 9.  
   If no, skip to question 10.

2. In what year and month was the law enacted?  

3. In the law, is a formal job description for the superintendent required?  
   - **YES**  
   - **NO**

4. Does the law specify that the formal job description serve as the basis for the superintendent’s evaluation?  
   - **YES**  
   - **NO**

5. How often is the evaluation to be completed? (Check appropriate response)  
   - Annually  
   - Semi-annually  
   - Not Specified  
   - Other (Indicate Length)

6. Who provided the impetus for the law to be enacted? (Check as many as apply)  
   - Legislature  
   - Individual School Boards  
   - Individual Superintendents  
   - State School Boards Associations  
   - State Superintendents  
   - State Teachers Union Association  
   - Other (Specify)

7. Does the law apply to the state superintendent/commissioner?  
   - **YES**  
   - **NO**

8. Do you believe the law has been beneficial?  
   - **YES**  
   - **NO**
9. Have there been any legal challenges to the law? YES NO
10. Is there a law regarding such evaluation pending in your state? YES NO
11. Have such legislation been proposed? YES NO
   If yes, by whom? __________________________
12. Do you believe that such a law should be enacted? YES NO
13. Does your association have a formal position regarding a law
   for the evaluation of superintendents? (If a formal position
   does exist, please attach a copy with your returned survey)
   YES NO
14. Is the state superintendent/commissioner formally evaluated
   in your state? YES NO
15. Are superintendents able to gain tenure in your state?
   YES NO

STATE ASSISTANCE
16. Are resources regarding superintendent evaluation available to
   individual school districts from the state associations?
   YES NO
17. Are resources regarding superintendent evaluation available to
   individual school districts from the state department of educa-
   tion? YES NO
18. What is included? (Check as many as apply)
   Evaluation Booklet Sample Materials
   --- Personal Consultation (Evaluation Forms, etc.)
   --- Workshops for Superintendents Direct Assistance
   --- Workshops for School Board Other (Please Specify)
   Members

LEVEL OF EVALUATION EFFECTIVENESS
19. How would you rate the overall quality of superintendent evalua-
   tions conducted in the individual school districts in your state?
   (Check the most appropriate response)
   --- High Quality --- Low Quality
   --- Average --- Insufficient Information to
   Respond

20. Why would you rate the quality of superintendent evaluations
    that way?

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION
21. Would you like to receive a copy of the results of this survey?
    YES NO
22. A copy of your state law regarding superintendent evaluation and
    any resource materials available through your state association
    or state department of education would be appreciated.
    PLEASE SEND A COPY(S) WITH THIS SURVEY, IF POSSIBLE.
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SELECTED MODELS FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE SUPERINTENDENT
FIGURE C-1  A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE SUPERINTENDENT
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FIGURE C-2
THE ROLE OF POLICY AND EVALUATION IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT
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