St. Cloud State University

The Repository at St. Cloud State

Culminating Projects in Education Administration and Leadership

Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education

8-1988

A Research-to-Practice Paradigm: Determining Administration Evaluation Criteria

Diana Greenblau Kasper

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/edad_etds

 Part of the Educational Leadership Commons

A RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE PARADIGM: DETERMINING ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION CRITERIA

by

Diana Greenblau Kasper

B.S., St. Cloud State College, 1970
M.S., St. Cloud State University, 1976

A Field Study

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the

Specialist Degree

St. Cloud, Minnesota

August, 1988

This field study submitted by Diana Greenblau Kasper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Specialist at St. Cloud State University is hereby approved by the final evaluation committee.

Elaine Leach
Chairperson

Gary Dow

Dennis Nunes

Dean
School of Graduate and Continuing Studies

A RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE PARADIGM: DETERMINING ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION CRITERIA

Diana Greenblau Kasper

THE PROBLEM:

The problem in this study was to attempt to determine criteria for administrator evaluation generated by the current practicing administrators. The study investigated the influence of the administrator's position, years of experience, size of school, and size of teaching staff on the criteria identified. Further, the study compared the criteria in terms of whether or not current practicing administrators noted that the criteria should describe or presently did describe administrator evaluation. This comparison was used to examine the absence, the presence, or the shift of a research-to-practice paradigm.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Data for the study were collected by a questionnaire which was mailed to all the public school principals in the 32 largest school districts in Minnesota. A cover letter, the questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope were sent to 463 principals. Returns were received from 261 respondents or 56.4%.

The data were tested and interpreted by analysis of means, variance, and percentages. The .05 level was used to determine significant differences based on the analyses of variance which was determined before and after cluster computations. T-tests were done to compare paired clusters for respondents from all districts with respondents from District 742.

FINDINGS

Based on the analyses of the data, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Criteria identified reflected administrator's position within the school and school size.

2. Models ranked strongest to weakest were Leadership, Management by Objectives, Job Targets, and Results Oriented Management in Education.

3. No model was significantly dismissed so that a definitive paradigm shift could be demonstrated.

4. An evolving paradigm was confirmed with indicators primarily from the Leadership model.

5. When compared with all respondents, District 742 respondents showed similar ranking of the models.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Criteria for administrator evaluation must be designed to recognize the differences of school position and school size.

2. Criteria from the Leadership model should be incorporated into an administrator evaluation design.

3. District 742 Board of Education should investigate the possible implementation of an administrator evaluation system that is based on criteria generated by current practicing administrators as suggested by this study.

August, 1988
Month Year

Approved by Research Committee

Elaine L. Leach

Elaine L. Leach, Chairperson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Administrator evaluation has emerged as a major issue for boards of education. Members of school boards sought assurances that administrators were accomplishing objectives. They wanted criteria by which to evaluate administrators but often used instruments without regard for current educational emphasis (Green, 1972). Members of boards of education were quoted as not wanting to reinvent the wheel. By this they meant that they prefer to rely on some solid proven base. They looked to educational research for models. Educational research then becomes increasingly important as an influencing factor in decision-making. This was demonstrated in the determination of administrator evaluation criteria. Such criteria included tasks listed on the job description, performance objectives, performance compared to some standard, personality factors, attendance records, health as related to attendance, factors related to cooperativeness and team work, experience and level of professional development (Herman, 1978).

Often the choice of criteria was linked by design to the purpose of evaluation. These purposes were also wide-ranging and included improvement of instruction, improvement of task performance, screening of administrators for promotion or demotion, differentiation of administrative assignment, granting merit or performance pay, making

decisions about tenure or permanent appointment, increasing productivity of the individual or the total management team, and providing in-service and staff development programs (Herman, 1978).

In order to obtain data to reflect the current public school arena in which principals and assistant principals work, this study gathered data from administrators themselves. The study explored criteria for administrator evaluation and investigated the absence, the presence, or the shift of a research-to-practice paradigm.

HYPOTHESIS

The criteria for administrator evaluation resulting from data generated by current practicing administrators reflected the administrators themselves by their position, years of experience, size of school, and size of teaching staff. Further, a comparison of these criteria in terms of whether or not current practicing administrators note that these criteria should describe or presently do describe administrator evaluation revealed an evolving research-to-practice paradigm.

These criteria were drawn from a variety of models: Results Oriented Management (Project R. O. M. E., 1975), Job Targets (Melton, 1970; Nicholson, 1973; Holben, 1986), Management by Objectives (Mansergh, 1971; Gray & Burns, 1979), Competency Based (Andrews, 1970; Campbell, 1971; Castetter, 1971; Young, 1972; Redfern & Hershey 1981), and Leadership Management Indicators (Gorton & McIntire, 1978; Russell, Mazzarella, White & Maurer, 1985). These models covered

several decades and are or have been in use in public school systems in Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington.

For the purposes of this study, administrators were defined as principals in public elementary and secondary schools. Elementary was defined as kindergarten through grade 6 and secondary was defined as grade 7 through grade 12. Any principal of a middle school, regardless of the grade configuration in that school, was placed into the secondary school category. In this study all the principals contacted were employed in Minnesota in public elementary or secondary schools.

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Using the Minnesota Education Directory 1987-1988 issued by the Minnesota Department of Education, this researcher proposed to identify the 32 largest public school districts of the 435 in the state. Each of the 463 principals in these districts received a questionnaire with a return self-addressed stamped envelope.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part A included the independent variables. The responding principal was asked whether he or she had an elementary, middle school, or secondary responsibility; the number of years in that position; the number of students in that school; and the number of teachers (full-time equivalents) in the school. The dependent variables were in part B. A series of administrative functions were listed. The responding principals indicated the degree to which the function presently describes or

should describe a criterion of his or her job upon which an evaluation should be based.

The administrative functions reflected categories and a cluster analysis showed relative strength for those indicators selected from each category. The intent was to have sufficient evidence of each respondent's choices but not to overwhelm the respondent with choices.

A weighted scale from 0-9 gave respondents the choice to indicate 0 for absolutely no importance to 9 for maximum importance with respect to each function as a criterion for administrator evaluation.

This ratio method allowed for comparisons between and among the various criteria choices. It suggested conclusions about the categories from which the criteria choices were taken. This in turn became evidence in confirming a research-to-practice paradigm, describing the absence of any paradigm, or suggesting a paradigm shift. A pilot study ensured questionnaire directions and item clarity.

FIELD STUDY FORMAT

This field study includes five chapters. The literature review is the focus of the second chapter. The third chapter contains the detailed research design of the study and the statistical methods for analysis of the data. The data and statistical methods form the basis of Chapter IV. Chapter V draws conclusions from the data and contains suggestions for further study.

STATE UNIVERSITY
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Examining educational research and its impact on educational practice began with an analysis by Henry Barnard who originated American Journal of Education which, for the most part, reported educational practices. With the 1890s came the contributions of such influential figures as John Dewey and E. L. Thorndike. Widespread testing of student aptitude and achievement followed and reached its peak in the 1920s. The Depression and World War II years were years of educational research decline. Not until the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 did educational research begin to revive. Some growth indicators were the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (which allocated 10% of the total budget to the states for research), and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which provided sufficient additional research resources to fund 21 research and development centers, 20 regional education laboratories, and over 100 research training programs between 1965 and 1967 (Educational Research, 1977).

In 1972 Congress founded the National Institute of Education. It was only in these last 16 years that school management has had a federal center devoted to the usefulness of educational research. Prior to the 1970s, educational research was based on a linear model of development, diffusion, and evaluation (Gideonese, 1968; Glass,

1969; Glennon, 1967; Schutz, 1970). In the 1970s the knowledge production and internalization or utilization paradigm was introduced. It emphasized use of knowledge and products to improve education (Guba & Clark, 1974). Recent scholars stressed the pragmatic value of educational research and its impact on educational practice (Glass, McGaw, & Smith, 1981; Tuckman, 1978, 1979; Wilson, 1972).

The historical trend can be followed as it related to the evolving definition of an administrative leader. Early theories involved the impact of such traits as I. Q., birth order, child rearing variables, socioeconomic status, and social participation. These trait theories were largely abandoned in favor of situational theories of leadership based on the belief that instead of inherent leadership traits, there were simply leadership styles or behaviors that may change radically depending on the situation. Situationists had less interest in who the leader was than in what the leader did. Now research has turned again to leader traits and characteristics. This time the emphasis tried to identify characteristics of effective leaders in an attempt to differentiate between good leaders and poor leaders (Mazzarella, 1981).

This research development has led to the practice in public school districts of hiring administrators only after positive profiles have been indicated on the Administrator Perceiver instrument or the Principal's Assessment Center Report. Further evidence of this practice-based paradigm can be seen in the work of Gorton and McIntyre (1978), Blumberg and Greenfield (1980), and Goldhammer, et al (1971). Gorton and McIntyre (1978) in a national study of the principalship

found that effective principals have, as their strongest asset, the ability to work with a wide variety of constituents having various needs, interests, and expectations. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) found that effective principals talk about and exhibit a true caring about what goes on day-to-day in the school. Goldhammer, et al (1971) studied outstanding school principals whom he labeled beacons of brilliance and found that these principals had the ability to work effectively with people and had the ability to secure their cooperation.

Were districts evaluating administrators? In 1962, 29% of the school districts responding to an Educational Research Service survey had a formal evaluation procedure. However, a follow-up survey in 1985 reported that 86% of the 1,016 school districts reporting had a formal administrator evaluation. Most of the districts with no formal evaluation enrolled 2,500 students or less (Carnes, 1985).

What were districts evaluating? There was an enormous array of instruments, methods, and procedures. Phi Delta Kappa devoted an entire issue of its Hot Topic Series in 1985 to Administrator Evaluation. One model from Michigan used a three part approach: concensus on job description, yearly performance goals, and an evaluative discussion covering 19 points (Herman, 1978). Another model from Oregon had a careful and comprehensive list of behaviors to identify the ways the school principal created the school characteristics that determine student achievement (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985).

In West Virginia, the evaluation was based on finding the kinds and degrees of similarities and differences in performance

characteristics, interpersonal conditions, and personal qualities that distinguish the extent to which institutional goals and objectives were accomplished (Goodwin & Smith, 1985). In Richmond, Virginia and in Socorro, Texas, as recently as 1984, the checklist format was still in use with satisfactory or unsatisfactory ratings and a comments section to give suggestions for improvement (Carnes, 1985). In Illinois, the approach involved performance and personal growth objectives, progress reports, and a summary report with comments (Carnes, 1985). In Michigan, the Gwinn Area Community Schools used a rating of 110, 100, 90, or 80 on each of 32 descriptors with sections to record strengths, superior performance, progress achieved, and performance deficiencies (Carnes, 1985).

An example of a more comprehensive approach came from the Parkway School District in Missouri (Carnes, 1985). Here a three-part process for performance appraisal was used. First, critical elements of job description items and special objectives were specified by a reviewing administrator at the beginning of the review period. Second, a verbal progress review was completed midway through the review period. Third, a final written review and assessment of performance was completed along with an assessment completed by another administrator (Carnes, 1985). In the same study, the Newington Public Schools in Connecticut used a self-appraisal format (Carnes, 1985). The appraisal designations had implications for salary compensation (i.e., a rating of "commendable" meant a raise of 1.3 times the base). Similarly, in West Chester, Pennsylvania, ratings on job performance criteria and achievement of management objectives translated to a

salary level so that "very good" carried with it a pay scale of 40% above the base salary (Carnes, 1985). A growing number of districts in this same study did combine objectives, interviews, and checklist format. Washington School District in Phoenix, Arizona, had results oriented objectives, job components, checklist, and indicators for service to the district and professional growth activities (Carnes, 1985). Gary, Indiana used objectives and expected results, an appraisal interview, a development plan, and a checklist (Carnes, 1985). Rock Hill District 3 in South Carolina used performance planning, target setting, and an appraisal while Houston, Texas had both management by objectives and a checklist for generic management skills (Carnes, 1985).

A pattern clearly emerged from the literature. Administrative evaluation was important and an integral part of most school districts. Checklists were not the only method used for evaluation. More and more districts offered a three-component process for administrative evaluation. There was often a checklist of generic management skills taken from the job description. A self-directed development plan or annual goals and work plan were usually included. Finally, a face-to-face performance appraisal conference was conducted with some type of written confirmation.

The literature, by its sheer quantity, pointed to the interest in administrator evaluation. An ERIC search on the general topic of Administrator Evaluation resulted in 914 documents. When more specific descriptors were searched for principals and evaluations, 27 documents were available. This researcher studied 19 of them. An

documents alone described over 40 separate administrator evaluation models including over 1,900 descriptors. One form had 338 indicators (Project R. O. M. E., 1975). An understanding of criteria for the determination of administrator evaluation was necessary for school districts and boards of education before instituting this process.

This researcher, as a member of the District 742 Administrative Team and President of the District 742 Administrators' Association, acknowledges the significant ego involvement with this project. One purpose of this research was to provide information to District 742 for its process of administrator evaluation. However, moving an issue such as administrative evaluation through a complex school district bureaucracy had some inherent safeguards against undue influence of a single individual. The final decision rested with the Board of Education which was made up of six persons. An issue of this sort must have survived the decision-making process. This study provided a research base for such decisions.

Chapter III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

RESEARCH DESIGN OF THE DATA

Current practicing administrators in Minnesota public school districts were identified in the Minnesota Education Directory 1987-88 issued by the Minnesota Department of Education. This researcher selected all of the school districts whose combined kindergarten through grade 12 enrollment exceeded 4.150. The rationale was to eliminate all of those school districts whose size was very much smaller than District 742 yet allow for a range that would include districts somewhat smaller, the same size, and larger than District 742. Using this rationale, 32 of the 435 public school districts in Minnesota were selected. All of the 463 principals in these districts received a single page questionnaire with a return self-addressed, stamped envelope. A code identified the school district on each return envelope but not the individual administrator. The questionnaire was sent out bulk mail through District 742 but first class postage was provided on each return envelope.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part A, which included the independent variables, had four questions. The first question asked whether the responding principal had an elementary, elementary assistant, acting elementary, secondary, secondary assistant, or an acting secondary principalship. The second question asked about the

number of years worked in that position: less than 3 years, 3-5 years, 5-10 years, or over 10 years. The third question inquired as to the number of students in the school: under 500, 500-999, 1,000-2,000, or over 2,000. Finally, they were asked to indicate the number of certified teachers (in full-time equivalents) in the school: under 20, 21-39, 40-79, or over 80. Part B of the questionnaire comprised the independent variables. There were 20 generic administrative functions listed which were based on a review of the research on administrator evaluation. Selecting the functions to represent major categories of administrator evaluation was a considerable task and went through several revisions. The major categories were: job targets, results oriented management, management by objectives, and leadership management. Job targets involved functions which stand alone and were district driven (Holben, 1986). Four functions, items 1-4 on the questionnaire were used to identify the job target category. Job targets were objectives that related to the long-range issues of school improvement (Melton, 1970). For purposes of this study the items selected were:

1. Evaluates appropriateness of student cumulative record information based on needs of pupil personnel staff.
2. Designs specific strategies for handling frequently occurring discipline problems.
3. Reviews student test data to determine need for new curriculum.
4. Plans individual teacher conferences to discuss instructional effectiveness.

As Melton (1970) pointed out in his work on job targets, the targets must be within reach and they must be capable of being completed in a fixed period of time. The second category on the questionnaire was taken from the results oriented model (Project R. O. M. E., 1975). These items were the most difficult to select as there were 338 indicators from which to choose. Items 5-11 represented this model. These items were performance indicators as follows:

5. Selects methods for assisting teachers in developing more effective practices.
6. Selects diagnostic procedures to aid in the identification of student needs.
7. Disseminates information about the school, its students, and programs through school newspaper.
8. Writes set of school policy statements and develops handbook.
9. Plans budget on the basis of projected support needed for various school activities.
10. Determines allocation of funds based on school program needs.
11. Develops an effective pattern for parental conferences with teachers and counselors.

This model, as these indicators illustrate, was school driven and building based (Project R. O. M. E., 1975).

The third model selected was management by objectives identified by items 12-16:

12. Formulates performance objectives relating to system-wide goals.
13. Adopts standards of performance.

St. Cloud, Minnesota

14. Writes objectives to accomplish standards of performance.
15. Evaluates agreed upon objectives in self-appraisal format.
16. Evaluates agreed upon objectives in conference format with appraisers.

This model was outcome based and emphasized that only agreed upon objectives were to be evaluated (Zakrajsek, 1979).

Leadership functions formed the fourth and final model and were incorporated into items 17-20:

17. Organization and/or program planning (examples: clarifies mission, establishes annual goals and yearly work plans, organizes work groups and individuals to accomplish goals).
18. Program/plant management (examples: manages facilities and equipment, develops and manages the budget, provides for auxiliary and support services).
19. Public/Community relations (examples: maintains parental involvement, establishes community advisory committees, establishes a plan for promoting good public relations).
20. Professional responsibilities (examples: participates in professional organizations, establishes personal development plan).

This model was process driven and defined leadership in terms of cooperation and mutual participation (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985).

As indicated, the various administrative functions represented certain models: job targets, results oriented management, management by objectives, and leadership. While respondents were asked to

consider each separate function, a cluster analysis was anticipated for each category. For each of the 20 functions as well as for each of the 4 clustered categories data collected showed the degree to which those responding indicated the function presently does or should describe an aspect of their job on which to base an administrator evaluation.

A scale of 0-9 was developed to give respondents the choice to indicate 0 for absolutely no importance to 9 for maximum importance with respect to each function as a criterion for administrator evaluation. The scale tried to match a description to each numerical value as follows:

0 = of no importance

1 = of minimal importance

2 = of little importance

3 = of small importance

4 = of fair importance

5 = of some importance

6 = of moderate importance

7 = of considerable importance

8 = of much importance

9 = of maximum importance

The scale was devised to permit use of the ratio method for comparisons between and among the various criteria choices. It also permitted a closer look at the influence of the dependent variables, especially at the younger administrators in terms of years of experience in position. The dual scale of presently describes versus

should describe allowed for suggesting conclusions about the categories from which the criteria choices were taken. Were there models which administrators were suggesting should be abandoned? Were there evidences of an administrator evaluation paradigm? Was one model clearly to emerge as the one which should describe administrator evaluation?

A pilot study was conducted to ensure questionnaire directions and item clarity. Several portions of the original questionnaire were revised following the pilot study. Format was changed from several letter sized pages to one single legal size page. The clustering of items was rearranged so that items appeared in groupings that reflected their categories.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The dependent variables were measured to reflect the respondents who were the current administrators in public schools in Minnesota in the 32 largest of the 435 school districts. Frequency and percent were calculated for each of the independent variables: school position, years of experience, number of students in school, and number of teachers. Each of these variables was then examined with respect to each of the administrative functions scaled for presently describes and then for should describe on the 0-9 scale previously mentioned. The purpose of using these scales was to obtain frequency of response by scale. In order to get a picture of each model, clusters 1-8 were devised:

St. Cloud, Minnesota

Cluster 1 Job Targets/Presently Describes

Cluster 2 Results Oriented Management/Presently Describes

Cluster 3 Management by Objectives/Presently Describes

Cluster 4 Leadership/Presently Describes

Cluster 5 Job Targets/Should Describe

Cluster 6 Results Oriented Management/Should Describe

Cluster 7 Management by Objectives/Should Describe

Cluster 8 Leadership/Should Describe

Again, each independent variable was examined with respect to each cluster. An analysis of variance was computed. The Scheffe procedure was completed to see whether any two groups were significant. The Pearson correlation was produced for each of the administrative functions showing coefficient, cases, and significance. This was repeated between each group and within each group. Finally, T-Tests were done to study paired groups of clusters:

Cluster 1 and Cluster 5
(Job Targets)

Cluster 2 and Cluster 6
(Results Oriented Management)

Cluster 3 and Cluster 7
(Management by Objectives)

Cluster 4 and Cluster 8
(Leadership)

Evidence of any paradigm was considered. All school districts in the study were noted with respect to any paradigm. District 742 was isolated to see whether or not a paradigm could be determined. District 742 was then compared with respect to the other school districts in the study.

Chapter IV

DATA AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data collected for this study were obtained by questionnaires received from public school principals in Minnesota representing the largest 32 school districts in the state. The data were processed by Academic Computer Services of St. Cloud State University. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX) was used to compute frequency tables, one-way analysis of variance, analysis of variance for clusters and sets of clusters, multiple range test, Pearson's product-moment correlation, Scheffe procedure, and T-tests.

Table 1

Frequency of Respondents by Location

	District	Frequency	Percent
1.	Anoka	29	11.1
2.	Albert Lea	6	2.3
3.	Bemidji	6	2.3
4.	Bloomington	11	4.2
5.	Brainerd	6	2.3
6.	Burnsville	7	2.7
7.	Duluth	11	4.2
8.	Edina	2	.8
9.	Elk River	4	1.5
10.	Forest Lake	6	2.3
11.	Grand Rapids	5	1.9
12.	Hastings	5	1.9
13.	Hopkins	3	1.1
14.	Mankato	8	3.1
15.	Minneapolis	26	10.0
16.	Minnetonka	7	2.7
17.	Moorhead	6	2.3
18.	Moundsview	7	2.7
19.	North St. Paul	7	2.7
20.	Richfield	3	1.1
21.	Robbinsdale	10	3.8
22.	Rochester	9	3.4
23.	Rosemount	7	2.7
24.	Roseville	3	1.1
25.	St. Cloud	11	4.2
26.	St. Louis Park	3	1.1
27.	St. Paul	26	10.0
28.	South Washington Cty.	5	1.9
29.	Stillwater	6	2.3
30.	Wayzata	4	1.5
31.	White Bear Lake	8	3.1
32.	Winona	4	1.5
		261	100.0

Note. Of the 463 questionnaires sent out, 261 were returned for a return rate of 56.4%.

Table 2

Frequency of Respondents by Position

	Position	Frequency	Percent
1.	Elementary Principal	174	66.8
2.	Elementary Asst. Principal	10	3.8
3.	Secondary Principal	66	25.3
4.	Secondary Asst. Principal	4	1.5
5.	Acting Secondary Principal	3	1.1
6.	Other/Missing	4	1.5
		261	100.0

Note. Respondents were told to include middle school principalships in the secondary level categories. Respondents reported 70.6% in the elementary categories and 27.9% in secondary categories.

Table 3

Frequency of Respondents by Experience

Experience	Frequency	Percent
Less than 3 years	65	24.9
3-5 years	38	14.6
5-10 years	28	10.7
Over 10 years	128	49.0
Other/Missing	2	.8
	261	100.0

Note. Respondents represented significant years of experience in the principalship with 49% reporting over ten years of experience. The balance of those who reported was shown in the 50.2% who reported ten years or less experience.

STATE UNIVERSITY
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Table 4

Frequency of Respondents by School Size

School Size	Frequency	Percent
Under 500 students	71	27.2
500-999 students	141	54.0
1,000-2,000 students	37	14.2
Over 2,000 students	10	3.8
Other/Missing	2	.8
	261	100.0

Note. Respondents reported their school size in the range of 500-999 students most often with 54% in that range. Overall, 212 respondents reported schools with 999 students or less; 81.2% of those who reported indicated 999 students or less.

Table 5

Frequency of Respondents by Staff Size

No. of Certified Teachers	Frequency	Percent
Under 20 teachers	32	12.3
21-39 teachers	119	45.6
40-79 teachers	77	29.5
Over 80 teachers	30	11.5
Other/Missing	3	1.1
	261	100.0

Note. Respondents were told to calculate the number of certified teachers based on full-time equivalents (FTE). There were 57.9% who reported 39 teachers or less. This matched the previous table with most respondents reporting 999 students or less. There existed a direct relationship of size of school to students which was not unexpected. It did confirm an average of 25.6 students per staff member.

Table 6

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #1: Evaluates Appropriateness of Student Cumulative Record Information Based on Needs of Pupil Personnel Staff.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	14	5.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	38	14.6
2	Of Little Importance	26	10.0
3	Of Small Importance	24	9.2
4	Of Fair Importance	38	14.6
5	Of Some Importance	44	16.9
6	Of Moderate Importance	30	11.5
7	Of Considerable Importance	26	10.0
8	Of Much Importance	8	3.1
9	Of Maximum Importance	3	1.1
	Other/Missing	10	3.8
		261	100.0

Note. Mean was 3.9 and the mode 5.0.

St. Cloud, Minnesota

Table 7

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #2: Designs Specific Strategies for Handling Frequently Occurring Discipline Problems.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	3	1.1
2	Of Little Importance	10	3.8
3	Of Small Importance	11	4.2
4	Of Fair Importance	10	3.8
5	Of Some Importance	18	6.9
6	Of Moderate Importance	25	9.6
7	Of Considerable Importance	69	26.4
8	Of Much Importance	65	24.9
9	Of Maximum Importance	46	17.6
	Other/Missing	2	.8
		261	100.0

Note. Mean was 6.7 and mode 7.0.

Table 8

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #3: Reviews Student Test Data to Determine Need for New Curriculum

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	6	2.3
1	Of Minimal Importance	10	3.8
2	Of Little Importance	16	6.1
3	Of Small Importance	21	8.0
4	Of Fair Importance	18	6.9
5	Of Some Importance	28	10.7
6	Of Moderate Importance	40	15.3
7	Of Considerable Importance	50	19.2
8	Of Much Importance	37	14.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	34	13.0
	Other/Missing	1	.4
		261	100.0

Note. Mean was 5.8 and mode 7.0.

Table 9

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #4: Plans Individual Teacher Conferences to Discuss Instructional Effectiveness

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	0	0
1	Of Minimal Importance	0	0
2	Of Little Importance	5	1.9
3	Of Small Importance	8	3.1
4	Of Fair Importance	11	4.2
5	Of Small Importance	18	6.9
6	Of Moderate Importance	21	8.0
7	Of Considerable Importance	47	18.0
8	Of Much Importance	50	19.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	98	37.5
	Other/Missing	3	1.1
		261	100.0

Note. Mean was 7.3 and mode 9.0.

Table 10

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #5: Selects Methods for Assisting Teachers in Developing More Effective Practices.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	0	0
1	Of Minimal Importance	2	.8
2	Of Little Importance	11	4.2
3	Of Small Importance	8	3.1
4	Of Fair Importance	10	3.8
5	Of Small Importance	36	13.8
6	Of Moderate Importance	38	14.6
7	Of Considerable Importance	49	18.8
8	Of Much Importance	45	17.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	60	23.0
	Other/Missing	2	.8
		261	100.0

Note. Mean was 6.7 and mode 9.0.

Table 11

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #6: Selects Diagnostic Procedures to Aid in the Identification of Student Needs.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	5	1.9
1	Of Minimal Importance	17	6.5
2	Of Little Importance	26	10.0
3	Of Small Importance	24	9.2
4	Of Fair Importance	37	14.2
5	Of Some Importance	44	16.9
6	Of Moderate Importance	42	16.1
7	Of Considerable Importance	24	9.2
8	Of Much Importance	23	8.8
9	Of Maximum Importance	14	5.4
	Other/Missing	5	1.9
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 4.8 and mode 5.0.

Table 12

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #7: Disseminates Information About the School, Its Students, and Programs Through School Newsletter.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	6	2.3
2	Of Little Importance	1	.4
3	Of Small Importance	5	1.9
4	Of Fair Importance	16	6.1
5	Of Small Importance	15	5.7
6	Of Moderate Importance	28	10.7
7	Of Considerable Importance	52	19.9
8	Of Much Importance	69	26.4
9	Of Maximum Importance	64	24.5
	Other/Missing	3	1.1
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.06 and mode 8.0.

Table 13

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #8: Writes Set of School Policy Statements and Develops Handbook.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	1	.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	4	1.5
2	Of Little Importance	13	5.0
3	Of Small Importance	7	2.7
4	Of Fair Importance	19	7.3
5	Of Small Importance	21	8.0
6	Of Moderate Importance	40	15.3
7	Of Considerable Importance	59	22.6
8	Of Much Importance	45	17.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	49	18.8
	Other/Missing	3	1.1
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.5 and mode 7.0.

Table 14

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #9: Plans Budget on Basis of Projected Support Needed for Various School Activities.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	9	3.4
2	Of Little Importance	8	3.1
3	Of Small Importance	5	1.9
4	Of Fair Importance	6	2.3
5	Of Some Importance	17	6.5
6	Of Moderate Importance	29	11.1
7	Of Considerable Importance	57	21.8
8	Of Much Importance	61	23.4
9	Of Maximum Importance	66	25.3
	Other/Missing	1	.4
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.9 and mode 9.0.

Table 15

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #10: Determines Allocation of Funds Based on School Program Needs.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	6	2.3
1	Of Minimal Importance	11	4.2
2	Of Little Importance	13	5.0
3	Of Small Importance	3	1.1
4	Of Fair Importance	11	4.2
5	Of Some Importance	21	8.0
6	Of Moderate Importance	24	9.2
7	Of Considerable Importance	51	19.5
8	Of Much Importance	56	21.5
9	Of Maximum Importance	63	24.1
	Other/Missing	2	.8
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.6 and mode 9.0.

Table 16

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #11: Develops an Effective Pattern for Parental Conferences with Teachers and Counselors.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	3	1.1
1	Of Minimal Importance	4	1.5
2	Of Little Importance	7	2.7
3	Of Small Importance	8	3.1
4	Of Fair Importance	12	4.6
5	Of Some Importance	28	10.7
6	Of Moderate Importance	34	13.0
7	Of Considerable Importance	63	24.1
8	Of Much Importance	49	18.8
9	Of Maximum Importance	49	18.8
	Other/Missing	4	1.5
		261	100.0

Note. Mean was 6.6 and mode 7.0.

St. Cloud, Minnesota

Table 17

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #12: Formulates Performance Objectives Relating to System-Wide Goals.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	5	1.9
1	Of Minimal Importance	7	2.7
2	Of Little Importance	14	5.4
3	Of Small Importance	15	5.7
4	Of Fair Importance	17	6.5
5	Of Some Importance	30	11.5
6	Of Moderate Importance	31	11.9
7	Of Considerable Importance	60	23.0
8	Of Much Importance	47	18.0
9	Of Maximum Importance	28	10.7
	Other/Missing	7	2.7
		261	100.0

Note. Mean was 6.0 and mode 7.0.

Table 18

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #13: Adapts Standards of Performance.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	4	1.5
1	Minimal Importance	4	1.5
2	Of Little Importance	15	5.7
3	Of Small Importance	11	4.2
4	Of Fair Importance	16	6.1
5	Of Some Importance	22	8.4
6	Of Moderate Importance	41	15.7
7	Of Considerable Importance	65	24.9
8	Of Much Importance	39	14.9
9	Of Maximum Importance	34	13.0
	Other/Missing	10	3.8
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.2 and mode 7.0.

Table 19

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #14: Writes Objectives to Accomplish Standards of Performance.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	7	2.7
1	Of Minimal Importance	9	3.4
2	Of Little Importance	19	7.3
3	Of Small Importance	18	6.9
4	Of Fair Importance	19	7.3
5	Of Some Importance	26	10.0
6	Of Moderate Importance	38	14.6
7	Of Considerable Importance	50	19.2
8	Of Much Importance	40	15.3
9	Of Maximum Importance	28	10.7
	Other/Missing	7	2.7
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 5.7 and the mode 7.0.

St. Cloud, Minnesota

Table 20

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #15: Evaluates Agreed Upon Objectives in Self-Appraisal Format.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	7	2.7
1	Of Minimal Importance	10	3.8
2	Of Little Importance	10	3.8
3	Of Small Importance	18	6.9
4	Of Fair Importance	19	7.3
5	Of Some Importance	25	9.6
6	Of Moderate Importance	32	12.3
7	Of Considerable Importance	54	20.7
8	Of Much Importance	46	17.6
9	Of Maximum Importance	34	13.0
	Other/Missing	6	2.3
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 5.9 and the mode 7.0.

St. Cloud, Minnesota

Table 21

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #16: Evaluates Agreed Upon Objectives in Conference Format with Appraisers.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	9	3.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	11	4.2
2	Of Little Importance	13	5.0
3	Of Small Importance	13	5.0
4	Of Fair Importance	17	6.5
5	Of Some Importance	26	10.0
6	Of Moderate Importance	31	11.9
7	Of Considerable Importance	47	18.0
8	Of Much Importance	51	19.5
9	Of Maximum Importance	36	13.8
	Other/Missing	7	2.7
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 5.9 and mode 8.0.

Table 22

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #17: Organization and/or Program Planning.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	3	1.1
1	Of Minimal Importance	5	1.9
2	Of Little Importance	2	.8
3	Of Small Importance	5	1.9
4	Of Fair Importance	15	5.7
5	Of Some Importance	17	6.5
6	Of Moderate Importance	41	15.7
7	Of Considerable Importance	58	22.2
8	Of Much Importance	50	19.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	64	24.5
	Other/Missing	1	.4
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.9 and the mode 9.0.

STATE UNIVERSITY
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Table 23

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #18: Program/Plant Management.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	4	1.5
2	Of Little Importance	7	2.7
3	Of Small Importance	9	3.4
4	Of Fair Importance	26	10.0
5	Of Some Importance	15	5.7
6	Of Moderate Importance	44	16.9
7	Of Considerable Importance	57	21.8
8	Of Much Importance	56	21.5
9	Of Maximum Importance	39	14.9
	Other/Missing	2	.8
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.5 and the mode 7.0.

St. Cloud, Minnesota

Table 24

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #19: Public/Community Relations.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	1	.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	3	1.1
2	Of Little Importance	1	.4
3	Of Small Importance	3	1.1
4	Of Fair Importance	14	5.4
5	Of Some Importance	11	4.2
6	Of Moderate Importance	23	8.8
7	Of Considerable Importance	51	19.5
8	Of Much Importance	69	26.4
9	Of Maximum Importance	84	32.2
	Other/Missing	1	.4
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.4 and the mode 9.0.

Table 25

Frequency of "Presently Describes" Responses for Administrative Function #20: Professional Responsibilities.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	5	1.9
2	Of Little Importance	11	4.2
3	Of Small Importance	14	5.4
4	Of Fair Importance	17	6.5
5	Of Some Importance	22	8.4
6	Of Moderate Importance	35	13.4
7	Of Considerable Importance	47	18.0
8	Of Much Importance	45	17.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	62	23.8
	Other/Missing	1	.4
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.5 and mode 9.0.

Table 26

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #1: Evaluates Appropriateness of Student Cumulative Record Information Based on Needs of Pupil Personnel Staff.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	10	3.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	29	11.1
2	Of Little Importance	25	9.6
3	Of Small Importance	20	7.7
4	Of Fair Importance	33	12.6
5	Of Some Importance	49	18.8
6	Of Moderate Importance	26	10.0
7	Of Considerable Importance	24	9.2
8	Of Much Importance	19	7.3
9	Of Maximum Importance	12	4.6
	Other/Missing	14	5.4
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 4.4 and mode 5.0.

Table 27

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function # 2: Designs Specific Strategies for Handling Frequently Occurring Discipline Problems.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	1	.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	4	1.5
2	Of Little Importance	11	4.2
3	Of Small Importance	13	5.0
4	Of Fair Importance	8	3.1
5	Of Some Importance	22	8.4
6	Of Moderate Importance	23	8.8
7	Of Considerable Importance	69	26.4
8	Of Much Importance	52	19.9
9	Of Maximum Importance	53	20.3
	Other/Missing	5	1.9
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.7 and mode 7.0.

Table 28

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #3: Review Student Test Data to Determine Need for New Curriculum.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	1	.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	2	.8
2	Of Little Importance	9	3.4
3	Of Small Importance	12	4.6
4	Of Fair Importance	11	4.2
5	Of Some Importance	23	8.8
6	Of Moderate Importance	21	8.0
7	Of Considerable Importance	62	23.8
8	Of Much Importance	59	22.6
9	Of Maximum Importance	56	21.5
	Other/Missing	5	1.9
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.8 and mode 7.0.

Table 29

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #4: Plans Individual Teacher Conferences to Discuss Instructional Effectiveness.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	0	0
1	Of Minimal Importance	1	.4
2	Of Little Importance	2	.8
3	Of Small Importance	2	.8
4	Of Fair Importance	2	.8
5	Of Small Importance	5	1.9
6	Of Moderate Importance	9	3.4
7	Of Considerable Importance	42	16.1
8	Of Much Importance	64	24.5
9	Of Maximum Importance	130	49.8
	Other/Missing	4	1.5
		261	100.0

Note. Mean was 8.0 and mode was 9.0.

Table 30

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #5: Selects Methods for Assisting Teachers in Developing More Effective Practices.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	0	0
1	Of Minimal Importance	1	.4
2	Of Little Importance	2	.8
3	Of Small Importance	4	1.5
4	Of Fair Importance	2	.8
5	Of Some Importance	11	4.2
6	Of Moderate Importance	23	8.8
7	Of Considerable Importance	51	19.5
8	Of Much Importance	66	25.3
9	Of Maximum Importance	96	36.8
	Other/Missing	5	1.9
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.6 and mode 9.0.

Table 31

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #6: Selects Diagnostic Procedures to Aid in the Identification of Student Needs

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	4	1.5
1	Of Minimal Importance	8	3.1
2	Of Little Importance	18	6.9
3	Of Small Importance	15	5.7
4	Of Fair Importance	24	9.2
5	Of Some Importance	35	13.4
6	Of Moderate Importance	51	19.5
7	Of Considerable Importance	40	15.3
8	Of Much Importance	33	12.6
9	Of Maximum Importance	26	10.0
	Other/Missing	7	2.7
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 5.6 and mode 6.0.

Table 32

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #7: Disseminates Information About the School, Its Students, and Programs Through School Newsletter

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	0	0.0
2	Of Little Importance	0	0.0
3	Of Small Importance	7	2.7
4	Of Fair Importance	8	3.1
5	Of Some Importance	16	6.1
6	Of Moderate Importance	28	10.7
7	Of Considerable Importance	42	16.1
8	Of Much Importance	79	30.3
9	Of Maximum Importance	72	27.6
	Other/Missing	7	2.7
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.3 and mode 8.0.

Table 33

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #8: Writes Set of School Policy Statements and Develops Handbook

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	1	.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	2	.8
2	Of Little Importance	5	1.9
3	Of Small Importance	13	5.0
4	Of Fair Importance	19	7.3
5	Of Some Importance	23	8.8
6	Of Moderate Importance	29	11.1
7	Of Considerable Importance	54	20.7
8	Of Much Importance	50	19.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	59	22.6
	Other/Missing	6	2.3
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.7 and mode 9.0.

Table 34

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #9: Plans Budget on the Basis of Projected Support Needed for Various School Activities

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	0	0.0
1	Of Minimal Importance	1	.4
2	Of Little Importance	3	1.1
3	Of Small Importance	3	1.1
4	Of Fair Importance	8	3.1
5	Of Some Importance	14	5.4
6	Of Moderate Importance	24	9.2
7	Of Considerable Importance	54	20.7
8	Of Much Importance	62	23.8
9	Of Maximum Importance	86	33.0
	Other/Missing	6	2.3
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.4 and mode 9.0.

Table 35

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #10: Determines Allocation of Funds Based on School Program Needs

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	1	.4
2	Of Little Importance	3	1.1
3	Of Small Importance	5	1.9
4	Of Fair Importance	7	2.7
5	Of Some Importance	14	5.4
6	Of Moderate Importance	21	8.0
7	Of Considerable Importance	58	22.0
8	Of Much Importance	60	23.0
9	Of Maximum Importance	85	32.6
	Other/Missing	5	1.9
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.4 and mode 9.0.

Table 36

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #11: Develops and Effective Pattern for Parental Conferences with Teachers and Counselors

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	5	1.9
2	Of Little Importance	1	.4
3	Of Small Importance	11	4.2
4	Of Fair Importance	11	4.2
5	Of Some Importance	23	8.8
6	Of Moderate Importance	28	10.7
7	Of Considerable Importance	62	23.8
8	Of Much Importance	51	19.5
9	Of Maximum Importance	61	23.4
	Other/Missing	6	2.3
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.8 and mode 7.0.

Table 37

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #12: Formulates Performance Objectives Relating to System-wide Goals

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	3	1.1
2	Of Little Importance	6	2.3
3	Of Small Importance	6	2.3
4	Of Fair Importance	13	5.0
5	Of Some Importance	21	8.0
6	Of Moderate Importance	27	10.3
7	Of Considerable Importance	62	23.8
8	Of Much Importance	63	24.1
9	Of Maximum Importance	47	18.0
	Other/Missing	11	4.2
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.8 and mode 8.0.

Table 38

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #13: Adopts Standards of Performance

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	1	.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	0	0.0
2	Of Little Importance	5	1.9
3	Of Small Importance	6	2.3
4	Of Fair Importance	9	3.4
5	Of Some Importance	20	7.7
6	Of Moderate Importance	36	13.8
7	Of Considerable Importance	58	22.2
8	Of Much Importance	55	21.1
9	Of Maximum Importance	56	21.5
	Other/Missing	15	5.7
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.0 and mode 7.0.

Table 39

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #14: Writes Objectives to Accomplish Standards of Performance

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	3	1.1
2	Of Little Importance	10	3.8
3	Of Small Importance	7	2.7
4	Of Fair Importance	15	5.7
5	Of Some Importance	25	9.6
6	Of Moderate Importance	35	13.4
7	Of Considerable Importance	60	23.0
8	Of Much Importance	48	18.4
9	Of Maximum Importance	45	17.2
	Other/Missing	11	4.2
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.5 and mode 7.0.

STATE UNIVERSITY

Table 40

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #15: Evaluates Agreed Upon Objectives in Self-Appraisal Format

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	3	1.1
2	Of Little Importance	7	2.7
3	Of Small Importance	10	3.8
4	Of Fair Importance	13	5.0
5	Of Some Importance	15	5.7
6	Of Moderate Importance	35	13.4
7	Of Considerable Importance	64	24.5
8	Of Much Importance	50	19.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	52	19.9
	Other/Missing	10	3.8
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.7 and mode 7.0.

Table 41

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #16: Evaluates Agreed Upon Objectives in Conference Format with Appraisers

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	3	1.1
1	Of Minimal Importance	0	0.0
2	Of Little Importance	4	1.5
3	Of Small Importance	5	1.9
4	Of Fair Importance	15	5.7
5	Of Some Importance	17	6.5
6	Of Moderate Importance	38	14.6
7	Of Considerable Importance	55	21.1
8	Of Much Importance	57	21.8
9	Of Maximum Importance	57	21.8
	Other/Missing	10	3.8
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.9 and mode 8.0.

Table 42

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #17: Organization and/or Program Planning

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	0	0.0
1	Of Minimal Importance	1	.4
2	Of Little Importance	3	1.1
3	Of Small Importance	2	.8
4	Of Fair Importance	6	2.3
5	Of Some Importance	14	5.4
6	Of Moderate Importance	24	9.2
7	Of Considerable Importance	57	21.8
8	Of Much Importance	68	26.1
9	Of Maximum Importance	83	31.8
	Other/Missing	3	1.1
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.5 and the mode 9.0.

Table 43

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #18: Program/Plant Management

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	1	.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	2	.8
2	Of Little Importance	9	3.4
3	Of Small Importance	9	3.4
4	Of Fair Importance	18	6.9
5	Of Some Importance	25	9.6
6	Of Moderate Importance	29	11.1
7	Of Considerable Importance	49	18.8
8	Of Much Importance	58	22.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	57	21.8
	Other/Missing	4	1.5
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 6.7 and mode 8.0.

Table 44

Frequency of "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Function #19: Public/Community Relations.

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	1	.4
1	Of Minimal Importance	0	0.0
2	Of Little Importance	1	.4
3	Of Small Importance	1	.4
4	Of Fair Importance	8	3.1
5	Of Some Importance	12	4.6
6	Of Moderate Importance	15	5.7
7	Of Considerable Importance	50	19.2
8	Of Much Importance	71	27.2
9	Of Maximum Importance	99	37.9
	Other/Missing	3	1.1
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.7 and mode 9.0.

Table 45

Frequency of "Should Describe "Responses for Administrative Function #20: Professional Responsibilities

Value	Label	Frequency	Percent
0	Of No Importance	2	.8
1	Of Minimal Importance	3	1.1
2	Of Little Importance	6	2.3
3	Of Small Importance	1	.4
4	Of Fair Importance	9	3.4
5	Of Some Importance	19	7.3
6	Of Moderate Importance	32	12.3
7	Of Considerable Importance	52	19.9
8	Of Much Importance	60	23.0
9	Of Maximum Importance	69	26.4
	Other/Missing	8	3.1
		261	100.0

Note. The mean was 7.1 and mode 9.0.

Table 46

Comparison of Frequencies of "Presently Describes" and "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Functions

Administrative Function	Presently Describes		Should Describe	
	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode
1. Evaluates appropriateness of student cumulative record information based on needs of pupil personnel staff.	3.9	5.0	4.4	5.0
2. Designs specific strategies for handling frequently occurring discipline problems.	6.7	7.0	6.7	7.0
3. Reviews student test data to determine need for new curriculum.	5.8	7.0	6.8	7.0
4. Plans individual teacher conferences to discuss instructional effectiveness.	7.3	9.0	8.0	9.0
5. Selects methods for assisting teachers in developing more effective practices.	6.7	9.0	7.6	9.0

Table 46 (continued)

Comparison of Frequencies of "Presently Describes" and "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Functions

Administrative Function	Presently Describes		Should Describe	
	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode
6. Selects diagnostic procedures in the identification of student needs.	4.8	5.0	5.6	6.0
7. Disseminates information about the school, its students, and program through school newsletter.	7.0	8.0	7.3	8.0
8. Writes set of school policy statements and develops handbook.	6.5	7.0	6.7	9.0
9. Plans budget on the basis of projected support needed for various school activities.	6.9	9.0	7.4	9.0
10. Determines allocation of funds on school program needs.	6.6	9.0	7.4	9.0
11. Develops an effective pattern for parental conferences with teachers and counselors.	6.6	7.0	6.8	7.0

STATE UNIVERSITY

Table 46 (continued)

Comparison of Frequencies of "Presently Describes" and "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Functions

Administrative Function	Presently Describes Mean	Presently Describes Mode	Should Describe Mean	Should Describe Mode
12. Formulates performance objectives relating to system-wide goals.	6.0	7.0	6.8	8.0
13. Adopts standards of performance.	6.2	7.0	7.0	7.0
14. Writes objectives to accomplish standards of performance.	5.7	7.0	6.5	7.0
15. Evaluates agreed upon objectives in self-appraisal format.	5.9	7.0	6.7	7.0
16. Evaluates agreed upon objectives in conference format with appraisers.	5.9	8.0	6.9	8.0
17. Organization and/or program planning.	6.9	9.0	7.5	9.0
18. Program/plant management	6.5	7.0	6.7	8.0

Table 46 (continued)

Comparison of Frequencies of "Presently Describes" and "Should Describe" Responses for Administrative Functions

Administrative Function	Presently Describes		Should Describe	
	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode
19. Public/community relations.	7.4	9.0	7.7	9.0
20. Professional responsibilities.	6.5	9.0	7.1	9.0

Note. Average of means for Presently Describes indicators 1-4 was 5.92 compared with Should Describe which was 6.47. This indicated respondents reported indicators 1-4 (Job Targets) as having moderate importance for job evaluation.

Average of means for Presently Describes indicators 5-12 was 6.38 compared with Should Describe which was 6.95. This indicated respondents reported indicators 5-12 (Results Oriented Management in Education) as having moderate importance for job evaluation.

Average of means for Presently Describes indicators 13-16 was 5.92 compared with Should Describe which was 6.77. This indicated respondents reported indicators 13-16 (Management by Objectives) as having moderate importance for job evaluation.

Average of means for Presently Describes indicators 17-20 was 6.82 compared with Should Describe which was 7.25. This indicated respondents reported indicators 17-20 (Leadership Model) as having considerable importance for job evaluation.

STATE UNIVERSITY

In Tables 47-54, the numbered groups reflected the respondents position within the school district:

Group 1	Elementary Principal
Group 2	Elementary Assistant Principal
Group 3	Acting Elementary Principal
Group 4	Secondary Principal
Group 5	Secondary Assistant Principal
Group 6	Acting Secondary Principal

Table 47

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #2 Position Within the School District

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	81.74	20.43
Within Groups	251	1461.28	5.64
Total	255	1498.02	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Reviews Test Data)	3.62	.0069	1.50	5	
			5.33	6	
			5.78	1	*
			5.98	4	*
			6.50	2	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were assistant secondary principals were significantly different from elementary principals, secondary principals, and elementary assistant principals.

Table 48

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #2 Position Within the School District

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	78.02	19.50
Within Groups	251	1090.09	4.34
Total	255	1168.12	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Plans Budget)	4.49	.0016	4.25	5	
			6.20	2	
			6.75	1	
			7.63	4	*
			8.33	6	

Note. * Denotes pair significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were assistant secondary principals were significantly different from secondary principals.

Table 49

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #2 Position Within the School District

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	140.86	35.21
Within Groups	250	1385.06	5.54
Total	254	1525.93	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Determines Allocation of Funds)	6.35	.0001	1.50	5	
			5.80	2	
			6.33	6	
			6.49	1	*
			7.26	4	*

Note. * Denotes pairs significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were assistant secondary principals were significantly different from elementary principals and secondary principals.

Table 50

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #2 Position Within the School District

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	111.58	27.89
Within Groups	245	1187.08	4.84
Total	249	1298.67	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Formulates Objectives)	5.75	.0002	2.55	5	
			2.66	6	
			5.00	2	
			6.10	1	*
			6.40	4	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were assistant secondary principals were significantly different from elementary principals and secondary principals.

Table 51

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #2 Position Within the School District

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	81.12	20.28
Within Groups	251	1091.62	4.51
Total	246	1172.75	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Adopts Standards)	4.4	.0016	2.50	5	
			3.66	6	
			5.70	2	
			6.34	1	*
			6.35	4	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were assistant secondary principals were significantly different from elementary and secondary principals.

STATE UNIVERSITY

Table 52

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #2 Position Within the School District

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	57.05	14.26
Within Groups	251	722.87	2.88
Total	255	779.93	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Public Community Relations)	4.9	.0007	5.00	5	
			5.33	6	
			7.32	1	
			7.69	4	
			8.60	2	*

Note. * Denotes pair significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were assistant secondary principals were significantly different from elementary assistant principals.

STATE UNIVERSITY

Table 53

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #2 Position within the School District

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	61.41	15.3
Within Groups	248	721.64	2.9
Total	252	783.06	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Should Describe (Determines Allocations)	5.27	.0004	4.25	5	
			5.33	6	
			7.38	1	*
			7.40	2	*
			7.76	4	*
					5

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were assistant secondary principals were significantly different from elementary principals, elementary assistant principals, and secondary principals.

Table 54

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #2 Position Within the School District

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	29.87	7.46
Within Groups	250	521.51	2.08
Total	254	551.39	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Should Describe (Public/Community Relations)	3.58	.0074	5.00	6	
			6.75	5	
			7.72	4	*
			7.78	1	*
			8.30	2	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were acting secondary principals were significantly different from secondary principals, elementary principals, and elementary assistant principals.

There were no pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level for Variable #3 Number of Years Worked.

In Tables 55-61, the numbered groups reflected the size of school of the respondents.:

Group 1	Under 500 students
Group 2	500-999 students
Group 3	1,000-2,000 students
Group 4	Over 2,000 students

Table 55

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 Size of School

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	72.76	24.25
Within Groups	245	1216.78	4.96
Total	248	1289.55	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Evaluates Student Records)	4.88	.0026	1.70	4	
			3.78	2	*
			4.02	3	*
			4.87	1	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were in schools with over 2,000 students were significantly different from those in any of the other size schools.

Table 56

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 Size of School

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	55.06	18.35
Within Groups	253	998.92	3.94
Total	256	1053.99	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Designs Discipline)	4.64	.0035	4.70	4	
			6.51	3	
			6.79	2	*
			7.14	1	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were in schools with over 2,000 students were significantly different from those in schools with 500-999 students and those in schools with under 500 students.

Table 57

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 Size of School.

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	97.09	32.36
Within Groups	254	1397.60	5.50
Total	257	1494.69	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Reviews Test Data)	5.88	.0007	4.30	4	4 & 2
			5.39	2	
			6.16	3	
			6.60	1	* *

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were in schools of less than 500 students were significantly different from either those in schools with 500-999 students or those in schools with over 2,000 students.

Table 58

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 Size of School

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	44.96	14.98
Within Groups	250	1281.41	5.12
Total	253	1326.38	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Selects Diagnostic Procedures)	2.92	.0345	3.10	4	
			4.64	3	
			4.79	2	
			5.27	1	*

Note. * Denotes pair significantly different at .05 level. Respondents who were in schools with over 2,000 students were significantly different from those in schools with less than 500 students.

Table 59

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 Size of School

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	52.76	17.58
Within Groups	245	1130.94	4.61
Total	248	1183.71	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Adopts Standards)	3.8	.0107	3.87	4	4
			6.17	3	
			6.18	2	*
			6.57	1	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level. Respondents who were in schools with over 2,000 students were significantly different from those who were in schools of less than 500 students or in schools with 500-999 students.

Table 60

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 School Size

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	77.60	25.86
Within Groups	241	1383.27	5.73
Total	244	1460.88	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Should Describe (Evaluates Student Records)	4.5	.0043	1.80	4	
			4.47	2	*
			4.62	3	*
			4.75	1	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were in schools with over 2,000 students were significantly different from those in any of the other size schools.

Table 61

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 School Size

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	52.77	17.59
Within Groups	250	1050.37	4.20
Total	253	1103.15	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Should Describe (Designs Discipline)	4.18	.0065	4.80	4	
			6.27	3	
			6.80	2	*
			7.05	1	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were in schools with over 2,000 students were significantly different from those in schools with either 500-999 students or with less than 500 students.

In Tables 62-64, the numbered groups reflected the number of certified teachers:

Group 1 Under 20 Teachers

*Group 2 21-39 Teachers

Group 3 40-79 Teachers

Group 4 Over 80 Teachers

Table 62

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 Number of Certified Teachers

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	50.18	16.72
Within Groups	253	1430.08	5.62
Total	256	1480.27	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Reviews Test Data)	2.95	.0329	5.49	3	3
			5.58	4	
			5.75	2	
			6.93	1	*

Note. * Denotes pair significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents whose staff consisted of 40-79 teachers were significantly different from those with under 20 teachers.

Table 63

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 Number of Certified Teachers

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	53.68	17.89
Within Groups	253	1119.54	4.42
Total	256	1173.23	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Presently Describes (Plans Budget)	4.04	.0078	6.55	2	
			6.62	1	
			7.26	4	
			7.55	3	*

Note. * Denotes pair significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents whose staff consisted of 21-39 teachers were significantly different from those with 40-79 teachers.

Table 64

One Way Analysis of Variance Before Cluster Computations Using Scheffe Procedure for Variable #4 Number of Certified Teachers

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	41.45	13.81
Within Groups	247	1235.04	5.00
Total	250	1276.50	

Administrative Function	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Should Describe (Selects Diagnostic Procedures)	2.7	.0426	4.62	4	
			5.62	3	
			5.90	1	
			5.93	2	*

Note. * Denotes pair significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents whose staff consisted of over 80 teachers was significantly different from those with 21-39 teachers.

In Tables 65 and 66, the "Presently Describes" (P) and "Should Describe" (S) Dependent Variables were designated as follows:

P1/S1 Evaluates appropriateness of student cumulative record information based on needs of pupil personnel staff.

P2/S2 Designs specific strategies for handling frequently occurring discipline problems.

P3/S3 Reviews student test data to determine need for new curriculum.

P4/S4 Plans individual teacher conferences to discuss instructional effectiveness.

P5/S5 Selects methods for assisting teachers in developing more effective practices.

P6/S6 Selects diagnostic procedures to aid in the identification of student needs.

P7/S7 Disseminates information about the school, its students, and programs through school newsletter.

P8/S8 Writes set of school policy statements and develops handbook.

P9/S9 Plans budget on the basis of projected support needed for various school activities.

P10/S10 Determines allocation of funds based on school program needs.

P11/S11 Develops an effective pattern for parental conferences with teachers and counselors.

P12/S12 Formulates performance objectives relating to system-wide goals.

P13/S13 Adopts standards of performance.

P14/S14 Writes objectives to accomplish standards of performance.

P15/S15 Evaluates agreed upon objectives in self-appraisal format.

P16/S16 Evaluates agreed upon objectives in conference format with appraisers.

P17/S17 Organization and/or program planning (examples: clarifies mission, establishes annual goals and yearly work plans, organizes work groups and individuals to accomplish goals).

P18/S18 Program/plant management (examples: manages facilities and equipment, develops and manages the budget, provides for auxiliary and support services).

P19/S19 Public/Community relations (examples: maintains parental involvement, establishes community advisory committees, establishes a plan for promoting good public relations).

P20/S20 Professional responsibilities (examples: participates in professional organizations, establishes personal development plan).

Table 65

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Before Cluster Computations
(coefficient/cases/significance)
Variables P1/S1--P10/S10

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
P1	.821 245 .000									
P2		.738 256 .000								
P3			.600 256 .000							
P4				.671 255 .000						
P5					.611 255 .000					
P6						.700 252 .000				
P7							.643 253 .000			
P8								.787 254 .000		
P9									.580 254 .000	
P10										.435 254 .000

Table 66

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Before Cluster Computations
(coefficient/cases/significance)
Variables P11/S11--P20/S20

	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	S16	S17	S18	S19	S20
P11	.634 253 .000									
P12		.672 249 .000								
P13			.637 245 .000							
P14				.649 249 .000						
P15					.658 250 .000					
P16						.644 250 .000				
P17							.690 257 .000			
P18								.659 256 .000		
P19									.644 257 .000	
P20										.676 252 .000

In Tables 67-70, the Independent Variables have been clustered to represent major administrator evaluation models:

Cluster 1	Job Targets
Cluster 2	Results Oriented Management in Education
Cluster 3	Management by Objectives
Cluster 4	Leadership

On Table 67 groups designated were the following:

Group 1	Elementary Principal
Group 2	Elementary Assistant Principal
Group 3	Acting Elementary Principal
Group 4	Secondary Principal
Group 5	Secondary Assistant Principal
Group 6	Acting Secondary Principal

Table 67

Multiple Range Test for One Way Analysis of Clusters for "Presently Describes" by Variable #2 Position in School District Using Scheffe Procedure

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	4	1204.09	301.02
Within Groups	234	15643.78	66.85
Total	238	16847.87	

Cluster	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group
Management by Objectives	4.5	.0016	10.00	5	
			14.33	6	
			20.77	2	
			23.81	4	*
			24.54	1	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were secondary assistant principals were significantly different from elementary principals or secondary principals in their identification and strength of importance given to Management by Objectives as presently describing criteria for administrator evaluation.

On Table 68, groups designated were the following:

Group 1	Under 500 students
Group 2	500-999 students
Group 3	1,000-2,000 students
Group 4	Over 2,000 students

Table 68

Multiple Range Test for One Way Analysis of Clusters for "Presently Describe" by Variable #4 Size of School

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	687.32	229.10
Within Groups	241	8278.89	34.35
Total	244	8966.22	

Cluster	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group 4
Job Targets	6.6	.0002	16.90	4	
			23.42	2	*
			23.51	3	*
			25.50	1	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were in schools with over 2,000 students were significantly different from those in all other school sizes in their giving less identification and less importance to Job Targets as presently describing criteria for administrator evaluation.

Table 69

Multiple Range Test for One Way Analysis of Clusters for "Should Describe" by Variable #2 Position in School District Using Scheffe Procedure

Cluster	F Ratio	F Probability
Management by Objectives	2.4	.0466

Note. No two groups were significantly different at the .05 level.

On Table 70, groups designated were the same as on Table 67.

Table 70

Multiple Range Test for One Way Analysis of Clusters for "Should Describe" by Variable #4 Size of School

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean of Squares
Between Groups	3	447.70	149.23
Within Groups	237	7272.14	30.68
Total	240	7719.85	

Cluster	F Ratio	F Probability	Mean	Group	Group 4
Job Targets	4.8	.0027	19.70	4	
			26.06	2	*
			26.12	3	*
			26.87	1	*

Note. * Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level. Respondents who were in schools with over 2,000 students were significantly different from those in all other school sizes in their giving less emphasis and less importance to Job Targets as should describing criteria for administrator evaluation.

On Table 71, the clusters were designated as follows:

Cluster 1	"Presently Describes" Indicators for Job Targets
Cluster 2	"Presently Describes" Indicators for Results Oriented Management in Education
Cluster 3	"Presently Describes" Indicators for Management by Objectives
Cluster 4	"Presently Describes" Indicators for Leadership
Cluster 5	"Should Describe" Indicators for Job Targets
Cluster 6	"Should Describe" Indicators for Results Oriented Management
Cluster 7	"Should Describe" Indicators for Management by Objectives
Cluster 8	"Should Describe" Indicators for Leadership

Table 71

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation with Cluster Computation
(coefficient/cases/significance)

	Cluster 5	Cluster 6	Cluster 7	Cluster 8
Cluster 1	.783 240 .000			
Cluster 2		.695 234 .000		
Cluster 3			.675 235 .000	
Cluster 4				.696 251 .000

Table 72

T-Test for Paired Clusters: Cluster 1 & 5/Job Targets for All Respondents

Number of Cases 240

	Cluster 1	Cluster 5
Mean	23.68	25.96
Standard Deviation	6.08	5.63
Standard Error	.392	.364

	Cluster 1 & 5
Difference from Mean	-2.27
Standard Deviation	3.88
Standard Error	.250
Correlation	.783
2--Tail Probability	.000
T-Value	-9.10
Degrees of Freedom	239
2--Tail Probability	.000

Table 73

T-Test for Paired Clusters: Clusters 2 & 6/Results Oriented Management in Education for All Respondents

Number of Cases 234

	Cluster 2	Cluster 6
Mean	51.14	56.24
Standard Deviation	10.65	9.34
Standard Error	.696	.611

	Cluster 2 & 6
Difference from Mean	-5.10
Standard Deviation	7.88
Standard Error	.516
Correlation	.696
2--Tail Probability	.000
T Value	-9.90
Degrees of Freedom	233
2--Tail Probability	.000

Table 74

T Test for Paired Clusters: Clusters 3 & 7/Management by Objectives for All Respondents

Number of Cases 235

	Cluster 3	Cluster 7
Mean	23.85	27.34
Standard Deviation	8.35	.545
Standard Error	6.71	.438

	Cluster 3 & 7
Difference from Mean	-3.48
Standard Deviation	6.24
Standard Error	.407
Correlation	.676
2--Tail Probability	.000
T Value	-8.54
Degrees of Freedom	234
2--Tail Probability	.000

Table 75

T Test for Paired Clusters: Clusters 4 & 8/Leadership Model for All Respondents

Number of Cases 251

	Cluster 4	Cluster 8
Mean	27.43	29.19
Standard Deviation	5.63	5.13
Standard Error	.356	.324

	Cluster 4 & 8
Difference from Mean	-1.76
Standard Deviation	4.22
Standard Error	.266
Correlation	.697
2--Tail Probability	.000
T Value	-6.61
Degrees of Freedom	250
2--Tail Probability	.000

Table 76

T Test for Paired Clusters: Clusters 1 & 5/Job Targets for District 742 Respondents Only

Number of Cases 10

	Cluster 1	Cluster 5
Mean	16.90	19.70
Standard Deviation	4.17	3.88
Standard Error	1.32	1.23

	Cluster 1 & 5
Difference from Mean	-2.80
Standard Deviation	3.29
Standard Error	1.04
Correlation	.669
2--Tail Probability	.035
T Value	-2.69
Degrees of Freedom	9
2--Tail Probability	.025

Table 77

T Test for Paired Clusters: Clusters 2 & 6/Results Oriented Management in Education for District 742 Respondents Only

Number of Cases 9

	Cluster 2	Cluster 6
Mean	45.55	53.44
Standard Deviation	11.12	8.83
Standard Error	3.70	2.94

	Clusters 2 & 6
Difference from Mean	-7.88
Standard Deviation	12.21
Standard Error	4.07
Correlation	.268
2--Tail Probability	.486
T Value	-1.94
Degrees of Freedom	8
2--Tail Probability	.089

Note. Whereas there has been a difference of significance at the .05 level in previous tables, in Tables 77-79 there is no significant difference at the .05 level.

Table 78

T Test for Paired Clusters: Cluster 3 & 7/Management by Objectives for District 742 Respondents Only

Number of Cases 7

	Cluster 3	Cluster 7
Mean	17.28	26.00
Standard Deviation	11.38	5.32
Standard Error	4.30	2.01

	Clusters 3 & 7
Difference from Mean	-8.71
Standard Deviation	13.42
Standard Error	5.07
Correlation	-.184
2--Tail Probability	.692
T Value	-1.72
Degrees of Freedom	6
2--Tail Probability	.137

Table 79

T Test for Paired Clusters: Cluster 4 & 8/Leadership Model
for District 742 Respondents Only

Number of Cases	9	
	Cluster 4	Cluster 8
Mean	26.55	27.11
Standard Deviation	3.84	4.42
Standard Error	1.28	1.47
	Cluster 4 & 8	
Difference from Mean	-5.55	
Standard Deviation	3.60	
Standard Error	1.20	
Correlation	.627	
2--Tail Probability	.070	
T Value	- .46	
Degrees of Freedom	8	
2--Tail Probability	.657	

Table 80

T Test Comparison of Individual Clusters 1-8 for District 742
Respondents (Group 1) with All Respondents (Group 2)

	Number	Mean	S.D.	S. Error	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Cluster 1						
Group 1	11	23.63	5.35	1.61	- .08	.937
Group 2	236	23.77	6.09	.39	- .07	.943
Cluster 2						
Group 1	9	55.00	5.24	1.74	1.96	.077
Group 2	236	51.30	10.84	.70	1.01	.311
Cluster 3						
Group 1	9	20.55	9.67	3.22	-1.05	.322
Group 2	234	23.99	8.30	.543	-1.21	.227
Cluster 4						
Group 1	11	24.54	7.38	2.22	-1.34	.209
Group 2	248	27.56	5.61	.357	-1.72	.087

Table 80 (continued)

T Test Comparison of Individual Clusters 1-8 for District 742 Respondents (Group 1) with All Respondents (Group 2)

	Number	Mean	S.D.	S. Error	T Value	2-Tail Prob.
Cluster 5						
Group 1	11	26.27	5.58	1.68	.15	.881
Group 2	2	26.00	5.66	.372	.15	.880
Cluster 6						
Group 1	8	59.50	5.88	2.07	1.52	.166
Group 2	229	56.20	9.42	.623	.98	.328
Cluster 7						
Group 1	9	29.22	6.41	2.13	.89	.400
Group 2	227	27.28	6.72	.446	.85	.397
Cluster 8						
Group 1	11	28.09	5.85	1.76	- .64	.538
Group 2	241	29.23	5.10	.329	- .72	.472

Note. District 742 respondents did not differ significantly from all other respondents on clusters 1 through 8. District 742 respondents showed a slightly higher mean on clusters 2, 5, 6, and 7. District 742 respondents showed a slightly lower mean on clusters 1, 3, 4, and 8. District 742 respondents closely reflected all other respondents.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The intent of this Field Study was to examine the criteria for administrator evaluation which resulted from data generated by current practicing administrators. These criteria reflected the administrators themselves by their position, years of experience, size of school, and size of teaching staff. Further, a comparison of these criteria in terms of whether or not current practicing administrators noted that these criteria presently describe or should describe administrator evaluation revealed an evolving research-to-practice paradigm. A cluster analysis of criteria which represented four major administrator evaluation models did not demonstrate a definitive paradigm shift. No one model emerged as being significantly dismissed. The data did confirm an evolving model with elements taken from each of the four models. However, the model whose elements were most frequently identified by respondents was the leadership model. This model emphasized process over product. The leadership model indicators stressed positive interactions with individuals and with groups. The examples given for these indicators included: establishing annual goals and yearly work plans, organizing work groups and individuals to accomplish goals, maintaining parental involvement, establishing community advisory committees, and establishing a personal development plan.

Conclusions

Respondents reflected a somewhat higher number of elementary principals than secondary in terms of the proportion of these positions statewide. Respondents reported substantial years of experience with the largest number of them reporting ten years or more. This indicated that the data had been gathered from respondents who had a good deal of experience in the principalship and had themselves gone through many cycles of administrative evaluation.

An examination of the individual indicators which respondents identified as presently describing administrator evaluation with a degree of considerable importance (rating of 7 or higher) included:

Administrative Function #4--Plans individual teacher conference to discuss instructional effectiveness.

Administrative Function #7--Disseminates information about the school, its students, and programs through school newsletter.

Administrative Function #9--Plans budget on basis of projected support needed for various school activities.

Administrative Function #17--Organization and/or program planning.

Administrative Function #19--Public/Community Relations.

Those indicators which respondents identified as those which should describe administrator evaluation with a degree of considerable importance (rating of 7 or higher) included:

Administrator Function #4--Plans individual teacher conference to discuss instructional effectiveness.

Administrative Function #7--Disseminates information about the school, its students, and programs through school newsletter.

Administrative Function #9--Plans budget on the basis of projected support needed for various school activities.

Administrative Function #10--Determines allocation of funds based on school program needs.

Administrative Function #13--Adopts standards of performance.

Administrative Function #16--Evaluates agreed upon objectives in conference format with appraisers.

Administrative Function #17--Organization and/or program planning.

Administrative Function #19--Public/Community relations.

Administrative Function #20--Professional responsibilities.

While each model had at least one administrative function identified with a rating of 7 or higher, only the leadership model emerged with 3 of its 4 administrative functions so identified.

However, the frequencies showed that the indicators of the Leadership model had 3 out of 4 identified. The indicators of the leadership model clearly have been identified as part of the evolving paradigm for administrator evaluation by the respondents when considered as one group.

Looking at the respondents within the groups and between the groups with particular indicators, the position of the respondent differed significantly reflecting his or her level of responsibility. Administrator Function #3, which involved the review of test data to determine the need for new curriculum, showed that respondents who were assistant secondary principals differed significantly from elementary principals, secondary principals, or elementary assistant principals. This reflected the different responsibilities that usually were assigned to assistant secondary principals.

Administrator Function #9, which described the planning of a budget based on projected support needed for various school activities, indicated that respondents who were assistant secondary principals were significantly different from secondary principals. This, again, reflected different responsibilities. In some districts, budget planning was designated as a central office responsibility, while in others it was a delegated responsibility. Administrative Function #10, which was the determination of allocation of funds based on school program needs, resulted in respondents who were assistant secondary principals being significantly different from elementary or secondary principals. This was more evidence that those with a primary responsibility within a school had need for an individualized evaluation. Administrative Function #12, which was the formulation of performance objectives related to system-wide goals, showed the same significant relationship as existed in the function previously described. Similarly, Administrative Function #13, which described the adoption of standards of performance and Administrative Function #19, which described the indicators of public and community relations, showed this same relationship. It must be concluded that administrator evaluation had better be the result of delineation by position.

The size of school reported by respondents revealed many significant relationships in terms of those who were principals in schools of 2,000 students or more. Administrator Function #1, which involved evaluating student records, #2 which was the designing of discipline methods, #3, which was the reviewing of test data, #6,

which was the selecting of diagnostic procedures, and #13, which was the adopting of standards, were all significantly different for those in the schools of 2,000 or more students from all other size schools. Since the number of certified teachers in a school was a direct ratio to the number of students in a school, this researcher has omitted the conclusions for this variable. However, it was made very clear from the data regarding size of school that this also must be considered in any administrator evaluation design.

The cluster analysis demonstrated that certain models of administrative evaluation were significantly different by position in the school district for the respondents. Respondents who were secondary assistant principals were significantly different from elementary principals or secondary principals in terms of the management by objectives model. In fact, elementary and secondary principals were twice as likely to endorse management by objectives as were secondary assistant principals.

The cluster analysis demonstrated that certain models of administrative evaluation were significantly different by size of school as reported by respondents. Respondents who were in schools of 2,000 or more students were significantly different in dismissing the job targets model. In fact, those in schools of over 2,000 were significantly different compared to those in any of the other size schools in considering models of evaluation.

The analysis of paired clusters for respondents as a whole did not reveal the absence nor the shift of a paradigm for administrator evaluation. For each of the paired clusters there were elements

identified as important both for presently describe and should describe criteria. The difference of the means was greatest for the Results Oriented Management in Education Model. The difference of the means was least for the Leadership Model. An analysis of clusters for respondents from District 742 in St. Cloud showed similar difference of the means for the Leadership Model and the Results Oriented management in Education Model as respondents taken as a whole.

Recommendations

Criteria for administrator evaluation must be designed to recognize the differences of school position and school size. Current practicing administrators identified indicators that could be developed into an administrator evaluation form and format. Evidence of an evolving paradigm suggested that the Leadership Model be incorporated along with some indicators of the other models. Even before the indicators were identified for inclusion in an administrator evaluation system, the school board members must have decided on the purpose or purposes of the evaluation. These could have included: improvement of instruction, improvement of task performance, promotion, demotion, differentiation of assignment, merit pay, tenure, or increased productivity of the individual or total management team. Then the administrators must have learned about and endorsed the process. Adjustments must have been made to accommodate ownership. As indicated initially, members of school boards do not want to spend time reinventing the wheel (K. L. Eastman, District 742 Committee of the Whole Meeting, June 9, 1988). They want a system that has worked on which to base a system of their own. One such

system has been developed in South Carolina (Department of Education, 1986) as part of a principal performance evaluation instrument. The indicators from this model were not being suggested, but rather the process and the timeline. An evaluation cycle was conducted which was initiated by September 1 of each school year and was completed by June 30. A preliminary conference was held no later than September 1 but could take place during the summer. During this conference the supervisor and the principal met to discuss the evaluation procedures. This was the opportunity for questions concerning the interpretation of evaluative criteria and for ground rules for data collection which were established. This was the place where position of administrator, size of school, and years of experience would be considered. A progress check was conducted by November 1 which provided for feedback, dialogue, and counseling as appropriate. The summative evaluation was completed by June 15 which included notes on areas of strength, improvements needed, and comments on overall performance. Finally, a summative conference was held on June 30 during which the evaluation was reviewed with remediation objectives established when necessary. Appeal procedures, remediation program, evaluation training, and administrative in-service were all carefully designed and communicated to those involved (Department of Education, 1986).

The data from this Field Study provided a nucleus of indicators around which to begin a district discussion of administrator evaluation. The discussion actually began ten years ago in District

742 when the Board of Education directed the Superintendent of Schools to review various standardized administrator evaluation procedures and develop a system (Minutes, May 18, 1978). The issue was raised again in 1988. As one part of an eventual system, this Field Study offered a statistical analysis which suggested several criteria, one model, and a format for administrator evaluation. Primary among the criteria were those from the leadership model. Use of a cyclical format was part of a recommended process.

Several suggestions for future study emerged during the course of this research effort. The design was not constructed to ensure an equal number of administrators in each of the years of experience categories. If interviews with an equal number of administrators with less than three years of experience had been conducted so that definitive comparisons were possible with principals with 3-5 years, 5-10 years, or 10 years and more experience, it might have demonstrated a clear and convincing difference on individual indicators or on grouped clusters. Another investigation that was not undertaken would have selected only outstanding administrators for the study. Questionnaires and interviews were not considered using only those administrators labeled beacons of brilliance (Goldhammer, et al., 1971). Those with exceptional profiles on the administrator perceiver were not isolated in the sample. Finally, isolating urban from rural settings was not considered.

This Field Study did reveal an evolving research-to-practice paradigm for administrator evaluation criteria. When adjusted for an administrator's position and size of school, criteria were identified

as indicators on which to base an evaluation. The cluster of indicators from the leadership model was identified as those which should describe a system of administrator evaluation. A cycle format was suggested to implement the evaluation process.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Andrews, R. (1970). The Washington principal evaluation inventory. Seattle: University of Washington.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Campbell, R. (1971, February). The evaluation of administrative performance. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, NJ.

Carnes, M. (1985). Evaluating administrative performance. (Educational Research Service Report.) Arlington: Educational Research Service.

Castetter, W. (1971). Appraising and improving the performance of school administrative personnel. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Department of Education, South Carolina (1986). Tentative principal performance evaluation instrument and requirements for field testing during the 1986-87 school year. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Education.

Eastman, K. L. (June 9, 1988). District 742 Committee of the Whole Meeting. St. Cloud, MN.

Educational Research: Limits and Opportunities (1977). Third annual report of the National Council on Educational Research, pp. 12-14.

Gideonese, H. (1968). Research development and the improvement of education. Science, 162, 541-545.

Glass, G. (1969, September). Educational knowledge use. Proceedings of the United States of Education Post Doctoral Fellows. Elkridge, MD: United States Office of Education.

Glass, G., McGaw, B., & Smith, M. (1981). Meta anaylsis in social research. London: Sage Publications.

Glennon, T. K. (1967). Issues in the choice of development policies. In T. K. Glennon, T. Marchak, & R. Summers (Eds). Strategies for Research and Development. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Glennon, T. K. (1967). Research and development. In J. Enke (Ed.), Defense Management. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Goldhammer, K., Becker, G., Withycombe, R., Doyel F., Miller, E., Morgan, C., DeLoretto L., & Aldridge, B. (1971). Elementary school principals and their schools: Beacons of brilliance and potholes of pestilence. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Goodwin, H. & Smith E. (1985). Faculty and administrator evaluation: Constructing the instruments. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University.

Gorton, R. & McIntyre K. (1978). The senior high school principalship. Vol. II: The effective principal. Reston: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Gray F., & Burns, M. (1979). Does management by objectives work in education? Educational Leadership, 36, 414.

Green, R. (1972). Administrative appraisal: A step to improved leadership. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Guba, E, & Clark D. (1974). Configuration perspectives: A challenge to the systems view of educational knowledge production and utilization. Washington, D. C.: Council for Educational Development and Research.

Herman, J. (1978). An up-front approach to administrative evaluation. NAASP Bulletin, 62, 34-42.

Holben, J. (1986, March). Matching district goals and administrative accountabilities. The School Administrator, pp. 12-14.

Mansergh, G. (Ed.). (1971). Dynamics of management by objectives for school administrators. Detroit: Metropolitan Detroit Bureau of School Studies.

Mazzarella, J. (1981). Leadership styles. In S. Smith, J. Mazzarella, & P. Piele (Eds.), School Leadership. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Melton, G. (1970). The principalship: Job specifications and salary considerations for the 70s. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Minnesota Department of Education. (1987). Minnesota education directory, 1987-88. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.

Minutes of District 742 Board of Education. (May 18, 1978). St. Cloud, MN.

Nicolson, E. (1973). The performance of principals in the accountability syndrome. NASSP Bulletin, 57, 95.

Project R. O. M. E. (1975). Results Oriented Management in Education. Athens: University of Georgia.

Redfern, G., & Hersey, P. (1981). Evaluation of principals. The Practioner, 3, 1-13.

Russell, J., Mazzarella, J., White, T., & Maurer, S. (1985). Linking the behaviors and activities of secondary school principals to school effectiveness: A focus on effective and ineffective behaviors. (Center for Educational Policy and Management Report.) Eugene: University of Oregon.

Schutz, R. E. (1970). The nature of educational development. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 3, 39-64.

Tuckman, B. (1978). Conducting educational research. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Tuckman, B. (1979). Analyzing and designing educational research. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Turney, B. (1971). Research in education. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press.

Wilson, J. (1972). Philosophy and educational research. Great Britain: Stanhope Press.

Young, J. (1972). Model for competency-based evaluation. (Report No. 28.) Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 068 501.)

Zakrajshek, B. (1979). Evaluation systems: A critical look. NASSP Bulletin, 63, 100-111.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Community Education
DISTRICT 742 COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
North Community School
1212 North 29th Avenue, St. Cloud, MN 56301 (612)251-1733

CLEAR LAKE · CLEARWATER · COLLEGEVILLE · LUXEMBURG · PLEASANT LAKE · WAITE PARK · ST. JOSEPH · ST. CLOUD · ST. AUGUSTA

Administrator Evaluation is a topic currently being studied in our school district, District 742 in St. Cloud. I am trying to combine my final academic requirement for a Specialist's Degree at St. Cloud State University with a research effort that will be of practical value for our district.

Would you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return in the self-stamped envelope provided. Please return by April 15 (before first class postage increases again!).

Thank you very much,

Diana Kasper

Diana Kasper
Director of Community Education

DK:dh

District 742 Community Schools is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer and is in compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

823304

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A

1. My position with the school district is:

Elementary Principal	_____
Elementary Assistant Principal	_____
Acting Elementary Principal	_____
or	
Secondary Principal (includes Middle School)	_____
Secondary Assistant Principal	_____
Acting Secondary Principal	_____

2. I have worked in this position:

less than 3 years	3-5 years	5-10 years	Over 10
_____	_____	_____	_____

3. There are # of students in this school:

under 500	500-999	1,000-2,000	Over 2,000
_____	_____	_____	_____

4. There are # of certified teachers (in full-time equivalents) in this school:

under 20	21-39	40-79	Over 80
_____	_____	_____	_____

PART B

Listed below are generic administrative functions based on a review of the research on educational administration.

Please indicate in first column the degree to which each function presently describes an aspect of your job on which to base an administrator evaluation. Then indicate in the second column the degree to which each function should describe an aspect of your job on which to base an administrator evaluation. On both columns, please use the following scale:

0 = Of No Importance
1 = Of Minimal Importance
2 = Of Little Importance
3 = Of Small Importance
4 = Of Fair Importance
5 = Of Some Importance
6 = Of Moderate Importance
7 = Of Considerable Importance
8 = Of Much Importance
9 = Of Maximum Importance

	Presently Describes										Should Describe									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Evaluates appropriateness of student cumulative record information based on needs of pupil personnel staff	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2. Designs specific strategies for handling frequently occurring discipline problems	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3. Reviews student test data to determine need for new curriculum.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4. Plans individual teacher conferences to discuss instructional effectiveness	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5. Selects methods for assisting teachers in developing more effective practices	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6. Selects diagnostic procedures to aid in the identification of student needs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7. Disseminates information about the school, its students, and programs through school newsletter	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
8. Writes set of school policy statements and develops handbook	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9. Plans budget on the basis of projected support needed for various school activities	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10. Determines allocation of funds based on school program needs	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

11. Develops an effective pattern for parental conferences with teachers and counselors

12. Formulates performance objectives relating to system-wide goals

13. Adapts standards of performance

14. Writes objectives to accomplish standards of performance

15. Evaluates agreed upon objectives in self-appraisal format

16. Evaluates agreed upon objectives in conference format with appraisers

17. Organization and/or program planning (examples: clarifies mission, establishes annual goals and yearly work plans, organizes work groups and individuals to accomplish goals)

18. Program/plant management (examples: manages facilities and equipment, develops and manages the budget, provides for auxiliary and support services.

19. Public/Community relations (examples: maintains parental involvement, establishes community advisory committees, establishes a plan for promoting good public relations)

20. Professional responsibilities (examples: participates in professional organizations, establishes personal development plan)

APPENDIX C

LISTING OF RECEIVING AND RESPONDING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

		Kdg.	Ele.	Sec.	Principals	Received
1.	Anoka	2,651	14,294	14,699	36	29
2.	Albert Lea	350	2,041	2,141	7	6
3.	Bemidji	408	2,216	2,143	10	6
4.	Bloomington	868	5,004	6,294	13	11
5.	Brainerd	467	2,542	2,798	12	6
6.	Burnsville	756	4,019	4,305	11	7
7.	Duluth	1,118	6,271	6,440	25	11
8.	Edina	340	2,133	3,150	7	2
9.	Elk River	473	2,330	2,620	6	4
10.	Forest Lake	583	2,837	3,186	10	6
11.	Grand Rapids	373	2,099	2,254	14	5
12.	Hastings	394	1,809	2,130	6	5
13.	Hopkins	496	2,924	3,277	9	3
14.	Mankato	605	2,981	2,789	12	8
15.	Minneapolis	3,827	18,535	17,077	55	26
16.	Minnetonka	434	2,266	2,795	9	7
17.	Moorehead	498	2,204	2,085	6	6
18.	Mounds View	981	4,875	5,530	13	7
19.	North St. Paul	753	3,719	3,808	13	7
20.	Richfield	332	1,728	2,340	5	3
21	Robbinsdale	1,232	5,995	7,123	16	10
22.	Rochester	1,119	5,512	5,995	22	9
23.	Rosemount	1,383	7,447	6,990	16	7
24.	Roseville	529	2,716	3,138	10	3
25.	St. Cloud	864	4,135	4,700	12	11
26.	St. Louis Park	322	1,682	2,166	6	3
27.	St. Paul	3,067	14,566	14,125	50	26
28.	South Washington Cty.	864	4,530	4,205	11	5
29.	Stillwater	522	3,219	3,850	11	6
30.	Wayzata	476	2,520	3,308	8	4
31.	White Bear Lake	725	3,365	3,588	12	8
32.	Winona	379	2,027	2,233	10	4
					463	261

TOTAL SENT - 463

TOTAL RECEIVED - 261

PERCENT RECEIVED - 56.4%