PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION: AVALON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL BOARD

SHABANA DASTAGEER MUHAJIR

PRACTICES AND PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION: AVALON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL BOARD

By

Shabana Dastageer Muhajir, B. Comm.

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

Faculty of Education

Memorial University of Newfoundland

October 15, 1996

St. John's Newfoundland

Abstract

The age of accountability puts new pressures on educators. There are increasing calls from every quarter for holding the educational institutions accountable. In such circumstances, it is difficult for the position of the principalship not to catch the public eye. The advocates for accountability assuming that the principal is *the*, not *a* major influence on the quality of education in a school (Murphy & Louis, 1994) have started demanding the sound evaluations of principals' effectiveness. Yet there is ample evidence in the literature to suggest that the greater attention to the subject has not led to a convergence of wisdom on how to evaluate principals that would bring maximum benefits in terms of personal and organizational growth.

This study was undertaken in an attempt to overcome part of current limitation in our knowledge concerning the principal evaluation practices. The first and foremost purpose of this study was to provide information about current principal evaluation practices utilized by the Avalon Consolidated School Board. The study also attempted to explore the perceptions of selected groups of teachers, vice-principals, principals, and board trustees with respect to these practices in an effort to provide a bridge between *what is* and *what should be*.

The primary method of data collection was semi-structured interviews. Other sources of data collection were: (a) documentation from the school boards, schools, principals, Department of Environment and Labour, and Department of Education, (b) follow-up calls to the principals and teachers, and (c) researcher's daily notes. The study was oriented to phenomenology, which provided a conceptual framework for the analysis of the data.

The major findings of the study led to the following conclusions: (a) the actual evaluation practices are not in conformity with the stipulations of the policy; (b) it is important for assistant superintendents to have clear understanding of the nature of the work and the level at which school principals are working; (c) there appeared to be a communication gap between the school board and its staff with respect to evaluation practices; (d) evaluation, irrespective of the type was not looked at as a beneficial and constructive process; (e) vice-principals and teachers regarded formative evaluation as informal everyday evaluation; (f) principals were willing to make the evaluation process more inclusive by incorporating input from multiple sources, provided that the evaluation package is well put together; (g) broadened work load makes it difficult for principals to perform their teaching duties effectively; this situation heightens the need for properly evaluating the teaching responsibilities of site-

administrators and, finally, (h) there is need for adequate administrative and other support services at the school level in view of emerging expectations and needs of the publics served by the schools.

Acknowledgements

The writer acknowledges the assistance, advice, and encouragement of Dr. Clar Doyle, her thesis supervisor, throughout the course of the study. Thanks is also expressed to Dr. George Hickman, member of the supervisory committee, who gave so generously of his time and experience.

Special thanks are also extended to the Avalon Consolidated School Board and in particular, the school board staff, principals, vice-principals, and teachers who participated in the interviews and made this study possible. Their cooperation is much appreciated.

Finally, the researcher wishes to express appreciation to Mr. Gerry White, Ms. Sylvia Hopkins, and Ms. Tina Parsons for helping her in getting the tapes transcribed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.....
And God saw every thing that He made. "Behold," God said, "it is very good." And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

And on the seventh day God rested from all His work. His archangel came then unto Him asking: "God, how do you know that what you have created is 'very good'?
What are your criteria? On what data do you base your judgement? Aren't you a little close to the situation to make a fair and unbiased evaluation?"

God thought about these questions all that day and His rest was greatly disturbed.
On the eighth day God said, "Lucifer, go to hell."

Thus was evaluation born in a blaze of glory.
Ever since the status of the profession has been somewhat in doubt: the road to salvation or a sure ticket to damnation?

From Michael Quin Patton's
Creative Evaluation

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Preamble

Schools have begun to change significantly, and will continue to evolve as we enter the 21st century. Several school reforms embraced the Canadian psyche in the past decade or so, and a myriad of initiatives appeared to revitalize and improve the system to meet the needs of the changing times. Today terms like site-based management, participatory decision-making, teacher-empowerment, school restructuring, and an array of other reforms fill the educational lexicon as reformers seek alternative means for better educating the nation's youth. Within all the reform efforts, a singularly common perspective is that the principal must be the *key* figure in a school (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992).

The term "principal" comes from the Latin *princeps* which, in turn, is derived from an amalgam of *primus*, meaning first and *capere*, meaning to take. A literal rendering is that of a person who is taken as first; one who is recognized as the leader (Allison, 1984). It is true that many factors determine the effectiveness of a school or school system, such as the skill of the staff, the availability of adequate facilities and supplies, the competence of the school board, and the interest and support of the community at large, but the most

crucial factor and one which influences all others is the school principal. The principal has a major responsibility in setting the tone, establishing the conditions, and providing stimulation for the kind of learning that goes on in the school.

The notion that principals are capable of having a substantial impact on schools, is supported by more than 50 empirical studies in the English language since the mid-1970s (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousens, 1990), and is widely believed by practising educators and the public. Although there is considerable consensus as to the pivotal role played by a school principal in school success, unanimity on the role definition of principals is far from evident. This is a consequence of a variety of expectations held by the assorted "publics" principals serve, and changes in their perceptions about principal's role over the years. Glassman and Heck (1992) note that the transformation in role conceptualizations may reflect the reform of a system moving from closed to open, and the result of increasing external demands for educational accountability.

Accountability is a process by which those who are responsible for a system answer for its performance. LeBlanc (1994) cites four reasons for educational accountability that are widely agreed upon in the literature. These reasons are:

1. a perception that school systems have become less

effective;

2. a downturn in the economy;

3. the changes created by the advent of a new economy that is global and knowledge-based; and

4. unmet demands for immediate new educational services. (p. 24)

The focal point for much of the concern in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador has been studies of both educational achievement and economic competitiveness which show that the quality of the education system in Canada lags behind too many countries, particularly Japan and the emerging Asian nations (Our Children Our Future, 1992). Further, authors of the report *Building A Vision for the Future (1991)* contend that the Newfoundland educational system is the lowest in terms of student achievement; in fact the system is losing ground in a number of instances instead of closing the gap which exists between this province and the rest of Canada.

The concerns expressed by a number of people (cited in the report submitted to the Royal Commission in 1991) are stated as follows:

- Frank Smith, when he was President of the former Newfoundland high tech firm, NORDCO, told a group of Newfoundland Science teachers on May 18, 1989, that:

> NORDCO has provided me with an opportunity to travel on a world-wide basis as we have expanded our marketing activities. Hence, I have been able to observe the industrial, technological, and educational competition we face, not only in Canada, but more critically in other countries around the world. Quite frankly, I have grave reservations on our educational system. (p.10)

• Dr. Linda Inkpen, former President of the Cabot Institute of Applied Arts and Technology, speaking to the Second National Conference on Business and Collaboration, sponsored by the Conference Board of Canada on April 25, 1991, said:

> Our Canadian educational standards have slipped badly during the last 10-15 years. This probably has been compounded by a decreased emphasis on Science and Technology. Canada is threatened with serious shortages of internationally competitive, highly trained and highly skilled workers. (p.10)

There is no questioning of the fact that the graduates of Newfoundland schools will increasingly have to compete for employment with graduates throughout the world. Faced with these realities, it comes as no surprise that high value is placed on the concept of accountability which has led to heightened demands calling for the evaluation of principal's effectiveness. Even the *Royal Commission (1992)* has recommended that every school be comprehensively assessed every 5 years, and schools where exemplary leadership is found programs be established to give school administrators special recognition for outstanding performance. In a similar vein, the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association made a

recommendation in a *Submission to the Royal Commission on Education in 1991*:

> That the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, in co-operation with the Department of Education, the School Trustees' Association and the Faculty of Education, and with appropriate funding provided, devise and implement an in-service program to provide to all appropriate persons in leadership positions at schools, in-depth knowledge about the relationship between leadership and school success. (p.46)

All of this demands that principals be evaluated in a manner that meets their individual needs, provides feedback about their performance, and satisfies public demand for accountability. Since public interest is no less at risk from incompetent school principals than from incompetent doctors, lawyers, accountants, and such public servants should be carefully evaluated throughout their professional careers (Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993). Sound evaluations of the aptitude, proficiency, performance, and special achievements of principals does not only help the principals to improve school-based teaching and learning, but also assure society that schools will be effectively administered by highly qualified principals.

Statement Of The Problem

In recent years, a heightened concern for the quality of public education has developed. The United States, with its

plethora of highly critical reports on education, such as *A Nation at Risk (1983) and Time for Results: The Governor's 1991 Report on education (1986)* has clearly set its direction, and there is indication that Canada is following as evidenced in part by the interest in teacher, and recently, principal evaluation.

There seems to be general consensus that evaluations are important and necessary, and that they can be beneficial. Confusion arises around what these evaluations should look like, how they should be conducted, who should conduct them, and what purposes they should serve (Rammer, 1991). This already ambiguous state of affairs is further aggravated with no clear definitions of the principal's role and varied expectations which often seem contradictory. Literature seems to emphasize several aspects of the leadership role. Principals are expected to integrate a variety of role orientations; they are encouraged to serve the stake-holders by providing facilitative leadership (Dunlap & Goldman, 1991; Goldman, Dunlap & Conley, 1993), roving leadership (Caputo, 1991; Depree, 1989), servant or steward leadership (Sergiovanni, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994; Hagstrom, 1992), intellectual leadership (Murphy & Louis, 1994), instructional leadership (Donmoyer & Wagstaff, 1990; Huto & Criss, 1993; Coppedge, 1993), cultural leadership (Giles & Proudfoot, 1994; Cunningham & Gresso, 1993), ethical and moral leadership

(Daresh & Playko, 1995; Alexander & Keeler, 1995) and don many other roles depending upon the requirements of the situation. Of importance is the fact that these roles are not mutually exclusive. Murphy and Louis (1994) echo the sentiment of many educators:

> Transformative school leaders must be able to balance a variety of roles, to move among them as needed, and live and work with the contradictions or ambiguities that acceptance of multiple roles may bring. (p. 15)

Quite obviously, the emerging view of principals places more obligations and responsibilities on them ever before in history. A fundamental question that arises from this discussion is: **How should the variety of roles of the school principals be evaluated given the multitude of expectations of assorted publics which often seem contradictory?**

The need for appropriately and adequately evaluating the various roles of school leaders becomes more pronounced in light of the fact that this is the age of accountability, and evaluation is a necessary tool in determining accountability (Langlois & McAdams, 1992). Ironically, despite considerable attention on the need for better evaluation systems to judge the effectiveness of principals, Hart (1992) notes that principal evaluation remains an underdeveloped aspect of education research and development. While there have been significant developments in teacher evaluation, practices of

principal evaluation have not kept pace in focus, sophistication, or reliability with changes in schools and schooling. Several researchers argue that this state of affairs leaves education with a single dimension system where only one group of professionals is held accountable (Glassman & Heck, 1987; Duke & Stiggins, 1985). This means that systematic and careful evaluation of principal qualifications, competence, and performance is critically important not only to attain a proper balance but also for the success of Canadian schools.

The 1994-95 Annual Report of the Avalon Consolidated School Board with regard to evaluation of educational personnel states that educational personnel are evaluated as follows:

- tenured personnel who normally undergo a formative evaluation and/or summative evaluation *when required* [italics added]; and,
- term contract personnel who are normally monitored and undergo a formative evaluation *only when it is requested* [italics added].

Looking at this report one may ask: **Who will set the parameters for requirement?** Will it be the superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, vice-principal, teacher, and/or parent? Moreover, evaluation according to Fontanna (1994) means:

> knowing what existed in the past, what exists now, and how that can be modified or changed in the future so it has a positive impact on change, performance, productivity, professional growth, and commitment. (p. 91)

Given this fact, one may ask if it is appropriate to leave the evaluation of principals until the point when it is **"requested"** or **"required"**?

Purpose Of The Study

The reality knocking at the doors of many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians today is that their education system is loosing ground not only with respect to international standards (Our Children Our Future, 1992) but also national (Building a Vision for the Future, 1991). Faced with this reality, no wonder literature is full of cries from the general public to district level officials demanding increased accountability by educational personnel, and Canadian school history is full of stories about multiple educational reforms for improving the education system. In view of these facts one may ask: *what steps are being taken to improve the performance of those who can play a crucial role in improving the performance of schools? Should not the efforts to improve principal evaluation become central to promoting academic improvement and long-term school effectiveness?*

One thing that stands crystal clear in the midst of all the ambiguity and muddle is that if we want to improve the performance of the schools with a firm belief that *our children are our future* then it is time to make some significant strides towards performance evaluation and improvement of those who are seen as the "*head learners*" of the school.

The Government of Canada (1991) stressed the importance of developing a "learning culture" because research suggests the impact that schools have on student achievement is related mainly to the quality of the learning environment that is, factors like clear goals, high expectations, student and teacher pride, and professionalism. What really makes a difference is a strong culture in the schools, in the home and at work. This again highlights the importance of the principal in the development of a structure of relationships within a school where teachers, support staff, students and parents are committed to and have the opportunity to learn and grow together. Coleman and LaRocque (1990) used the metaphor of "skilful gardener" to describe the role of district administrators and the necessary school system ethos which the researcher feels adeptly represents the role of the principal as well, and the ethos/ideals needed within a school:

> The gardener uses time well, encourages the industry of others by developing shared information about good practices, and produces "flow'rs and

> herbs", that is, both intrinsically and instrumentally valuable products.... The administrator/gardener continually struggles against a kind of social entropy, exemplified by teacher isolation, stagnation in "stuck" schools, and by schools as independent fiefdoms in districts lacking a productive ethos. If they are not being tended, the schools/gardens grow wild, with important values and product getting choked out by weeds, that is, competing elements..... The garden provides an environment suitable for a variety of living things, microclimates and special treatments abound. But the skilful gardener is equally successful with flowers and more mundane crops. Liberty is not a license; pruning of growth do occur. (p.197)

Productive ethos at the school level can both constrain and facilitate the work of teachers and students. Blase (cited in Coleman & LaRocque, 1990) argues that the principal is critically important in creating either a positive or negative ethos; and positive or productive ethos contribute towards the success of the school. The importance of a strong culture and the role of the principal in developing and nurturing a culture that is conducive to the success of the school has been highlighted by several authors. For instance, Sergiovanni (1995) reports that from the review of the literature on successful schools it is clear that building of a culture which promotes and maintains a given school's conception of success is key. He also states that principals can play a central role in developing such a culture. Peterson and Finn (1985) sum this up by saying that never does one encounter a good school with a bad principal. It follows that a well-

crafted principal evaluation system is essential for the progress and development of the principal and the school system.

The purpose of this study was to fill part of the current limitation in our knowledge about the principal evaluation systems. The study provided information about the current evaluation practices, and explored the perceptions of a selected group of superintendent, assistant superintendent, principals, vice-principals, and teachers with respect to the principal evaluation practices within Avalon Consolidated School Board. It also probed the role played by the evaluation system in contributing towards the performance improvement of school administrators, who are in positions that are crucial to building cultures that can hinder or promote the success of the school.

Significance Of The Study

This study helped to identify the current evaluation practices in relation to purposes, criteria and procedures used by the Avalon Consolidated School Board for the formal evaluation (formative and summative) of principals; and those practices that were found helpful by principals.

The study will add to the limited amount of information available on teachers perceptions of the evaluation of principals. It will also provide information for further

development in this area of inquiry.

In general, this study should hold significance for the following groups:

School boards;

Superintendents/assistant superintendents;

Principals/vice-principals; and

Teachers.

Definitions of Terms

1. **A Closed System**: Closed system is characterized by centralized control, where management is emphasized and organizations are considered to be isolated from the surrounding environment. It is based on the assumption that organizations are managerially-tight and culturally-loose.

2. **An Open system**: Open system is characterized by decentralized control, where leadership is emphasized. It is based on the assumption that organizations are managerially-loose and culturally-tight. Open system theory assumes that organizations continuously interact with the environment.

3. **Stuck Schools**: Stuck schools are those where no progress, growth, or development takes place. People working in these schools hesitate to take risks and proceed in cautious and

conservative ways; they are less motivated to achieve goals and, therefore, set their expectations low.

4. **Ethos**: Ethos signifies that subset of culture which an organization has; those shared understandings, norms, and values which are visible or can be easily described by the members of the organization (Coleman & LaRocque, 1990).

5. **Productive ethos**: Productive ethos has intrinsic value for educational professionals in the school system. For teachers it reduces anxiety and raises professional expectations for and commitment to success. Productive ethos may contribute to teacher perceptions of self-efficacy of both the performance kind and the organizational kind (Coleman & LaRocque, 1990).

6. **Principal**: Principal means a teacher designated as a principal of a school under the authority of the Schools Act.

7. **Public school or school**: Public school means a school operated by a board and receiving grants from public funds provided for education by the province.

8. **Board**: Board means a school board having jurisdiction over a school or a student attending a school in the district of that board.

9. **Superintendent**: Superintendent is the individual professional educator who is designated as the chief executive officer of the school board.

Limitations and Delimitations

A number of delimitations and limitations impinging on the present study are:

1. It was delimited to the perceptions of superintendent, assistant superintendent, principals, vice-principals, and teachers within the Avalon Consolidated School Board.

2. The perception of selected groups of superintendent, assistant superintendent, principals, vice-principals, and teachers may not apply to all the people of their respective groups as every person is atypical, and therefore has unique perceptions resulting from individual needs and experiences.

3. Since the study was confined to the Avalon Consolidated School Board in St. John's, findings may or may not apply to other areas of the province or the province as a whole. It will be up to the individual readers to determine whether or not the findings of the study are relevant to their individual settings.

Overview of the Contents

Purpose shapes vision, and vision shapes structure (Schlecty, 1990). The structure of this study is shaped by the vision the researcher holds, and the purpose she intends it to serve. The study is organized into five chapters. A brief summary of the contents of each chapter is given below.

Chapter One provided a discussion of the purpose and identified the significance of the study. Definitions of the terms used in the study were included to avoid any misinterpretation. The chapter concluded with a list of delimitations and limitations under which the study was conducted. The reader, therefore, should review the conclusions in light of these restrictions.

Chapter Two presents a review of related literature and research; thus providing a background to the study.

The design and methodology of the study are included in Chapter Three. This chapter outlines the population of the study; the sample drawn from this population; and methods of data collection and data analysis.

Chapter Four contains the presentation and analysis of responses received from the participants of the study.

A summary of the study is included in Chapter Five. Also included in this final chapter are the major findings, conclusions drawn from these findings, and a few recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

SELECTED REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature pertinent to the study. The chapter is divided into two sections.

The first section presents a brief history of the public school principals by highlighting its specific, but not mutually exclusive stages of development. It also serves to illustrate how the changes in education and society led to the changes in the evaluation practices.

The second section will present some of the major findings on the relationship between schools and students' achievement; the studies of Coleman (1966) and Jencks, Smith, Acland, Bane, Cohen, Gintis, Heyns, and Michelson (1972) will be examined. Subsequently, some recent studies that contradict the findings of Coleman and Jenck will be discussed briefly. This section will also present the various opinions of many writers regarding current practices, procedures and techniques used in the evaluation of principals. In particular, the section will address topics such as accountability; evaluation; problems associated with evaluation; and suggestions for improving principal evaluation system. In the end, Finally, the writer will highlight some of the contributions and limitations of the literature relating to principalship and evaluation practices.

Section I

The Changing Faces of Principalship

The principal is the link between the teaching staff and the central office, and the community. The school principal has the authority to make decisions and enunciate rules and regulations which are consistent with the School Act, the regulations of the Department of Education, and the specific authority granted by the employing school board (Giles & Proudfoot, 1994).

The conceptions of schooling and principalship have undergone metamorphosis over the years. However, there has been a dialectical pattern of development; metaphors and images of the preceding decades influenced the role in the later ones, wherein these concepts were further refined and extended. Murphy and Louis (1994) reflecting on the expanding role of the school site-administrators observed that while expectations are being added little is being deleted from the principal's role. This view is equally shared by Roland Barth (cited in Sergiovanni, 1995) who remarked that principals have assumed one small additional responsibility after another.

It is this evolving role of the school principal that is discussed at length in the following pages. Some of the books that had been particularly useful in this analysis were: *Education and the cult of efficiency (1962); Behavioral Science and Educational Administration (1964); A history of*

Thought and Practice in Educational Administration (1987); Understanding the principalship (1993), and Reshaping the Principalship (1994).

The Tens, Twenties and the Thirties

Schools and their Principals

In the early part of this era, two forces influenced the writings and opinions of the authors. One was pseudo-religious beliefs (Beck & Murphy, 1993), and the other was administrative efficiency or, according to Gross (1964), "gospel of efficiency". In the early years, principals were mainly concerned with promoting spiritual and civic values in schools. Around the same time, widespread public interest in Taylor's ideas led people to apply his efficiency principles to the public schools. Taylor's principles of scientific management held special appeal for school administrators, as schools were largely criticized by general public for their inefficiency (Callahan & Button, 1964). Teachers were being criticized for their lack of efficiency, and schools were attacked for their impractical and antiquated curricula. To make matters worse, journalists voiced their disapproval about educational efficiency, and people started inquiring into reasons for poor educational results in spite of massive investments in public schooling. The atmosphere within the business world was not much different. Critics expressed

uneasiness about school costs and the quality of educational "products" being turned out (Callahan, 1962). This led to the demand for administrators who could operate schools efficiently. According to Callahan and Burton (1964), "efficiently" meant economically.

Worthy of note is the fact that even the belief that principals should lead according to the tenets of scientific management was discussed with spiritual imagery. In other words, the emphasis on principles of scientific management merged with a focus on the spiritual side of the principal's work. As mentioned by Eaton (1986), the two images of the principal, that is, principal as a spiritual leader and principal as a scientific manager, did not conflict with each other; one can say that there was a comfortable coexistence of both the metaphors.

During the later half, the interest in the spiritual side of schooling started to wane. The principal came to be seen as a business executive or manager whose primary task was not instructional but administrative. S/he was considered an organizer and supervisor of administrative activities within the school. This was a result of the emerging interest in the bureaucratic system of organization (Beck & Murphy, 1993). School leaders started placing business considerations before educational objectives in managing their schools.

As the quest for efficient and productive schools

intensified, discussions about the business and managerial dimensions of leadership increased. Concern with the educational or pedagogical dimensions of the principalship ebbed (Murphy & Louis, 1994). School administrators no longer considered themselves as educational leaders, but as somewhat anti-intellectual business managers, unsympathetic to higher purposes of learning and no less concerned with the measures of productivity and efficiency than their commercial and industrial counterparts (Callahan, 1962).

Assumptions Related to Evaluation

Beck and Murphy (1993) report that standards were vague and basically process-oriented during the early part of this period. They also contend that the literature of this period does not state precisely how principals should be evaluated; nevertheless, as the spiritual and scientific values inspired the work of educators, principals were expected to use the principles of scientific management to link students with such noble values as truth, beauty and right moral conduct. Hence, success was judged against such standards.

Callahan (1962), however, does indicate the development of rating forms as early as 1917 for measuring the efficiency of school principals. This apparently was a result of teacher-rating sheets for measuring their efficiency. Since these rating sheets had to be filled out by principals, attention

was drawn to the development of means for measuring the efficiency of school principals. Several kinds of rating scales were developed for this purpose. These forms were given to teachers who were asked to rate their principals. This scale confirms Beck and Murphy's (1993) contention that the focus was basically on *process* rather than *product*.

This period witnessed the involvement of educators in a wide variety of activities. Besides a considerable amount of attention devoted to the development of rating scales, hundreds of surveys of schools were also made (Callahan, 1962; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Educational improvement was sought in view of these survey findings. The emphasis of these surveys was on the financial and mechanical aspects of education. The dominant motivating force in most cases was economic, not educational. They contributed toward a business and mechanical conception of schooling and principalship. School educators were told by leading educators that the surveys can be used in defense against the critics (Callahan, 1962). So, the concepts of sound management and these surveys provided means for the public to assess the principal's work (Beck & Murphy, 1993).

The Forties

Schools and their Principals

Although the principles of scientific management gained considerable popularity in the early part of this century,

from the beginning they provoked intellectual competition. Gross (1964) contends that both teachers and practitioners grew restless with the narrowness of these principles. This gave way to a human relations movement in education.

The human relations view of management was made up of two interpenetrating bodies of ideas. One was democratic administration, a philosophy of school administration manifested in the work of John Dewey, and the second was the human relations ideas drawn from behavioral science and industrial studies. The fusion of these two bodies of thought in the 1940s was described first as "democratic human relations," and later simply as the "human relations" approach to school administration (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Benion, 1987). This movement changed the conception of principal's role significantly. Principals were encouraged to develop democratic orientations in their administration. They were expected to involve parents, students and teachers in planning processes. This expectation was related to a belief that schools have important social purposes to fulfil. Yauch (cited in Campbell et al., 1987) states that involvement of teachers in decision making processes meant that the principal's authority was not greater than that of other staff members. Even though the principal was still obliged to serve as "school representative" and "executive of the superintendent," the principal's primary responsibility was to act as an

"interpreter" or "executor of the group policy". Democratic administration and human relations both seemed to offer ways of redistributing decision making responsibility, and of helping administrators work more effectively with teachers. They proved, in essence, to provide principals with the interpersonal skills and understanding which were deemed essential for dealing with management problems that were perceived to be primarily human in nature (Campbell et al.).

Assumptions Related to Evaluation

In the forties, just like the twenties, principals were expected to link their schools with values and beliefs. However, values this time were less religious and more oriented towards a democratic commitment to the dignity and equality of all the people. The general assumption was that a smoothly run school and democratic leadership will occur together, and the evidence of either or both will attest to a job well-done. As mentioned before, the central theme of much of the writings on the principalship in this time period was that democratic leadership is both ideologically correct and practically effective. It is of little surprise, therefore, that effective use of resources (material, natural, temporal, and human) as a criterion of effective leadership was related to the belief that effective principals will promote democracy and equality (Beck & Murphy, 1993). The 1940's encompassed

both types of standards for evaluation which had dominated the earlier decades, that is, standards were both process and product oriented.

The Fifties

Schools and their Principals

Whether it was scientific management or human relations, both perceived principals to be working in closed-system. However, a number of factors contributed to the changes in the role-conceptualizations of principals during this decade. One factor that led to changes was the theory movement, i.e. the theory-research movement in educational administration. The second factor critically important to the understanding of the role of school administrators was the opening of the school system to the outside environment. Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Benion (1987) in the chapter entitled *Open Systems: Organizations and their Environments* discuss some of the social conditions, movements in education and work of the organizational theorists who espoused open-systems ideas, and contributed to the emergence of such a view. After decades ivory tower was finally gone, and an open-systems approach to administration was encouraged. Beck and Murphy (1993) states that the theory movement and open-systems approach to administration paved the way for the emerging expectations of the dual role of the principals. On the one hand, they were

beginning to be pictured as professional administrators who lead their schools by utilizing insights and theories drawn from educational, psychological, sociological, and business research. On the other hand, they were viewed as overseers of infinitesimal details of school operation. These two conceptions of the principal's role presented a mosaic of emerging expectations. Scholars of this decade contended that principals were leaders not managers; however, at the same time they were expected to oversee the minuscule details of school management.

Assumptions Related to Evaluation

Despite a widespread belief in the relationship between certain behaviours and measurable, objective outcomes, Beck and Murphy (1993) note that most writers did not suggest that these measurable outcomes be used to judge the principal's performance. Even those writers who claimed that measures could be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional techniques, did not relate such measurable outcomes directly to the work of the principals.

In spite of the fact that the assessment of the work of practising principals was not the focus of attention, it was the first period when writers recommended any kind of objective criteria to assess principals. These writers considered performance in academic programs helpful in

evaluating principals' abilities to lead.

The Sixties

Schools and their Principals

After World War II, an interest in Weber's concept of organization as rational bureaucracies was revived in administrative circles (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Benion, 1987). This type of governance structure was considered appropriate for schools; consequently scholars began to discuss principalship with bureaucratic imagery. Principals were depicted as members of well-developed educational bureaucracies with clearly defined duties and responsibilities (Beck & Murphy, 1993).

Weber (cited in Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Benion, 1987) considered bureaucratic domination more rational than earlier forms of leadership because it gave authority to those whose training and competence qualified them to lead. However, the way Weber described bureaucratic organizations, it seems he was not just concerned with rational import of bureaucracy but also legal and ethical, as this form of organization pertained to the governance of society and to the survival of democracy in Germany. Campbell et al. (1987) argue that bureaucracy represented to Weber what public education represented to Jefferson, that is, a social structure that would foster and preserve democratic practices. Nevertheless,

Weber was aware of the social dangers that excessive bureaucracy could pose. He acknowledged that highly routinized and impersonal organizations have the capability to stifle the creativity and freedom of individuals.

This belief schools as Weberian bureaucracies led authors (Douglass, 1963; Boyan, 1969; Noar, 1961) to consider the principal as the ultimate authority, even though most of the authors talked about shared-decision making and greater voice to teachers in school governance. Another common characteristic of the scholars of this decade was the unbridled faith they had in science. They thought that science could uncover universally effective technologies for managing schools and teaching children. Therefore, high premium was placed on uniform standards in preparation programs, leadership and pedagogical techniques, and evaluative strategies. Beck and Murphy (1993) state that administration in the sixties was a highly impersonal activity; with no room for any feelings, and no discussion of beliefs. Instead, concrete ways to improve the quality and level of production were discussed.

Assumptions Related to Evaluation

This was the first period when authors wrote extensively about evaluating the work of practising administrators. Due to the interest in the conception of school as rational

bureaucracies, it was assumed that the performance of school principals could be judged according to the kinds of products they produced.

The notion of evaluating principals by the product, and holding them accountable to various groups of people, left principals somewhat vulnerable and confused about role expectations, as different groups had different expectations in mind (Beck & Murphy, 1993). As a result, principals of this era experienced a kind of inner turmoil.

The Seventies

Schools and their Principals

This decade embraced another shift in conceptions of the principalship. This metamorphosis in role conceptualization was largely due to the influence of external factors. Changes taking place in society and the breakdown of historically ingrained notions of schools as sheltered monopolies (Murphy & Louis, 1994; Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Benion, 1987) played a major role in making the role more complex and challenging. The move of the system from closed to open led to the demand that principals view their work in the context of the larger culture. They should consider the social impact of their actions and decisions, and seek ways to involve and inform community members. One can say that principals were expected to lead not only teachers and students, but also

persons within the larger community. They were viewed as persons responsible for confirming that schools and communities connect in meaningful ways. The belief that schools should offer meaningful experiences to students, teachers, and community members has received a lot of attention in the literature of the 70s. A lot of emphasis was placed on the promotion of "meaningful" educational experiences. Beck and Murphy (1993) report that educator's meaning in this era was often linked to three beliefs:

1. schools and their leaders should encourage the holistic development of persons;
2. fulfilling this goal entails working to ensure that students and teachers have positive emotional experiences; and
3. experiences of this type depend to a large extent on participation in positive, supportive, and nonconflictual relationships.

The above three beliefs combined and gave way to the assumption that good leaders will engage in and encourage such relationships. Many scholars talked about humanistic schools and humanistic leadership, emphasizing the principal's role in facilitating holistic human development. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971) in their book *Emerging patterns of Supervision: Human perspectives* discussed humanizing education and educational organizations. They saw democratic leadership as essential for being a good principal. Similarly,

Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) voiced the belief that good leaders will support positive relationships within and outside their institutions.

Although the writings of this decade manifested a humanistic tone, scholars integrated values orientation with an academic one by grounding their arguments for humanistic leadership in the theoretical framework of Abraham Maslow. In short, principals of the 70s were not considered as bureaucrats with clear lines of authority. Instead, they were expected to lead by suggestion and persuasion rather than by mandate. The emphasis was on bargaining, persuading, and negotiating, and indeed the writers did realize that the expected role of the principals was not an easy one to perform (Beck & Murphy, 1993).

Assumptions Related to Evaluation

The belief that principals should be evaluated objectively took on a dominant tone in this decade. Objective, quantitative measurements were considered important and desirable. Much of the scholarship talked about (Immegart, 1971; Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld, & York, 1977) evaluating principals objectively. Some even provided assessment strategies for accomplishing this chore.

Nevertheless, there were some authors (Stodgill, 1971; Hitt, 1973) who discussed evaluation practices in more

subjective ways. They offered lists of desirable traits, and suggested that principals can be evaluated according to their possession of these qualities.

The Eighties

Schools and their Principals

The extinction of the boundary between schools and the outside world continued to shape and influence the role conceptualization of school principals. In the earlier decade, principals were encouraged to involve community members in school activities and lead in educating them, especially with regards to educational activities. The 1970s witnessed school principals reaching out into the community in order to involve and inform them. In the eighties, this trend was somewhat reversed. Instead of principals reaching out into the community, the community was making an attempt to reach into schools in an effort to provide guidance to principals and the educational processes (Beck & Murphy, 1993).

Furthermore, literature of this decade exhibits widespread belief in the instructional leadership role of the school principal. This shift in perspective demanded a deemphasis in the principal's role as manager, and greater stress on instructional leadership responsibilities (Murphy & Louis, 1994; Hallinger, 1992). Principals were expected to make teaching and learning their foremost priorities. This

expectation seems to have been the outcome of the research findings on effective schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Wimpelberg, 1990). Numerous authors discussed the role of the principal as overseer of the teaching/learning enterprise (Carnine, Gersten, & Green, 1982; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Lee, 1987; Kroeze, 1984; Little & Bird, 1987; Pounder, 1987). This led to the belief that principals must provide strong directive leadership if a school is to make tough educational decisions in the best interest of students (Murphy & Louis, 1994).

In the latter years of this decade, an interest in the transformational leadership role of the school principal arose. Principals were seen as change agents. They were expected to utilize transformative power to initiate and facilitate change in education (Beck & Murphy, 1993). This new conception of the principal's role was partly responsible for the change in power relations between building-level and district-level administrators. School board personnel were no longer considered as having power "over" principals. In fact there was a desire to move power and authority into individual schools. This, in turn, gave way to the notion of accountability. Principals were expected not only to be effective resource managers, but also account for the ways these were utilized. This interest in the notion of accountability took on a more vociferous tone in the next

decade.

Assumptions Related to Evaluation

The belief prevalent among educators that there is a causal relationship between principal's competencies and school outcomes, turned the attention of both the authors and practitioners alike to outcomes-based evaluation. Authors contended that the performance of principals should be judged in view of the performance of their schools, teachers, and students. This provided means to evaluate site-administrators on the basis of the realization of their stated goals for their schools. It also placed responsibility on principals to provide evidence as to the achievement of these goals. It is interesting to note that both of these conditions were present in assessments of the evaluation of principals in instructionally effective school districts (Beck & Murphy, 1993). In addition to the focus on outcomes as standards for evaluation, interest in the evaluation of individuals prior to their entry into the field, which was prevalent in the fifties, resurfaced. This re-appearance of many earlier beliefs, relating to the role of principals and evaluation practices, in the later decades makes it clear that the past had a considerable influence in shaping the future which is evident in the dialectic

The Nineties

Schools and their Principals

In the post-industrial society, the heterarchical model of organization is emerging to replace the hierarchical one. In this model of organization, hierarchy of authority is considered inappropriate. Teachers are given influence in areas that had been traditionally within the realm of administration, and principals are no longer viewed as the *only* leaders. In fact they are considered as 'leaders of leaders' whose task is to facilitate the work of teachers. This is a tremendous shift in the conceptions of site leaders; the traditional view of leadership was based on positional power of the principal in a hierarchical school organization. Even the instructional leadership concept, which emerged in the earlier decade, shared one critical assumption with the earlier models of leadership, that is, the principal is the school's sole decision-maker. The instructional leadership role, although different from the managerial model, highlighted the centrality of the principal's role in coordinating and controlling curriculum and instruction. No doubt the journey towards instructional leadership added new obligations in every decade, but the critical point is that it did not represent a qualitative change in the way principals did their work (Hallinger, 1992; Murphy & Louis, 1994).

The new, evolving conception of principalship emphasizes

the diffuse nature of leadership. Contemporary concepts such as collaborative decision-making, teacher empowerment, site-based management, and school restructuring are responsible for transforming the role of the principals by new decision making jurisdictions as more individuals and groups are beginning to get involved in governing schools; the general expectation among people is that principals should share leadership responsibilities, and create collaborative decision making processes. This reduces the need for the principal to serve the central role as school's instructional leader. The leadership is expanded to include teachers, and parents (Murphy & Louis, 1994). This thought is reflected in Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins (1992) book *Developing Expert Leadership for Future School*, in which they observe that instructional leaders lead from the front or the middle whereas the transformational leaders lead from the back of the band. Leithwood (1992) also states that "'instructional leadership' no longer appears to capture the heart of what school administration will have to become. 'Transformational leadership' evokes a more appropriate range of practice; it ought to subsume instructional leadership as the dominant image of school administration at least during the '90s" (p. 8). Similarly, Hallinger (1992) writes:

> Shifting priorities have already begun to diminish the viability of this image of the principalship. Critics now assert that this conception of the principalship as the school's instructional leader is ill-suited to long-term needs for institutional development in schools. (p. 39)

Certainly, the principalship today is a complex and demanding educational leadership position.

Assumptions Related to Evaluation

Considerable attention is given to the concept of team evaluation in recent years. Different authors propose slightly different approaches. Nonetheless, one common thread running through the work of these authors is that more than one evaluator should be involved.

A large majority of business organizations are contemplating incorporating 360-degree feedback in an effort to make performance appraisal more inclusive. Murphy and Cleveland (1995) state that information from self-evaluation, supervisors, peers, and subordinates is used as a source of feedback in this methodology. This concept changes the whole notion of evaluation as top-down review, and is consistent with the move of the system from hierarchical to heterarchical. Whether the people in the educational world, and especially school principals are ready to accept such a participatory system of appraisal, the findings in Chapter Four will shed some light. Nevertheless, there is a clear

indication in literature as to the preference given to the involvement of multiple raters instead of only one. Some of the costs and benefits associated with such a shift are discussed later in this chapter.

Newfoundland and Labrador. The emerging concepts of school report card and school assessment team are likely to have an impact on the whole notion of evaluation in this province. School assessment teams would visit different schools and assess various aspects. The performance of the school would reflect on the performance of the school principal as s/he is considered to play a pivotal role in the success of the school. The report prepared by the external team of educators would then be sent to the school board in an attempt to improve any necessary aspect with the intention of improving the overall performance of the school.

The intention behind school report card, on the other hand, is to keep the general public informed about the important aspects of the schools their children attend. The School Report Card would contain information about students' performance in criterion referenced tests (CRTs) and Canadian Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) in that particular school, the district, and the province. It would also provide information about teaching staff such as their average age, average years of experience, etc. A survey called *Quality of School Life*

would disclose the attitudes of students toward their school. Again, the attitude of students in that particular school will be compared with the attitudes of students throughout the district and the province.

It must be noted that the years between 1911 and 1925 (Callahan, 1962) witnessed a growing movement to survey schools. The intention behind these surveys was to keep the general public informed about the existing conditions and standards. In the words of George Strayer (cited in Tyack & Hansot, 1982) a survey was

> an inquiry concerning public education which seeks to acquaint the public with all of the educational agencies supported in whole, or in part, by public moneys, with respect to their organization, administration, supervision, cost, physical equipment, courses of study, teaching staff, methods of teaching, student body, and results as measured by the achievement of those who are being trained or have been trained therein. (p. 161)

The unanticipated result of these surveys was that people started making comparisons between different schools; even with schools in other cities. This led to the increase in the number of criticisms of the schools. Administrators grew fearful and anxious of these investigations as their role became central in the eyes of the public. Beck and Murphy (1993) note that these surveys provided an important avenue for evaluating the work of individual principals. A view equally shared by Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Benion

(1987).

In retrospect, it seems inevitable that these report cards will have similar effect in drawing attention of the public to the performance of the "*leader of the leaders*". These pilot projects have the potential of further igniting the accountability movement, and evaluation is a necessary tool in determining accountability.

Section II

Impact Of School On Student Achievement

During 1960s and 70s, there was widespread pessimism among academics about the impact of schools on the development of students. This seemed to be a consequence of two highly influential American books: Coleman's (1966) report on *Equality of Educational Opportunity* and Jencks, Smith, Acland, Bane, Cohen, Gintis, Heyns, and Michelson's (1972) *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*.

The Coleman Report showed that educational attainment is largely independent of the schooling a child receives. Similarly, Jencks concluded that the most important determinant of educational attainment is family background; factors such as socioeconomic status and race affect educational attainment almost entirely by affecting test scores and aspirations. He also contended that equalizing the

quality of high schools would reduce cognitive inequality by one percent or less, that increasing expenditures would be unlikely to increase achievement, and that redistributing resources would probably not reduce test score inequality. Likewise, British writers came to the same conclusion about the limited influence of schools. The Plowden Report (1967) entitled *Children and their Primary School* indicated that factors like parental attitude, family size, and home circumstances are correlated with student performance. For instance, children from smaller families do better on the whole than those from larger. In short, the report concluded that home influences outweigh those of the school.

Today, however, there is general agreement that schools and leadership in those schools, do make a significant difference. The following studies will provide support to this notion.

Inner-city children (Weber, 1971)

The Coleman Report (1966) concluded that schools do not make a difference and that a student's achievement is exclusively a function of family background. Weber's work, on the other hand, provided an alternative to Coleman Report. Weber studied four inner-city schools in Manhattan, Los Angeles, and Kansas City that were found to be notably successful in teaching beginning reading; all four schools had

achievements far above the typical inner-city schools, and the differences among them were relatively slight. The analysis revealed that eight factors made a significant difference in these schools and one of them was strong leadership. School administrators set the tone for the school and assumed responsibility for instruction and allocation of resources to reach school goals. The study also indicated that the failure in beginning reading typical of inner-city schools was the fault not of the children or their background but of the sc' ols.

New York state performance review (1974)

The New York Study supported Weber's findings and indicated that school environment is instrumental in elevating achievement scores. Two New York City elementary schools were studied in depth to determine what school factors influenced reading achievement. Both schools, one high achieving and one low achieving, had half their student population receiving welfare and had consistently high or low student achievement scores. Some of the findings showed that:

- the differences in student performance in these two schools seemed to be attributed to factors under the schools' control;
- administrative behaviour, policies and practices in the schools appeared to have a significant impact on school

effectiveness;

• the more effective inner city school was led by an admi...strative team which provided a good balance between both management and instructional skills.

In addition, there were some notable differences between low and high achieving schools. The high achieving school was characterized by stability of leadership, good relations with community, initiation and implementation of new programs, manipulation of union contract by principal to meet the needs of the school, and delegation of authority for staff supervision and support.

Several other studies such as *ESAA In-Depth Study (Wellisch, MacQueen, Carriere, & Duck, 1978); School Social Systems and Student Achievement (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979); Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children (Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, Smith, 1979); and School Improvement Project (Edmonds, 1979)* indicated that schools do make a difference and that leadership behaviour is positively associated with school outcomes. It follows that not only schools, but also principals should be held accountable for their performance.

Accountability

The report, *Our Children Our Future (1992)*, states that accountability not only assures all sectors of the public that

the resources being put into education represent a sound and cost-effective investment in the future, but also that the educational experiences provided to Canadian children are of the highest quality. The following are some of the reasons given for holding the education system accountable for its performance:

- the need to maintain acceptabl standards of performance;
- the demand for efficiency in light of diminishing resources;
- the need for all to be informed about the performance of the system and how tax revenues are used;
- the increased importance of education for economic development; and
- the need for continual improvement in the system because an unresponsive system is likely to prove stagnant and non-competitive.

Areas of accountability for principals

Gorton and Schneider (cited in Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992) propose that accountability for student learning should be shared by teachers, administrators, students, parents, governmental agencies, and the general public. They offer specific areas of accountability for principals:

- Identifying and clearly defining, with the help of others, the educational objectives of the school.
- Specifying which teaching, supervisory, or administrative

procedures and resources are needed to achieve those objectives.

- Developing and implementing a plan for evaluating the extent of progress or achievement of the school's objectives.
- Informing the school board and the community regularly about the degree to which objectives have been achieved, and the reasons for problems, if they occur.

Certainly, principals should be held accountable for achieving objectives, but objectives such as these are difficult to assess in a manner that would appease those demanding accountability in performance. It follows that accountability and evaluation go hand in hand. It also means that principal evaluation practices should move away from being mere perfunctory, episodic, and non substantive.

The following section will address the topic of evaluation in considerable detail.

Evaluation In Context

Evaluation is simply a process of ascertaining the worth of something by the systematic collection of information. A review of literature indicates that the evaluation system serves a multitude of purposes. However, these purposes may be divided into two general categories, namely, those serving primarily as a means and those serving as an end (Nygaard, 1974).

Evaluation procedures that acts as a means is called formative evaluation and that which serves as an end is called summative evaluation (Figure 1 shows the major components of the two types of evaluation).

Formative evaluation is concerned with improvement; it is the process of identifying and remediating ineffective behaviour. Rogers (cited in Orlosky, McCleary, Shapiro, & Webb, 1984) conceptualized this process as a "helping relationship, one in which at least one of the parties has the intent of promoting the growth, development, maturity, improved functioning, and coping with life of another" (p.118). Summative evaluation, on the other hand, is concerned with judgement; it is the process of collecting data in order to make final decisions about the future status of whatever is being evaluated. It is the last chance, the final point where an ultimate disposition concerning a person is made (Daresh & Playko, 1995).

Fontanna (1994) notes that annual summative evaluation rarely brings about professional growth or change, while ongoing formative evaluation that allows for corrections and encourages the development of new skills and talents does. Further, Worthern and Sanders (cited in Daresh & Playko, 1995) stressed the importance of keeping the two forms of evaluation separate as one of the major concerns in evaluation today is that the two evaluative forms are often mixed.

Figure 1

Components of Two Major Purposes of Evaluation

Purpose of Evaluation	Role of Supervi-sor	Uses	Focus
Formative Evaluation serves as a means to improve performance	Counsellor	Improve performance; interrelated with decision making, goal development, & other administrative tasks	The improvement of the educational system
Summative Evaluation serves as an end, a final judgement	Judge	Basis for promotion, demotion, inservice, training, transfer, & similar personnel decisions	The individual & his/her performance

Source: Adapted from Evaluating Administrative Performance, 1985

The section to follow will discuss some of the problems related with the evaluation of principals.

Problems Associated with Principal Evaluation

Some people move from complexity to simplicity
and on into catastrophe.
Others move from simplicity to complexity
and onward into full-scale confusion....

- Halcolm

Issue of "objectivity" and "subjectivity" in performance appraisal

Performance can be measured in many ways. In general, performance data can be classified in two groups, that is, judgemental or subjective and nonjudgemental or objective measures (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995). The conflict between these two measures is evident in the literature. Nalbandian (1981), while discussing judgemental methods of evaluation, contends:

> Subjective appraisal methods lend themselves to favouritism, inefficiency, and conflict in the management of personnel. They permit race, sex, age, friendship, and other non-job-related factors to subvert the evaluation process. (p.392)

Although he criticizes subjective measures, Nalbandian maintains that even objective appraisal methods are not without its cost. First of all it is extremely difficult to arrive at a set of explicit, objective expectations about an employee's performance; secondly objective performance contracts tend to reduce the employee's organizational contributions to explicit statements of job-related behaviour. Moreover, the inability of the performance contracts to capture all the behaviour which might improve organizational effectiveness offers employees an opportunity to perform in accordance with only the criteria upon which they can be formally evaluated. This, instead of being advantageous, can lead to organizational paralysis.

While it may be desirable to have an evaluation system based on "objective" criteria that can stand up to any judicial scrutiny, the work of teachers and principals makes it difficult to do so, especially in light of the fact that the work of principals is becoming increasingly complex with an increase in the need to exercise discretion. It follows that evaluation of the work of principals must rely to some extent on human judgement. Jacques (1977) notes:

> Human beings are always trying to substitute so-called objective indicators in place of the simple act of human judgement, and losing the essence of human ability in the process. This kind of technocracy is a prime enemy of humanity in industrial societies .... The competence of a person must always be judged in terms of how well or how badly he did in the obtaining circumstances. There is no avoiding the exercise of human judgement, and what is more there never will be any.... The art is not to try to eliminate human judgement but to ensure that it is fully employed. The exercise of judgement is the greatest of human assets. (p. 55-56)

Murphy and Cleveland (1995) contend that the attempt to make performance appraisals completely objective has never succeeded. The issue, then, is not to find ways to divorce judgement from appraisal but to determine how best human judgement can be utilized. The importance of "subjectivity" is further emphasized by Berry and Ginsberg (1989).

Legitimizing subjectivity

Berry and Ginsberg (1989) note that reliance on human

expertise and professional judgement as the key data-gathering instrument seems to be missing in the evaluation of principals. They further contend that humans judge and appraise the quality of complex educational processes and outcomes, just as art critics judge and appraise complex works of art.

Lack of trust in the evaluators made principals adhere to "objective" checklist type evaluation in the past. However, Berry and Ginsberg's research findings seem to indicate that principals may be ready to accept "subjectivity" in their evaluation process by allowing more judgements to enter into decision-making. The following remark made by a school principal will shed some light: "There is a lot more to what I do than is measured on these damn instruments" (p.182).

In the following passage, Ginsberg and Berry (1990) talk about the current evaluation practices.

The folklore of principal evaluation

In a comprehensive review of the literature related to principal evaluation, Ginsberg and Berry (1990) found a wide array of practices reported with little systematic research to support one approach over another. Specifically, five categories of sources were identified:

1. **Home recipes**: instruments, methods, and opinions presented in the literature with minimal empirical support for any of the approaches offered.

2. **Literature reviews**: a number of reviews which all derived the theme that little analysis or research on principal evaluation exists.

3. **Guidelines and textbooks**: published guides for practitioners, though no research based evidence was found to substantiate any particular approach.

4. **Surveys of practices**: much of the research involved self-report surveys on practices in various school districts. The review concluded that many of these surveys were flawed methodologically, though the state of current practices was documented.

5. **Research and evaluation studies**: investigations examining specific instruments, control of principals, practices in effective districts, and various aspects of principal evaluation were found to suggest ways to improve principal evaluation, and implied the need for further research.

Several concerns emerge when considering appropriate means to appraise principals including the nature of principal's work, lack of any specific job description, variety of sources of expectations, and the lack of a research base on principal evaluation. Some of the problems associated with principal evaluation are highlighted by Snyder and

Ebmeier (1992) in the following section.

Technical and conceptual problems

Snyder and Ebmeier (1992) argue that administrative evaluation not only appraises unimportant principal behaviours but also use methods and instruments that often lack even the elements of sound practice. They characterized the problems with existing instruments and processes for evaluating principals into two categories, namely, technical and conceptual. Technical problems are frequently described in terms of reliability and validity benchmarks, including:

- over reliance on the supervisor as the sole source of input (concurrent validity);
- reliance on opinion data gathered from individuals who are not in a good position to observe the principal's behaviour or whose discrimination skills are not effectively developed to produce reliable or valid results (discriminate validity);
- reliance on generic rating scales that have poorly defined criteria for those ratings (criterion-related validity);
- failure to incorporate a substantial body of knowledge regarding effective administrative practice into existing instruments (content validity);
- failure to collect evaluative information from clients of the school (ecological validity);

- failure to design separate instruments for summative or formative evaluations and frequent use of instruments for purposes for which they were not designed (content validity); and
- failure to establish reliability across raters and over time (internal reliability).

Conflicting definitions of the purpose of schools are often the source of conceptual problems associated with existing principal evaluation instruments. This leads to ambiguous principals' job descriptions and vague definitions of effectiveness which are often situationally determined. For instance, effectiveness might be defined in terms of personal traits, the quantitative number of administrative tasks demonstrated, the qualitative demonstration of competence, or the achievement of more school outcomes than comparative groups of principals. As a consequence, it has been difficult to design an evaluation instrument based on a sound definition of effectiveness as constituent groups value different outcomes. Further, creating effective performance evaluations that not only deal with these issues but also hold up against legal appeal becomes an even greater challenge (Heck & Marcoulides, 1992).

The purpose of following section is to provide some guidelines for making the evaluation system legally defensible.

Guidelines for Legally Defensible Appraisal

Bernardin and Beatty (cited in Murphy & Cleveland, 1995) and Cascio and Latham (cited in Murphy & Cleveland, 1995) have reviewed the legal issues connected with performance appraisal, and provided a set of standards for developing performance appraisals that are legally sound. Some of these guidelines are given below:

- Performance standards must reflect standards that are based on job requirements. The standards that are based on job requirements should reflect specific dimensions of job performance rather than an overall rating.
- The performance dimensions should be defined in behavioural terms, and must be communicated to employees.
- More than one rater should be involved whenever possible.
- Proper documentation including critical incident, date, and location should be provided in case of extreme ratings.
- A sound performance appraisal system should have a formal appeal process.
- Raters should receive training.
- Feedback should be given to the ratee.
- Appraisals should be frequent.

It is customary for an individual's performance to be evaluated by his/her immediate supervisor, but it is not clear if it is the optimal practice. Murphy and Cleveland (1995) report that although the legal system is not hostile to this

practice, it nevertheless discourages it. The importance of having multiple raters has been highlighted by several authors. The team approach to evaluation is the next topic for discussion.

Suggestions For Improving Principal Evaluation Practices

> *When the artist is alive in any person, whatever his kind of work may be, he becomes an inventive, searching, daring, self-expressive creature.... He disturbs, upsets, enlightens, and opens ways for better understandings. Where those who are not artists are trying to close the book, he opens it and shows there are still more pages possible.*
>
> *- Henri*

Team Approach to Principal Evaluation

Although there appears to be no consensus as to the one best approach for evaluating principals, literature does seem to indicate a preference for team (Erickson, 1988; Pekoe Jr., 1991; Murphy & Cleveland, 1995) instead of having one person evaluate principals on a variety of measures. Erickson (1988) and Pekoke Jr. (1991) suggest that the team may involve members of the central office staff could evaluate principal in their own areas of expertise; for instance, the director of fiscal services could evaluate the principal's skills in business management, the community services coordinator could

evaluate the principal on school community relations, and curriculum director could evaluate principal's skills in curriculum matters.

Some of the advantages of this form of evaluation given by Erickson (1988), Pekoke Jr. (1991), and Murphy and Cleveland (1995) are given below:

- Regardless of how detailed the training program or how explicit the rating form, there is little protection against intentional or unintentional distortion by any single evaluator. Using more than one evaluator lessens the effect of bias and personality conflicts that can impinge on even the fairest, most impartial evaluation.
- Principals can benefit from a fuller, richer picture of their performance. Different members of the evaluation team have different impressions about how any one principal performs. The composite score can show principals at their best and can also point up areas of concern that might have remained hidden from a single evaluator.
- Principals face conflicting demands, often from the people who evaluate them. This approach to evaluation may lead to greater understanding of the many demands they place on principals due to robust dialogue among team members.

A similar team approach to evaluation is recommended by Ernest (1985). But he suggests that an evaluation team could include superintendents, assistant superintendents,

coordinators, supervisors, directors, building teachers (all of the teachers or a sample of them), students (a sample), and the principals themselves, by means of self-assessment.

Another form of team approach that has gained considerable currency in recent years, and is widely used in business is called 360-degree feedback. The next sub-section talks about this concept.

360-Degree Feedback

A variant of multi-source feedback is upward feedback which calls for ratings from multiple subordinates (London & Smither, 1995). Some of the organizations that have started using "upward appraisal" systems include the World Bank, Bank of America, Continental Bank, Exxon, Johnson and Johnson, Tenneco, Wells Fargo, British Petroleum, and GTE (Bernardin, Dahmus, & Redmon, 1993). Another variant is called 360-degree feedback. It refers to the practice of involving multiple raters, often including self-ratings in the assessment of individuals, thus constituting a full circle of relevant viewpoints. Dunnette (1993) contends that 360-degree feedback is relevant to organizational practices involving performance appraisal, performance feedback, leadership and management theory and practice, and individual and group training programs.

Although this methodology can be used for both appraisal

and development purposes, the majority of organizations are using it solely for development. This brings forth an epistemological issue which is discussed in considerable detail in Tornow's (1993) article *Perceptions or Reality: Is Multi-Perspective Measurement a Means or an End?* He notes that differences in emphasis and perspectives between the scientists and practitioners' worlds become evident when looking at multirater instruments for measurement purposes. This is so because measurement can be seen in two ways; it can be seen as end in itself or as a means to an end. When measurement is viewed as an end in itself, the underlying assumption is that there is an objective reality which can be mapped. The intention is to refine the measures to obtain as accurate ratings as possible. Pure measurement is basically the domain of the researcher/scientist whose focus is on improving the reliability and validity of measurement. Therefore, the goal of the scientist is to reduce the error of measurement and rater variation in order to enhance the accuracy of measurement.

In the domain of manager/practitioner, measurement is seen as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. The purpose is neither to find the true score, nor to reduce error variance caused by rater variation. Instead the manager/practitioner considers the multiple perspectives as meaningful sources of variation from which much can be

learned.

In 360-degree feedback, the focus is more on measurement as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. Sources of variation are seen as useful in guiding personal development (Tornow, 1993).

Costs and Benefits. Research has shown that this technology can enhance communications and performance. London and Beatty (1993) note that it can increase formal and informal communications, build effective work relationships, increase opportunities for employee involvement, uncover and resolve conflict, and show respect for employees opinions on the part of the top management.

Multi-source feedback can also provide guidance to leaders in making personal and organizational change. Different constituencies will have slightly different perspectives depending on the nature of their interactions. London and Beatty (1993) found that when customer-based data are combined with data from subordinates on leader behaviour, such feedback often creates the discrepancies that energize focused change. The combined data may be helpful to the leaders in revealing what needs to be done for improving the performance of the organization as well as the changes that need to be made in their own behaviour for accomplishing the task.

One should also note that supervisors are inclined to have more positive attitudes towards subordinate appraisal when they receive feedback from both their subordinates and their managers. For instance, Bernardin, Dahmus, and Redmon's (1993) research findings show that supervisors who received feedback from their managers and their subordinates were more supportive of subordinate appraisal than those who received feedback from only managers or only subordinates. Dunnette (1993) argues that this finding is fully compatible with the central premise of 360-degree feedback, which is based on the assumption that supervisors/managers will profit more when performance feedback is provided from multiple perspectives instead of from only one.

In addition to significant benefits, this methodology has its costs. According to London and Beatty (1993) this process not only generates a considerable amount of information to collate, but also becomes the vehicle for selective perception and information distortion. Negative information becomes powerful and difficult to deny when different sources agree, and easy to distort and perceive selectively when constituencies disagree.

The next section will open a window into the perceptions held by different groups of people in relation to principal evaluation practices.

Perceptions Of Selected Group Of Educators

The feelings and views expressed by selected professor, school principals, and superintendents in the literature reviewed are furnished below.

Professor of educational administration

Manatt (1989) says that "performance evaluation for principals remains sketchy, poorly thought out, and largely ineffective. That's a harsh judgement, of course, but its accurate. Today's evaluation of school administrators are largely bureaucratic meaningless exercises." (p.22)

School principals

Some of the concerns and views of the principals are presented below:

- MacDonald (1984) says that "evaluation of administrative effectiveness in one facet of our educational system which is seriously lacking" (p.23). He further contends that it is still an exception rather than a rule to find policy on formal evaluation of principals, although some areas in Canada are further along than others. However, the need for such policies is clear.
- Harrison (1988) says that the "evaluation of principals is effective only if the principals being evaluated and the superintendents who are evaluating them understand the

components of the evaluation process" (p.1).

• According to one seasoned principal (cited in Cousins, 1990): "I don't remember looking forward to the appraisal process as a learning experience for me. I looked forward knowing it was going to be there and very confident of the way it would be scored." (p.23)

• Wadelius (1979) points out, that "formal evaluation provides principals with the feedback that is necessary to help them improve their performance." (p.5)

Superintendents

Presented below are some of the insights and perceptions of superintendents pertaining to the evaluation practices.

• Speaking about a year-end summation of a specific appraisal, a superintendent (cited in Cousins, 1990) said "I think the appraisal process was a confirmation of what the principal already thought, all we did was confirm each other's impressions in that experience. They were really no surprises." (p.23)

• Another superintendent (cited in Cousins, 1990) spoke of a somewhat less experienced and more motivated principal that the principal's attitude is much more of "what can I learn from the evaluation? Let's not even do the evaluation unless its going to help me to do my job" (p.23).

Selected Research Study

Dawe, R. A. (1983): A study of evaluation systems for school principal in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador

This study examined principal evaluation systems available in Newfoundland and Labrador to make recommendations for future developments in this area. Findings of this study indicated that the evaluation practices at the time were generally the same throughout the province and the main purpose for evaluation was the improvement of performance or instruction. With regards to evaluation procedures, there was strong support for involving principals themselves in their evaluation by means of self-assessment. Furthermore, the study recommended committee approach as the procedure that should be used to develop an evaluation system.

Contributions and Limitations of the Literature

The strong leadership role of the school principal has been supported by an abundance of research findings; however, the research is sparse on how best the principal can perform the dual role of manager and leader. The literature reviewed by this researcher has many gaps as several important and vast responsibilities of the principals have hardly been addressed and the research found is mostly descriptive and prescriptive in nature. Empirical reports on leadership and school restructuring, illustrating how the role of the school

leaders, who is considered as the linchpin in plans for educational change, changes in schools that are attempting to bring about fundamental change through restructuring are scarce.

Likewise, the notion that evaluation of principals should be mandatory is strongly supported by the literature. Also, that it can be helpful in improving the performance of principals and in turn schools. But the greater attention to the subject has not led to a convergence of wisdom on its design, use, and implementation.

The literature also confirms that little research has actually studied principal evaluation practices, which makes it difficult to find appropriate means to appraise principals, especially in light of the fact that authors maintain different perspectives as to the purposes, criteria, and processes that should be utilized. While the literature does serve to identify the problems and concerns related to current evaluation practices, it provides little information as to the best means or process that may have a positive impact on schools in general and principals in particular. When literature does exist the conclusions and opinions of the authors tend to be either based on the behaviours associated with instructional leadership in effective schools; the subjective views of the authors; or research conducted on evaluation practices utilized in United States. This makes it

difficult to reach any decision as to the sound evaluation practice backed by solid research findings that takes into consideration not only the emerging role of school principals which emphasizes diffuse nature of leadership, but also Canadian situation which may warrant different solution then their American counterparts.

The literature also reveals that unlike the study of teacher assessment, the study of principal assessment has not benefited significantly from research on learning and teaching and the practice has not been guided by firmly established theoretical considerations.

Summary

The chapter was classified into two broad sections. The first section recounted the evolution of the principalship from the beginning of this century. It also highlighted the unfolding, dialectic pattern of development; the later concepts often reflected a fusion and extension of images of the preceding decades. As Beck and Murphy (1993) observe that principalship is a role influenced by its own history. This section also examined how the changing assumptions about leadership led to changes in the evaluation practices.

The second section provided a brief summary of the research findings related to schools and student achievement.

Included also was a synopsis of the relevant research and work done, to date, in the area of principal evaluation. The chapter concluded with a discussion of certain weaknesses and limitations apparent in the literature reviewed by the researcher.

In view of the fact that the primary focus of this study was to examine current evaluation practices and perceptions of selected group of people in relation to those practices, the literature review for this study was mainly focused in this direction.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

> *Qualitative research unlocks the door to life as it is lived. It illustrates the mundane and the bizarre. And, most importantly, it demonstrates how we, as researchers, are just as bizarre as the people around us.*
>
> - *Rothe*

The purpose of this chapter is to present the general procedural model or design of the study. The chapter will describe (a) the theoretical approach, (b) the population from which the sample was drawn, (c) the sample selection, (d) the method of data collection, (e) research questions, and finally, (f) the data analysis procedure.

Theoretical Approach

Qualitative research is not just a generic research process, it is comprised of numerous disciplines or schools of thought, such as ecology, ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism, critical analysis. The orientation which has been concentrated on in this study, and which will provide a conceptual framework for the analysis of data is called phenomenology.

Phenomenology

The term phenomenology is derived from two Greek words, *phainomenon*, meaning an appearance and *logos*, meaning reason

or word. Hence, phenomenology is reasoned inquiry which discovers the inherent essences of appearances. Stewart and Mickunas (1974) in their book *Exploring Phenomenology* raise the question: *What is an appearance?* They contend that the answer to this question leads to one of the major themes of phenomenology: an appearance is anything of which one is conscious. Therefore, anything that appears to consciousness is a legitimate area of philosophical investigation.

Phenomenology focuses on how people internalize the objective world into consciousness, how they negotiate its reality in order to make it liveable and shareable, or how they construct social reality within the confines of the world's constraints. To accomplish this aim, phenomenologists have to put aside their own biases and beliefs, and try to understand what a particular phenomenon means to the individuals they study. Only after that can they ask what that phenomenon means for society in general (Rothe, 1993). In short, phenomenological inquiry is aphilosophic investigation of appearances; phenomenologists are not only interested in objective realities but also deeper subjective ones. They try to bring forth these meanings, hidden in the conscious, to the front.

Some of the advantages of using this approach were that findings helped the researcher to uncover the meanings people attached to the whole notion of evaluation; their experiences

with evaluation process, and their deep subjective feelings became a major source of information in the study. This helped in capturing a deeper and richer picture of the phenomenon under study. In addition, phenomenological analysis lent itself to further critical analysis.

Selection Process and Sampling

Selection refers to a general process of focusing and choosing what to study. Sampling is a more specialized and restricted form. The selection process requires the researcher to outline precisely the population to be studied, using whatever criteria are relevant to establishing the boundaries of the phenomena. Once the boundary has been delineated, a smaller subset of it may be selected for study.

Worthy of note is the fact that the researchers who use qualitative approaches use sampling and selection somewhat differently from those researchers who use quantitative research methods. For the latter, sampling is a necessary precursor to the research. In qualitative research, however, selection is a recursive process. It is dynamic not static. This does not mean that qualitative researchers do not use selection and sampling to define their initial population, but their concern with selection and sampling does not end with the creation of the initial group. Although some phenomena can be identified and characterized as being salient

prior to entering the field, others emerge only as the field work proceeds. Consequently, selection is a developmental procedure in qualitative research (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).

The Population

Initially the population for this study consisted of all the school principals, vice-principals, teachers, and school board staff in St. John's and Mt. Pearl areas of the province. However, as the study proceeded it became apparent that the population would have to be expanded to include a member of the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association. This change in initial population size was made in view of the research findings, and with the intention of addressing those needs of the study which arose once the data gathering process was initiated.

The Sample

Quota selection process was utilized to facilitate the selection of the sample for this study. Quota selection is sometimes called maximum variation sampling. This method of selection provides a representative subset of a larger population.

The participants in this study included:

1. Ten female school principals; eight from primary/elementary and two from senior high.

2. Eight male principals; four from elementary, two from junior high, and two from senior high.

3. Three female elementary school vice-principals.

4. Four male vice-principals; two from senior high, one from junior high, and one from elementary school.

5. Five female teachers. Three teachers from primary/elementary, one from junior high, and one from senior high.

6. Three male teacher; two from senior high and one from junior high.

7. One female school board employee.

8. One male school board employee.

9. One male Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association (NLTA) member.

Research Site

All the schools in Mt. Pearl and St. John's area were contacted. Out of seventeen schools in St. John's, fourteen participated. One elementary and two junior high schools did not volunteer. All the five schools from Mount Pearl area took part.

Method of Data Collection

Before writing her thesis proposal, the researcher contacted two principals, one from high school and one from

elementary. These two people helped in shaping and modifying the research topic. Accordingly, the thesis proposal was written taking into consideration those characteristics which were unique to the research setting. This is an informal method of data collection which is called mapping.

LeCompte and Preissle (1993) observe that mapping a field site or a group helps in directing researchers to the forms of data collection that would be fitting to the topic under investigation. It also facilitates the development of formal means of data collection such as interviewing.

The primary research method used in this study was semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews incorporate a series of concise, clear, and focused questions in advance. Nonetheless, whenever more information is required probes or follow-up questions are used. These probes not only lead the interviewee into providing greater depth and breadth for answers, but also provide opportunity to the interviewer to pursue any particular area in-depth (Rothe, 1993). Since this study is oriented to phenomenological inquiry, probes helped the interviewer in penetrating the deeply internalized assumptions, intentions and motives. The interviews ranged from thirty minutes to two and a half hours.

Other sources of data included:

1. documentation from school boards, schools, school principals, Departments of Education and Labour.

2. follow-up telephone calls to school principals and teachers.

3. researcher's daily notes which supplemented the interviews and helped in capturing the nature of the themes as they unfolded. Many researchers who work with qualitative data accumulate a secondary set of data, that is, researcher's memos. They are written from the moment the first data are collected (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). The researcher utilized this secondary source for recording any significant actions, gestures, movements, or any other information that seemed important. It was the aim of the researcher to record everything of consequence, no matter how brief. Every attempt was made to ensure that all data were recorded in the proper context so as to obtain the true meaning of the participant responses.

Research Questions

The study examined the current practices and perceptions of selected groups of superintendent, assistant superintendent, principals, vice-principals, and teachers in the Avalon Consolidated School Board with respect to the principal evaluation practices.

More specifically, the study attempted to explore the perceptions of above mentioned groups of people on the following points:

1. When was the system developed?
2. Was the system piloted?
3. How were principals informed about the evaluation system?
4. Was there an in-service program developed to introduce principals to the evaluation system?
5. Is the system reviewed regularly? How?
6. What weaknesses and/or strengths there are inherent in the policy?
7. How the policy might be improved?
8. How does the present policy fit with respect to the changing role of the principal?
9. Who should be responsible for conducting the evaluation?
10. What should be the purpose of evaluation?
11. Should rating scale be used or you would prefer a narrative?
12. Who should be involved in the evaluation of principals?
13. How each source of feedback should be weighted?
14. All parents should be included or only those on school councils and PTA? Should criteria differ for parents on councils from other parents?
15. Should principals be told as to how individual sources evaluated him/her or should it be kept confidential?

Data Analysis

After transcribing the interviews in full, the researcher listened to all the interviews in order to note any important information, such as the time taken for responding to a particular question, the manner or the tone in which they expressed their notions; if they laughed over something or they were hesitant in saying something, all of that was recorded. This helped in discerning the inmost feelings and sentiments of the interview subjects.

Data collected with the help of documentation from schools, school principals, school boards, Department of Environment and Labour, Department of Education, and semi-structured interviews were analyzed using three categories. These categories indicate major themes addressed in the literature and are representative of issues most plausible to the study:

1. Why, what, how and by whom of evaluating principals.
2. How the perceptions about principal evaluation relates to actual practice.
3. New requirements, directions for 1990s.

The researcher utilized these categories in interpreting the collected data with the intention of developing grounded theory which could address the issue of the gap between actual evaluation practices and those perceived to be important and should be employed. The resulting data and inductive analysis

helped in providing a better understanding of not only the problem being studied but also individual thoughts, concerns, and insights pertaining to the problem.

Inductive research begins with data collection and then attempts to generate theories from relationships discovered among the data. Researchers try to enter the research setting without any preconceived notions that sensitizes them to their own subjective responses. Nevertheless, the perceptions and experiences of the people they study often colour their own. In view of this fact, the researcher tried to present both preconceptions and post-conceptions wherever possible.

To preserve confidentiality, pseudonyms for all people and schools were used. Actual responses of the participants were used as much as possible to avoid any conscious or unconscious distortion or misinterpretation of data. References to literature were made frequently to discuss various viewpoints and their implications in depth.

Design of the Study

The design of the study was somewhat evolutionary. First, the school board was contacted to obtain the permission for conducting the study. After getting the permission, all the school principals were contacted; with their help, vice-principals and teachers were reached. After conducting most of the interviews, school board staff was approached. Copies of

the personal letters sent to the research participants are included in Appendix A.

With the help of mapping and literature review a predetermined set of questions was formed, and these questions guided the researcher in her early interviews. Initial data shaped the format of subsequent questions. It also directed the researcher to conduct follow-up calls; contact additional personnel; conduct supplemental searches of the literature; and obtain other relevant documents from school boards, principals, Department of Education, and Department of Environment and Labour. The data collection process proceeded as follows:

Table 3.1

Schedule for Data Collection

DATE	TASK
Sept. 29, 1995	Request for permission to conduct study
Jan. 4, 1996 to Feb. 9, 1996	Interview Board Employees
Oct. 26, 1995 to Mar.28, 1996	Interview Principals
Oct. 26, 1995 to Nov.29, 1995	Interview Vice-Principals
Nov. 8, 1995 to Feb. 13, 1996	Interview teachers
Mar. 28, 1996	Interview NLTA member
Oct. 27, 1995 to Apr. 3, 1996	Received documents from School Boards
Mar. 4, 1996	Received documents from Dept. of Environment & Labour
Feb. 26, 1996	Received documents from NLTA
Feb. 26, 1996	Received documents from Dept. of Education
Apr. 6, 1996 to Apr. 7, 1996	Follow-up calls to principals

Summary

This chapter contained a detailed account of the methodology used in the conduct of the research. The first section presented a discussion of the phenomenological approach; it also outlined some of the advantages of using

this orientation of qualitative research. The method of population and sample selection was furnished in the next section; the reason for change in the original population was also touched upon. Then, the research site and method of data collection were discussed; the various sources that were utilized for gathering data were outlined. A brief description of research questions was also included (See Appendix- B for a more comprehensive account). These questions were not meant to be exclusive; other questions arose during the conversation of the interviews. Finally, it was indicated that data were analyzed according to three categories. These categories helped in revealing how the principal evaluation system was intended to work, how it is presently working, and how it should work in future.

Chapter Four contains a presentation of the results of the research along with a discussion.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

In God we trust-all others must use data!

- Anon

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of the data generated through semi-structured interviews, review of evaluation policies from different school districts, and various other documentation. The chapter has been divided into four sections; each section will serve to illustrate the kind of assumptions and suggestions put forward by individual groups.

The first section of this chapter will present analytical information concerning the principal evaluation practices as seen through the eyes of the central office staff. It will also highlight how the system is actually working and how it is intended to work, thereby illuminating the gap between actual and intended practices. The feelings of the school board staff with respect to this gap will also be furnished.

The second section reports on the data collected from the school principals. Their opinions, suggestions, criticisms, and experiences illuminate what they what in terms of performance appraisal; it also gives directions for future trends and the avenues that need to be explored.

The third section will provide a detailed analysis of the perceptions and experiences of the teachers with the principal evaluation system.

The last and final section deals with the views of tl vice-principals; it talks about suggestions and insights this group of administrators shared with respect to the evaluation of their administrative colleagues. The distribution of schools by community is depicted in Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

TABLE 4.1

INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOLS IN MOUNT PEARL AREA

School	Type	Staff Size	Student Size
A	Senior High	43	715
B	Junior High	39	700
C	Elementary	20	330
D	Elementary	20	406
E	Elementary	32	600

TABLE 4.2

INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOLS IN ST. JOHN'S AREA

School	Type	Staff Size	Student Size
A	Senior High	37	660
B	Senior High	31	475
C	Senior High	40	700
D	Junior High	29	460
E	Elementary	12	194
F	Elementary	15	180
G	Elementary	18	380
H	Elementary	12	210
I	Elementary	32	585
J	Elementary	22	370
K	Elementary	22	340
L	Elementary	34	552
M	Elementary	32	600
N	Primary	7	117

Section I

School Board Staff

Two people from the school board were contacted. This section presents and analyzes their views related to the research topic. Their direct involvement with the evaluation of building-level administrators, and the dual role of judge and facilitator played by them gives a special significance to the relation they share with principals; their views regarding the evaluation practices provides an important dimension to this study, as they are the ones who have to utilize these practices and make the system work. The breakdown of the personnel interviewed is presented in Table 4.3. All names used in this section are fictitious.

TABLE 4.3

INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOL BOARD STAFF

Board Members	Years of Experience In Their Current Position
A	6 Years
B	7 Years

Experiences and Perceptions about Evaluation Practices

Mr. Power explained to the researcher how evaluation is carried out in their school board. He reported that the process of evaluation starts with principals doing the self-evaluation. In the case of a tenured principal they focus on an area that the principal wants to concentrate on. The area is discussed between the assistant superintendent and the principal during a pre-evaluation conference. When asked by the researcher if there should always be a pre-evaluation conference, Mr. Power answered:

> There should ah, well I won't be so bold as to say that that always happens. It's encouraged. It should be done in our view. There should be a pre-evaluation conference, an observation and a post-evaluation conference. That's the way we'd like to see it done.

The researcher probed again, "If there is no pre-evaluation conference, then who sets the objectives and who decides..." Mr. Power piped in, "Well the system breaks down. Doesn't it?" After a while he added:

> What is the point if I...If you're one of my principals and _ were to evaluate and I walk in and I'll say, "Now I'm evaluating you, and I'm going to evaluate you on your public relations." Now, I've decided that without consulting you. So, how do I know that's the area that you need to be evaluated in. So there's got to be a two-way street.

After discussing how, when, and by whom the objectives are set in the case of tenured principals, Mr. Power talked

about probationary principals. He observed, "In the case of probation the objectives are really set in the job description."

Getting this reply from him, the researcher inquired, "Do principals have a job description?" In response to this he said:

> In the Act of the School and in the collective agreement there are duties outlined for what a principal is. That's what I mentioned to you. And this is one of the weaknesses that we have. We don't have a job-description drawn up. We got a tentative one drawn up that a group of principals were asked to come together as a committee and draw up. Now this is a weakness and there is no question about it...

Mr. Power concluded the explanation of the way evaluation is conducted by stating that a post-evaluation conference takes place at the end of the process in which the evaluator and evaluatee discuss the results. As he says, "It's a sort of give and take."

After the review of the board's policy, it was evident that all probationary principals are expected to go through an evaluation process. Only after the successful completion of this probationary period, principals are granted tenure. With respect to pre-evaluation conference the board's policy (1991) states:

> An initial conference shall be held with the professional personnel being evaluated as early in the school year as possible, but not later than October 15. (p. A-12)

The researcher, however, was informed by some probationary school principals that they have not been contacted by anyone from the school board, and that they know nothing about any formal evaluation. These meetings with the probationary principals were taken place in the period between October 26 to November 24, 1995. The two sources were giving information that was contradictory, and led to some confusion; therefore, the researcher asked Mr. Power for clarification. Mr. Power asserted:

> I know that everybody who is on probation in this district and every single one of them were told point blank, when they were interviewed, "You will be on evaluation". Now, whether the assistant superintendent responsible for that school has gotten around to doing it well, I don't know...You got to realize that *several of our principals who have become principals and are on probation have already had very successful years as vice-principals*. Now, in a situation like that you probably wouldn't put as an intensive evaluation in place as you would with someone who's coming from the outside, who's never been a principal or vice-principal in our system. So, that kind of flexibility exists.

Close analysis of the response of Mr. Power raises a fundamental question: **Does the position of the assistant principalship prepares the incumbent adequately for the leadership role of the principal?**

The review of the literature seems to suggest that the position of assistant principalship does not provide adequate training for the principalship, because assistant principals

often spend time doing chores they would not do as principals (Kelly, 1987). Marshall (1992) notes that the tasks of some assistant principals are routine, possess low visibility, lack evaluation and review, and reward. Furthermore, it is the principal who exercises discretion in assigning the assistant his/her tasks and responsibilities (Boyer, 1991; Marshall & Mitchell, 1991), and often principals give their assistants those jobs they do not want to do themselves (Roderick, 1986). In general, the work of assistant principals centers on routine clerical tasks, discipline, and bus duties (Buckner & Jones, 1990; Koru, 1993). They are given those non-management tasks that can be performed by clerical staff, teachers, counsellors, community agencies, parent volunteers, or others (Hassenpflug, 1991). Although much attention has been paid to the instructional leadership role of school administrators, Koru (1993) observes that assistant principals are seldom charged with instructional improvement activities.

In view of this reality, the reader should decide if the successful years as assistant principals guarantee one's success as a principal to make the evaluation process less intensive?

Even if one accepts the fact that in situations where principals and vice-principals work together as teams, the position of assistant principalship can be regarded as a stepping stone to the principal's position; the following

cases will show that the actual process does not fall under the flexibility referred to by Mr. Power.

Ms. Jones: Ms. Jones, after serving as a vice-principal for over 10 years, became a principal. She was not informed by anyone that she would be evaluated. She did not even know if the board has a formal evaluation system for school principals. In this particular case, the individual was never evaluated as an administrator.

Ms. William: She was also on probationary contract when the researcher met her. She was never told that she is going to be evaluated. She stated, "I haven't met anyone formally to say that I am going to be evaluated." Having received the reply that no one has informed her "formally", the researcher inquired if anyone told her informally that she is going to be evaluated. She replied, "Not really said directly. I **assumed** it I guess through the conversations but it hasn't been formally stated."

As the above two examples involve the female gender, an example involving the male gender is warranted, so that the reader does not get any wrong impression.

Mr. Myrick: Mr. Myrick has been a principal in this district for 5 years, and was never evaluated. Once the evaluation process was initiated when he was a vice-principal in another

district, but the process never got completed. In his words:

> I don't think that process got completed because there was supposed to be self-evaluation and a staff evaluation but it never got to the staff evaluation component.

In all these cases the question is not whether the evaluation is "intensive" or not; the issue is that they were never evaluated, or they are being evaluated, regardless of the fact whether they have come to the principal's position from the same school, same district, or different school board. This points to only one thing that Mr. Power may very well be right in his assumption that "*...the system is falling down. There's no question about it.*"

In analysis, there appears to be a gap between actual and intended evaluation practices. The system is not working the way it has been indicated in the board documents. The irony of the situation is that even the holders of the position of superintendency are not aware that their vision is not being realized.

The following section discusses evaluation practices related to teaching principals.

Principal As a Teacher

Both school board employees, Ms. Jeffery and Mr. Power, reported that in the case of teaching principals, their

teaching is also taken into consideration, and they are evaluated in exactly the same manner as any other teacher. However, Mr. Power added:

> Generally speaking once a person becomes a principal, they've probably been a teacher. So, we probably wouldn't spend as much time observing the principal as a teaching principal in the classroom as we would in observing how he or she runs the school.

In conclusion, administrative duties are generally given priority over teaching responsibilities during performance evaluation of the school principals. The assumption being that the school principal must have been an effective teacher.

The section to follow will talk about the board's evaluation policy.

Evaluation Policy

The current evaluation policy evolved when the superintendent came to this board in 1989 from the Conception Bay South Integrated School Board. There was very little in this board with respect to teacher or principal evaluation. Therefore, with the permission of the board they adapted the policy that was used in the Conception Bay South. The superintendent expressed his feelings about this as follows:

> I would have liked in this board to have done something very similar to what we did in Conception Bay South, where we involved the teachers and the principals in developing their own evaluation policy. But out here we ended up basically imposing

> a policy on them. Now, I don't consider that to be the appropriate thing; but when you're in a board where you don't have a policy, you have to put something in place; otherwise you could get in trouble.

Nevertheless, the policy has been reviewed every year since its adoption. The process followed in this board for reviewing any policy is that school principals are asked at joint principals meeting if they think any of the policies or regulations need to be reviewed. The central office staff is also asked each year to submit anything in their policy manual that they feel needs to be reviewed. From there, they go to the appropriate board committee to see if it actually needs to be reviewed. If it does, then they would set up a subcommittee that will review it and make changes. Then it goes to the board for ratification for any changes that occur.

Mr. Myrick, who sat on one such subcommittee for reviewing the current evaluation policy, made the following observation:

> I just sat on one little committee that gave some feedback from administrators' perspective. Again, if you are looking at evaluation you have to look at how principals fit into a system with respect to everybody else in the system ... And when we did this it was, "You guys do up for administrators, you do for teachers, you do for co-ordinators. You do for someone else". I did not see that there was a link between the three. They were chopped up, isolated out in categories. And I am not convinced that that is how it should be done.

Similarly, Mr. Brushett reflecting on the evaluation policy stated:

> I recall a time when this was all put on the table, and there was a discussion about how to make it a meaningful process at whatever level, teacher or principal. And a fair bit of time was given to it in principal's meetings to discuss it. But when it came down to the bottom line of how to do the grass roots, involvement of people at each level to build a good policy, I think it came down largely to dollar; the consultants' fees were quite high and at that point they said, "Sorry, we can't afford this". And they walked out.

Apparently, principals did not like the way the policy was reviewed, and they had some concerns about that. The following section will bring forth their additional concerns regarding the evaluation policy. The section will also present views of the school bc rd staff on the areas of strength and/or weaknesses inherent in the policy.

Areas of Strengths and Weaknesses

Regarding the weaknesses and/or strengths inherent in the policy, Mr. Power told the researcher that one of the major weaknesses is that it is a policy which has not been developed from the grass roots. He observed:

> It's not a policy that's been developed by the teachers for the teachers. It's not a policy that's been developed by the principals for the principals. And that is such an important part of the process; that people have to feel ownership of what it is that they're involved in.

No doubt principals and teachers need to be involved in the development of their policies, but the general feeling prevalent among these groups of principals and vice-principals was that even teachers' voice should be heard in the development of the policy for the principals. Likewise, principals should be consulted in developing any policy for teachers. They were not in favour of restricting the participation to any single group of people. Following are some statements made by administrators which typically represent this type of perception held by them:

Mr. Hayes (principal): Not just principals, teachers should be involved in that and principals should be involved in teachers... Teachers also need to have a clear understanding of what the responsibilities are, the role, the expectations and so on. By having everyone involved in the process, everybody hopefully is a little more in line with what the role encompasses.

Ms. Stanley (vice-principal): What they need to do is sit down and talk to some teachers and ask teachers what they would propose for evaluation of a principal. What are the things that you think that we should look for when we're making up our forms. What do you think is important...And questions might change. Because you see, the school board is looking at it from one perspective, what we want out there is different. At the same time you've got to have teachers' voice, and I think that the evaluation process could be meaningfully developed if board personnel, administrators, and teachers worked together.

In relation to the strengths in the policy, Ms. Jeffery, a school board employee, claimed that the policy:

> helps principals focus on what their own objectives are. What is it that they really want to achieve over a year.

Mr. Brushett, a high school principal, also expressed similar views. To a question about his experiences with the policy, he remarked, "It helps you to focus. You establish and grow, you work from there." He continued:

> But there comes a point for the renewal, and unless you are a very self-motivated person, you know, if you have the time to put into the professional literature all the time, got time to be on the cutting edge, and you don't have to deal with the mundane type of things then may be you can renew from within. But I guess it only helped me in the sense of focusing.

As an analysis, there seems to be a communication gap between the school board and the school administrators; consequently, the board is unaware of the feelings and perceptions of its site-administrators with respect to the evaluation policy and the process utilized for developing or reviewing it. Evidently, the board is trying to do its best for its staff, but the problem is that they are putting in their best effort without actually knowing what the staff wants.

The next section will explore the views of the school board staff on how the process might be improved.

New Paths to be Explored

> *Vision without action is merely a dream. Action without vision just passes the time. Vision with action can change the world!*
>
> *- Barker*

Both school board employees were open to the involvement of parents and students in the evaluation process. Attempt is already being made to include teachers and students, but their involvement is not mandatory; it's up to the evaluator and the evaluatee to make such a decision. The option is available to administrators if they want to utilize it. Mr. Power's views concerning this issue:

> We encourage principals to do a survey of teachers and a survey of students. We don't encourage them to do a survey of parents. That could be a mistake on our part. But that is not an area that a lot of people are comfortable with yet. And it's something that has to grow.

It is important to note that school districts in other provinces have already started exploiting this area. First time in 1988, parents played a part in the evaluation of school administrators in the Vancouver School Board. According to Bognar (1990) most of the principals who went through the evaluation process had volunteered, and they had very few concerns about the evaluation process.

The School District No. 36 (Surrey), material obtained from the school principal, also utilizes parent input in the evaluation of their administrators. According to their

evaluation policy, principals' performance is evaluated in eight different areas such as, establishing direction, interpersonal relations, community relations, instructional leadership, curriculum, improvement of student learning, professional development, and organization-management. Interviews with parents are conducted for evaluating principal's performance against first three sets of criteria. This shows that some districts are already ahead in this area.

In reply to the question, whether primary/elementary school students should be involved, Mr. Power reflected:

> I saw a process used in the Calgary Board out in Alberta whereby the students from K-6 were not so much involved with the evaluation of the principal as they were in expressing their opinion about their attitude towards school, which in a way helps you to get a feel for the way the principal operates the school indirectly. They were asked to either X out a happy face or a sad face. And I thought it was a really good idea.

He was not sure whether or not the students from K-6 should be involved to a great extent. As for the High School students, he strongly felt that they can provide some valuable information, as the students at that level are very astute. In his words:

> I find that they see things in teachers and principals that could be beneficial to these people if they were given a good honest, open forum whereby they could express their opinion.

Mr. Power's opinion that students' involvement in the evaluation of school could help in providing a perception of how that school principal operates, was shared by a vice-principal. Ms. Stanley while talking about elementary level students noted:

> I think a lot would come out in their evaluation of their school. I don't know if you'd have to evaluate the principal or the vice-principal. I think that that sort of stuff would come out if you evaluated the school. What do you think of school and what is your school like... I think that there's definitely a place for taking seriously what the kids think about the place in which they live during the day because they know whether they feel cared for and wanted and loved; and I think you could pick up a lot from their evaluation on school. And may be you could have an evaluation of principal and vice-principal.

It should be noted that the Avalon North Integrated School Board involved elementary level students in the evaluation of the school principal directly. One of the school principals reported that a questionnaire with happy and sad faces was given to even kindergarten students. The questions in this survey were directly targeted upon the school principal.

Ms. Jeffery, like her colleague Mr. Power, was receptive to the idea of involving teachers, parents and students in the evaluation process; in fact, she went a step further, and recommended the involvement of other administrators as well.

Although both school board employees agreed that stake

holders have an important role to play, they parted company when it came to the issue of weighting. Mr. Power thought different value should be placed on them, depending on how close the relationship that particular individual or that particular group has with the principal. He commented, "I think the closer the people work with you, the greater the weight should be."

In contrast, as comments below reveal, Ms. Jeffery was of the opinion that no weighting is necessary. She remarked:

> I don't think I would put weight on it as such. It would be all part of input; it would provide really valuable information to the person being evaluated.

Once again both school board employees joined hands on the topic of evaluative criteria. They claimed that different criteria should be given to different groups of people. Ms. Jeffery went to the extent of saying that parents who serve on committees should evaluate on different sets of criteria than parents who are not.

Undeniably, the board is trying to move away from the traditional model of evaluation in which one's immediate supervisor is the sole source of information. The board encourages its principals to seek input from teachers and students; their involvement is optional, not mandatory. As far as the involvement of parents is concerned, it is not an area which has yet been explored by this board.

Summary of the Section and Some Concluding Thoughts

This section reported that current evaluation policy was adapted from the Conception Bay South Integrated School Board, when the superintendent joined this board in 1989. The reason behind such a move was that there was very little in terms of teacher or principal evaluation in the Avalon Consolidated School Board. The superintendent, therefore, put in place the policy which was developed in the school board where he was working previously.

Even though attempt was made to review the policy at the time of its adoption, the responses of the school administrators indicated that it was just a futile attempt; they were not given an honest, open forum whereby they could express their opinions. Apparently, the board was in a haste to put something in place. As a result, emphasis was on *product* rather than *process*.

Analysis of the responses of the research participants and the board documents showed that the board's evaluation policy and the actual practices are not in conformity. Most of the principals on probationary contract were not informed that they would undergo an evaluation process. However, this is not what is indicated in the documents of the board. According to the Annual Report of 1994-95, all probationary principals will undergo a summative evaluation. According to their evaluation policy, all initial conferences with the evaluatees are held

prior to October 15 of each year. Of significance is the fact that the researcher had met these probationary principals in the period between October to November, 1995.

Although attempt is being made to incorporate feedback from teachers and students into the appraisal process. Use of parent feedback is not an area which is yet explored. The following characteristics stood out during the review of the evaluation practices:

- absence of pre and post evaluation conferences;
- lack of any follow-up even in the case of deficient performance;
- non completion of the process.

As far as the evaluation conferences are concerned, their importance cannot be overemphasized. Pre-evaluation conference gives the opportunity to the evaluatee and the evaluator to set the individual objectives for the evaluatee in a collaborative fashion. Individual objectives ensure that each administrator strive beyond the range of day-to-day activities. It also provides the opportunity to assistant superintendents to develop the leadership abilities and skills of their subordinates. The importance of individual goals takes on added significance in the case of seasoned principals who have essentially mastered the elements of their job description. The individual objectives make sure that they continue to grow professionally (Langlois & McAdams, 1992).

In the case of probationary school principals, pre-evaluation conference gives the opportunity to assistant superintendents to describe the job requirements and special areas of concern during the interview session. When job description is included into the performance appraisal process, it ensures that administrators do not emphasize certain aspects of the job and neglect others. This is very helpful because role-players often have their own set of priorities and expectations for the position; often staff has its own perceptions of the job, and try to project these expectations onto the new principal. Therefore, inclusion of job description in the pre-evaluation conference serves at least two purposes: (a) it ensures that principals invest time and energy across the spectrum of their responsibilities, and (b) the job description gets critically examined in every pre-evaluation conference. This exercise helps in eliminating those items that are no longer valid; it also helps in including new areas of importance (Langlois & McAdams, 1992).

The purpose of post-evaluation conference is to provide feedback about one's performance, and also to make sense of the data. Kaplan (1993) says that the most irresponsible thing one can do is to drop all the data into someone's lap and then disappear. In the case of this school board, evaluation process is often not completed; even when it is completed, there is no follow-up. But assistance in making sense of the

data and moral support by the supervisor is vital, especially in situations where serious problems have been identified. It is necessary that someone acts as a resource person and stays in touch; data should also be collected in the future on the extent to which they have produced the desired changes.

On the basis of these findings, it is concluded that the absence of pre and post evaluation conferences plus no job description hinders the benefits of performance appraisal. Assessment of performance under such circumstances could hardly bring individual or organizational growth.

Section II

School Principals

Eighteen principals were interviewed from primary, elementary, and secondary schools in the Mount Pearl and St. John's areas. The duration of the interviews was between half an hour to two and a half hours. Principals are classified on the basis of years of experience in Table 4.4. Their perceptions, anecdotes, concerns, suggestions, and experiences became an important part of the study. The following section discusses their views in considerable detail. To preserve confidentiality, pseudonyms have been used in place of actual names.

TABLE 4.4

INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Number of Principals	Years of Experience In Their Current Schools
16	1 to 5 years
1	6 to 10 years
1	11 to 15 years

Experiences and Perceptions about Evaluation Practices

It was evident from the interview data that seventeen principals felt that they should be evaluated. Ms. Jones was the only principal who did not share her group's views. She did not think that administrators should be evaluated formally unless "there's a need for it." Nevertheless, she conceded that she would have "no difficulty with the process" if the school board chooses to do so.

What she considered essential was that one should:

> listen to what the students have to say, what the staff has to say, you know, that to my way of thinking is evaluation. Everybody having input and therefore you're reflecting on what you are doing and meeting their needs and changing accordingly.

She observed that administrators evaluate themselves continuously on the basis of feedback from various sources and take corrective measures. This was part of the reason why she did not see any real need for formal evaluation. However, her experiences with the evaluation process in general contributed greatly to her present views on evaluation of administrators. She concluded that the way evaluation is normally conducted would not bring much benefit.

Two important points that stand out over here are as follows:

1. initiation of evaluation process in case of an observable or identified need.

2. Administrators seeking feedback from different sources and changing accordingly.

The first point together with Mr. Dinzel's comments below takes on added significance. Mr. Dinzel shared his observation as follows:

> In terms of principal evaluation to be quite honest with you there is not really an ongoing evaluation as such. Its almost done on needs basis rather than something that's formalized.

This is apparently what Ms. Jones suggested, but the critical point that arises over here and presented succinctly by Ms. Vernal is, "As long as we wait until an identified need to implement a process then its going to be seen as negative." Ms. Vernal's comments are not far from truth. One thing that was very prominent throughout the interview process was that people did not look at evaluation as a positive and healthy process. They were wary of the evaluator as well as the evaluation. Mr. Griffiths comments are indicative of this perception:

> If they call tomorrow and say you're (principal) going to be evaluated, I'm not going to rub my hands and say she is going to be gone soon and I got her job.

This statement shows the underlying assumption of the speaker with respect to evaluation. His views were representative of all the others. People did not feel the way evaluation is done presently, it could result in improvement.

It seems Ms. Vernal is right in holding the view that evaluation should not result in case of an identified need. She suggested:

> If we have it as an ongoing process then what will happen is people will use it as a constructive means to bring about change within themselves.

The second issue that needs to be addressed is that administrators continuously evaluate themselves on the basis of feedback from various sources. In Ms. Jones' case, she actively seeks for feedback because she does not see any real need for formal evaluation for reasons mentioned above. However, other administrators may do so out of necessity. Mr. Dinzel's comments are revealing in this respect. While talking about assistant superintendents he mentioned:

> They don't have time to put as much time and effort into evaluation as you probably would like. To some degree it's almost like you're going through the motions. You are doing it because it's expected of you, but its probably not as good a tool as one would like it to be. And consequently *the amount of feedback that we get is pretty negligible to be quite honest with you.*

In such instances, administrators may be forced to seek alternative means of getting feedback as Farr (1993) notes that when people do not get the desired amount of feedback from their superiors they search for and create feedback for themselves. The risk that is involved in such a situation is that they may interpret various actions and messages from

peers and other people as having performance related information, even if such is not intended by the people. This may lead to errors by the individual in his/her work performance. Further, research findings of Ashford and Cunnings (cited in Farr, 1993) show that individuals seek less feedback when their role is not ambiguous, and when the individual has been employed for a relatively long period of time. On the basis of these findings, Farr (1993) advices that supervisors should be especially careful to provide feedback to those individuals who are new to the job, and also to those individuals who are in positions that are not well defined, or do not result in readily observable outcomes.

This does not mean that administrators should not be reflective; what it means is that feedback from assistant superintendents is extremely important and its significance cannot be underestimated, no matter how much school administrators evaluate themselves.

Like Ms. Jones, other principals were unanimous in their condemnation of current evaluation process:

Ms. Vernal: It's more of a duty. It's more of a responsibility than a constructive process.

Mr. Brushett: There's a very strong sense that it's a necessary evil and you are being done...Evaluation has come to be seen as a bit of a farce and my last two years would be somewhat farcical. For example, really there was no meeting, no documenting, no interview, no nothing until there was a contract put in place.

Mr. Clarke: Two years that I was on probation my evaluation was very superficial. What is down on paper is a superb evaluation, but it was extremely superficial evaluation.

Mr. Myrick: I think evaluation right now as it currently exits is nothing more than a bureaucratic ritual. It's done just to put pencil to paper.

Although they were highly critical of the way evaluation is conducted, still they did not share Ms. Jones' view that school administrators should not be evaluated formally unless and until there is a need. When Mr. Myrick was asked if principals should be evaluated, he replied, "Most definitely." He stated further:

> I guess I have a lot of problems with evaluation throughout the education system in that I do not think there's anywhere, at least in this province, this board certainly, I don't think has a valid evaluation system. I don't think it's anything that would stand up anywhere. I don't even think it's a good formative evaluation let alone summative evaluation. Policy is old, out dated. This sounds critical and harsh, but I am just telling you what it is.

Mr. Myrick explained the reason for holding such a view:

> I mean like NLTA, they are much too powerful, much more prepared to do battle on these issues than school board as employer.

He also told the researcher that he was speaking to people at the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association (NLTA) and they said:

> Look there is absolutely nobody in this province who can get dismissed for incompetency. **We'll beat them every time.**

When the researcher herself met one of the members of the Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association (NLTA) she was given a similar message, but not is such a forthright manner. Mr. White told her:

> We have not had many dismissals for incompetency in this province and that's not because we don't have incompetent people as one would expect of 8500 or 9000 people. You would find some degree of incompetency from time to time. The problem is defining what incompetency means and been able to put a process in place that adequately gets that. Most school boards at the moment are working towards putting an evaluation system. Most school boards have an evaluation system but they are so, what should I say, the system that they have ah...that don't stand up under scrutiny from a lawyer or from anybody else who that teacher hires to defend.

He, then, went on to talk about the whole area of incompetency and the problems associated with defining and detecting it. According to him this problem becomes significant with school boards' failure to follow a proper process. He also outlined the aspects that are normally looked at:

> Did the school boards do their homework? Did the school board, for example helped that teacher with the problems that were demonstrated? Was the professional help given on a continuing basis? Was it monitored carefully? All of that has to happen before you can go into summative whereby people are dismissed for incompetency. Once the system is not in place then you're going to have a tough time

> proving to a court that this person is incompetent...**That is not to say we don't have incompetent people, but the system is not there to prove it.**

Against this backdrop, the following cases should be examined. These cases will bring forth the actual evaluation process that each school principal went through.

High School Principals

Ms. Jones. She was a vice-principal for over ten years with this school board, but never went through an evaluation process. This is her first year as a principal and she stated:

> Nobody has informed me that I am to be evaluated this year.

Mr. Myrick. He has over ten years of administrative experience. He was evaluated one year when he was a vice-principal in a different school board, but the process was never completed. He has been a principal of a high school in this district for the past five years and the evaluation process has yet to be initiated.

Ms. Mullett. Ms. Mullett was evaluated as a vice-principal. This is her first year as a principal, and she is presently going through an evaluation process. She had to submit her philosophy of education and objectives for the

first year. The objectives were solely set by her, but she and assistant superintendent meet frequently to discuss various issues.

Mr. Brushett. He has over ten years of administrative experience and has been evaluated twice over the years. First time, questionnaires and interviews were conducted. There was no pre-evaluation as such just a series of interviews with the assistant superintendent. However, there was a post-evaluation conference. He did not remember whether he got a written report or not. Second time it was just informal observation. Criteria, instruments, and process were very loosely defined; there was no post-evaluation conference and no written report.

Junior High School Principals

Mr. Ivany. He has 25-26 years of administrative experience, and has been evaluated 5-6 times in different school districts. Last evaluation was some 3 years back. He had pre and post evaluation conferences; the post evaluation conference was not an extensive one, and he was never informed about his areas of strengths and/or weaknesses. He did not get a written report after the evaluation, and according to Mr. Ivany:

> I received a letter, that's all, confirming that I passed the evaluation.

Mr. Hayes. Mr. Hayes has been a principal for 12-13 years in different school districts, and has been evaluated in the past. This is his first year in this position, and he has been told that he will undergo an evaluation process. However, there has been no pre-evaluation conference.

Elementary School Principals

Ms. Vernal. Ms. Vernal was evaluated when she came into this position. Teachers were given questionnaires. There was a pre-evaluation conference, but she did not have to write any objectives. There was also a closure to the evaluation process whereby in a meeting with the assistant superintendent and associate superintendent they discussed how the year had gone by. She remarked, "So that was post-conference, I *guess*." She did not get any written report and the need areas that were identified were left to her to resolve. There was no time-frame placed on resolution of those identified needs. In fact she said that she was not even told to work on it. It was just pointed out to her. She reflected:

> I was given no strategies to change. It wasn't suggested to me that I should either seek additional resources or that I should pursue this actively.

However, if one were to look at the board's policy (1989), it states that:

18. iii. specific suggestions must be offered by the administration (or person(s)) charged with evaluation which will assist in correcting these specific deficiencies.

iv. A minimum of thirty (30) days will be permitted to provide time for improvement prior to a second evaluation regarding that (those) specific deficiencies. (p.A-14)

Ms. Stephen. This is her third year in this district, and she had just completed the evaluation when the researcher met her. Prior to this school she was a principal of another school within the district, and was evaluated over there as well. As she says:

> In actual fact for somebody who has spent twenty years of her teaching career not being formally evaluated I ended up being evaluated may be five times in the past ten years because I kept changing positions.
>
> As an afterthought she added:
>
> It has nothing to do with me as a person; it had everything to do with my changing positions.

There were pre-evaluation conferences, but there were no post-evaluation conferences. She says:

> The post conference at the end, that is the one tends not to happen because you tend to get a letter at the end that says, "We are delighted to inform that you have been granted tenure. Now you are through the evaluation."

The weak areas that were identified were not discussed again. No plan for improvement was put into place.

Mr. Dinzel. This is his eleventh year as a school administrator, and he has been evaluated twice. First time when he was evaluated, he had a pre-evaluation conference, and at the end of the process he received a written report; but according to him there was no set standard as criterion at the time, so basically what he received was an anecdotal report saying that "you had satisfied the criteria that they had decided on, and that you are tenured as an administrator." Second time he was evaluated at this school and again there was a pre-evaluation conference, but he says that "only in terms of program proposal." He had to put together a program proposal that teachers had input into. This new program started some five years back and every principal is expected to submit this proposal every year to the board. The board personnel then set a time for the principals to go down and discuss the proposal. "So in terms of that there is a pre-evaluation conference taking place... But in terms of the proposal contents strictly; strictly about evaluation, no that did not take place." There was no post conference not even in terms of the program proposal. However, he received the letter saying that everything was satisfactory, and that he has been tenured in this position.

Ms. Alyward. Ms. Alyward had been evaluated in this position. The assistant superintendent made periodic phone

calls, and in addition to that he requested several documents. She had a pre-evaluation conference in which they discussed staffing, programming of the school, her perception of her own role, and teaching. Objectives were discussed but basically she set her own objectives. It was a two year process, and they met frequently during this period. Staff also completed an evaluation form. At the end of this two-year period they had a final meeting, and she got a written report; the evaluator went over the report with her.

Ms. William. She has been a principal for five years. She was a principal for 4 years in a different school district where she never received any formal evaluation. This is her first year with this school board, and she has not been informed if she will be evaluated or not. At least not formally. She says:

> There's been no formal meeting with regards to anyone sitting down and saying to me these are the criteria, and this is the process. It hasn't been explained that way.

When the researcher probed if any anyone told her informally that she is going to be evaluated, she responded, "Not really said directly. I **assumed** it I guess through the conversations, but it hasn't been formally stated." (See Appendix C)

Mr. Ellis. He has been a principal for over twelve years. This is his fourth year in this particular position. He has been evaluated twice in different schools, but not in this one. He did have a pre and post evaluation conferences when he was evaluated, and he also got a written report.

Ms. Ronald. This is Ms. Ronald's first year in this position, and she says, "I'm **assuming** that this year is more or less my year of evaluation. That's my **feeling** basically."

Ms. Trent. This is Ms. Trent's first year as a principal. She has not been evaluated yet, but she says that, "I am **assuming** that I am under scrutiny all the time." She also added, "They do what they call an observation, a monitoring, that's the word they use." She has not been informed what procedure would be followed.

Mr. Dalton. He has been a principal for the past five years, and has been evaluated on two different occasions. The first time they did not go through a formalized evaluation process because it was a contractual position. Later he was evaluated for one year, and according to Mr. Dalton, "They had an option of doing two, but they opted for one since I matched with the district well." Both times they had a pre-evaluation conference, and the assistant superintendent went through the

policies of the school board and some other documentation with him. Questionnaires were given to staff, and he received feedback. A concluding conference between the evaluator and the administrator took place, and he received a written report both times.

Ms. Daley. Ms. Daley has been a principal of this school for two years. She was not evaluated during this period, even though she requested for it both years. According to her, "I requested it both years, and basically did not get an answer. So no answer means no." Ms. Daley's situation was somewhat different as she was on contractual position. According to the board's policy, formal evaluation of personnel hired on a term contract will only occur when indicated in writing by the superintendent. However, the board's annual report of 1994-1995 states that term contract personnel can have the evaluation process initiated if they request for it. Ms. Daley reflected on the situation as follows:

> I understand it's not a priority with them at this point, but I thought from my point of view it would be good to have something in place.

Ms. Coish. She was a principal of another school within the district where the evaluation process was initiated, but the process was never completed. Staff survey was conducted, but she never got any feedback. When she asked for it, she was

told in a joking manner that obviously it was favourable, otherwise she would have heard back. She was not evaluated in this position.

Mr. Roberts. He was evaluated in his first or second year. He was not sure which year was that. He did have a pre-evaluation conference, and the assistant superintendent had some input into the goals which he was trying to achieve that year. They had a lot of meetings throughout the year, and he also got a written report after the evaluation. The evaluator and the evaluatee went through the report together.

When these administrators were asked if they benefitted from evaluation, some principals reported that they found the evaluation process helpful; their responses are as follows:

Mr. Ivany: Oh yes, I benefitted immensely because I've always enjoyed interacting with colleagues and finding out my strengths and weaknesses from their perspective.

As the researcher was leaving after the interview he quickly added:

> I should have thought about this earlier. It depends on who's evaluating. The experience of being evaluated can be valuable if you have a good working relationship with the evaluator. And not the last time I was evaluated, but the time previous to that one, they were two entirely different experiences, and the second last was much more valuable to me than the last. I had a lot more interaction...I benefitted from that one than I did

the last time.

Mr. Ellis: Yes I did find it helpful. I think it proved that I was right.

Others expressed mixed feelings. The following responses will illustrate this point:

Ms. Coish: I think it could be. Even just getting that feedback from staff because I've been thinking of doing that myself before the end of this year sometime. You know, just to get some feedback. Yeah, yeah, I think it could be. I have not been involved in a terribly helpful process myself, you know, but it could be. A lot of things that I've gotten have been informal through ah, some of it comes through experience or finding somebody at the board to talk to or you know you learn from dealing with certain situations. But the evaluation process itself, I think it could be, but I don't feel particularly that it has been for me at this point.

Ms. Stephen: I wish I could say yes. I found the evaluation process helpful. Unfortunately we don't always have the time to sit down and complete the process, and that is very often what happens...But having gone through the process, that is important. And the staff for example, knowing that you are willing to do that, that's important.

To summarize, then, the gap between theory and practice widens to chasm in the case of performance evaluation of principals. Given this gap, it is little surprise that people hold such negative feelings toward appraisal process. The situation gets worsened by the fact that many of them are aware that it is not easy to remove them from their positions under the present system. What then should be done to hold

people in such key positions truly accountable, the question is definitely in need of an urgent answer.

Evaluation Policy

The researcher received some very interesting replies regarding the development of the evaluation policy. When this group was asked how did the policy evolve, their replies went like this:

Mr. Brushett: Just grew. Everybody needed to have one and then all of a sudden we had one.

Ms. Vernal: They've drawn upon resources that were available from George Hickman.

Ms. Stephen: Actually it came when Bill Lee came to the board office. It would be about a year after that. He had been superintendent in Conception Bay South, and may have developed an excellent policy there. So he brought a lot of that with him, and set up committees in our district to review that policy.

Ms. Stephen also reported that the system was not piloted in this school board because "its been piloted actually in another board." Hardly containing her laughter, she continued: In there it must have worked."

Some school principals were aware as to what exactly the policy states; others were not. Data gathered in this study revealed that those principals who either have been evaluated several years ago, or who have not been evaluated at all were the ones who were not cognizant of the contents of the current policy. Mr. Myrick who was never evaluated had no knowledge as

to what exactly the policy states. Ms. Jones, who like Mr. Myrick has never been evaluated as an administrator, did not even know if the board has a formal evaluation system for administrators. Mr. Brushett who was evaluated several years back told the researcher that he only reviewed it that day. Ms. Trent who knows that she is being monitored, but did not have any pre-evaluation conference was not familiar with the board's policy. Mr. Dalton, who was evaluated a few years back, assumed that there might have been some changes in the policy since he was evaluated; he was not aware what these changes were, and if in fact there were any changes made, because he has not seen the policy since. The only principal who has not been evaluated, but did take some time to browse through the policy manual was Ms. William. She said:

> It has not been formally introduced to me or explained by anyone, but in going through the documents here I found it, and of course I looked through it. But it hasn't been formally done.

The board apparently has one set of expectations, and the principals another. When evaluation is looked at by these building-level administrators as something that is being done to them and a "necessary evil", then, not many will take a first step willingly towards "getting done". It is highly unlikely that many will make an effort to familiarize themselves with the evaluation policy, or the practices, unless and until they really have to. The issue that arises

over here is not who is to be blamed; the critical point is that **can we let this current state of affairs prevail?**

Areas of Strengths and Weaknesses

It was somewhat surprising and confusing to see that all the principals, including those who had said earlier that they are not aware of the board's policy, went to considerable length in explaining what the weaknesses are, and how might they be improved. The only logical conclusion that can be drawn from this is that, they may be familiar with some aspects of the evaluation policy, but not in great detail. Mr. Myrick's remarks may support this to be the case. When he was asked if he is aware of the evaluation policy, his reply was:

> I have never been evaluated so it's not something I have *bothered* to familiarize myself with.

Later to a question about strengths and/or weaknesses inherent in the policy, noted:

> I think it's basically full of these motherhood statements. Principal must be able to do A,B,C,D. Should do A,B,C,D,E. And I think somebody will look at it and say well I do this stuff anyway...

As mentioned earlier, Mr. Myrick sat on a committee which reviewed this policy. When he was asked why he did not bring forth these concerns at the time, as it might have made a difference, he replied:

> No. No. No. I mean I brought that up when I was doing that, but you know it was more of an outcomes rather than a procedure.

When he was probed further about other aspects of the policy, he told the researcher that he does not feel he knows enough to comment.

The researcher's conversation with other site-administrators on the same issue brought forth the following responses:

> Ms. Coish: I'm not sure we have a policy. I mean, I suppose we do have one to a degree but it needs a lot of flesh put on you know. I would like to see it expanded. Like I said I'd like to see instruments that you can use yourself, and I think it would be worthwhile to consider organizing a couple of different tracts for it.

> Mr. Ivany: One weakness is too much paper work, and not enough personal interaction, you know. I think an evaluation policy should be such that people can get together rather than having to write as much. Okay, I developed my philosophy of education. I set my objectives, my goals and this sort of thing, and we have a pre-evaluation conference and I sit down with another individual. We talk about these kinds of things; the goals and objectives I have for the school, and how I plan to implement them. But I feel that if I could sit down with this person and have him shadow me for a day or two or five or ten, to come in and sit with me, follow me and see how I operate. That could be more effective than a lot of this paper pushing.

> Ms. Alyward: As opposed to policy itself, the personality, in what the evaluator brings to the evaluation in the form of experiences all those weaknesses are strengths depending on who is being evaluated, and in what time period.

> Mr. Dinzel: The evaluation of administrators might be efficient the way it is done, but I am not sure

> it's very valuable. You don't get a whole lot of feedback because of the workload of people at the board office...In some cases people charged with doing the evaluation would not have been former administrators themselves. So in a sense they can't really sense what you are really trying to do. So that would certainly be a weakness.

He also added:

> There is no real concrete evaluation policy in place that you'd say well this is what applies to everybody on a regular basis. That's not happening so in that sense it's a weak policy.

Ms. Stephen: It does force us to evaluate ourselves; if there is a problem it provides a need to resolve it. It's weaknesses is that it's time consuming. We've to find some other ways, other than traditional ways of district office evaluating administrators that has to do with different kinds of instruments like using reflective journals that'll minimize the time.

Ms. Vernal was the other principal who had talked about the benefits of using journals. She remarked:

> I had found journals to be very effective. Quite a different approach in evaluation, and one which in a discussion with others would suggest it may not be an approach to evaluation that could be held to be legally accountable should there be a grievance.

However, she added:

> Yet it is probably one of the most meaningful forms of evaluation that I have ever participated in, and based on the responses of the individuals was one of the most meaningful forms of evaluation they ever partook in.

Quite plainly, the weaknesses cited by the principals in the policy surpassed any strengths indicated by them.

Interestingly, even those administrators, who had claimed ignorance of the contents of the evaluation policy, did not hesitate to join the bandwagon in pointing out its weaknesses.

The proceeding section will reveal the feelings and perceptions of these principals about some other aspects of the policy.

Time-Frame for Evaluation

Most of the principals stated that five year period stipulated in the policy for the evaluation of professional personnel is fine. Three principals, however, went a step further and suggested that principals should be moved every 5 years. It must be noted that the bill on education that was proposed on January 1996 and which was withdrawn latter did state that principals should be appointed for a period not greater than 5 years. Administrators who expressed this opinion in this study were Ms. Mullett, high school principal, Mr. Ivany, junior high principal, and Mr. Dalton, elementary school principal. Ms. Mullett voiced her feelings like this:

> To be honest after 5 years I don't think a principal should be in a school any longer. What's wrong with our system is that we should be encouraging more movement.

Although principals considered 5 year evaluation cycle appropriate, they added that there should be some sort of mechanism in place that would give them continuous feedback

and support. In addition, there should be continuous communication between the board personnel and school administrators. School principals used the words like continuous support and feedback, ongoing communication, mentoring and fostering of development, and closer contact with central office, to show what they would like to have on an ongoing basis. In considering the views of the principals, it is important to note the following definition of formative evaluation.

Nygaard (1974) describes formative evaluation as "an ongoing communication, feedback, adjustment, and assistance process."

It seems that principals were trying to evade the use of the term "evaluation" altogether. Even formative evaluation was put in the same cloak as summative. Most of them regarded formative evaluation as the first step towards summative. Ms. Vernal speaks to this point:

> Formative is only a first stage. If we say formative, we are leading to summative.

This shows the lack of trust between the board personnel and these site-administrators. One example may provide a glimps of this reality. While talking about self-evaluation, Mr. Brushett suggested that their peers should be involved in the evaluation process with whom they could discuss their self-evaluation report. He and Mr. Norman thought it would be

helpful if they could discuss it with their peers, instead of someone from the central office. Mr. Brushett, however, conceded that school board can play a role. What he said is as follows:

> But the school board can help you. They need to be able to say, without fear they need to be able to say what we encourage administrators in our system to do is get together and talk once a month. And then you can actively encourage that as opposed to taking a view that if you get together and talk, *you are talking something negative about them.*

Three female administrators, one from primary and two from elementary, claimed that formative evaluation should be conducted on an ongoing basis. Of interest is the fact that none of them has been evaluated.

Lack of trust together with no clear sharp distinction between summative and formative evaluation may have contributed to the present state of affairs. where people were making comments like:

Mr. Dalton: I think whether we call evaluation or not, I think the process has to be ongoing. I think it becomes ah, its more of a clinical approach to getting the job done than constructive process whereby meaningful support is provided.

Mr. Norman: The word itself sometimes brings out a lot of negative connotations in that it's seen as being done to.

Ms. Stephen: People are often afraid of evaluation; they think it is there to be negative, and it does not have to be nor should it be.

Her following statement puts a final nail into the

coffin, "*We need another word for it.*"

In conclusion, formative evaluation is certainly not a first stage of summative evaluation; the two processes of evaluation are based on fundamentally different epistemological viewpoints. Summative evaluation can be regarded as *an end in itself*; the underlying assumption behind this process of evaluation is to reach an ultimate decision. The focus is on the individual and his/her performance. Formative evaluation, on the other hand, can be characterized as *means to an end*; this process is concerned with improving the situation with the help of ongoing support, feedback, and assistance. The focus in this type of evaluation is on improvement of the educational system. From conversations with this group of administrators, it was quite apparent that what they wanted was a process that would foster professional and personal development. The evasion of the term "evaluation", irrespective of the type, is indicative of the growing dissatisfaction and discontent with the whole system of evaluation.

New Paths to be Explored

In the end, it is important to remember that we cannot become what we used to be by remaining what we are.

- de Pree

Involvement of Parents

Out of 18 principals interviewed, 2 were hesitant to give parents and students a say in the evaluation process. Ms. Vernal pondered that parents are not well-informed "about education and the variables that impacts one's ability to offer the kind of educational program that one would want to." Therefore she concluded, "It is difficult for them to draw conclusions." Nevertheless, she stated if parents are going to be represented by a school council then that is something which "is open for consideration." She observed that often small core group of parents are very committed to the educational process, and probably they can play a role; but she wondered if parents themselves would like to get involved because of job and family pressures.

Mr. Ellis, like Ms. Vernal, was not sure about involving parents. He needed more time to think. He stated:

> I haven't arrived at the point of saying, "Yes parents should be involved". May be if I think about it a little more. We can give that a lot of thought.

Apart from Ms. Vernal and Mr, Ellis, all the other principals were willing to take input from parents and students. Interestingly, some of the principals had already made attempts to take feedback from parents. Ms. Alyward told the researcher that they had sent questionnaires to parents based on her school. Areas like school effectiveness, school atmosphere, were some of the areas that were focused upon. She also indicated that most schools have made these attempts.

Ms. Coish was another principal who had done parent surveys which were centred on her school in order to get their feedback. She observed that one can glean valuable information from this. In her opinion:

> It's the same thing. Data is what you want. You don't want this sort of eerie feary perception of good and bad or whatever and I think that's what we need to be doing.

When the researcher met Ms. Mullett, she was thinking of distributing questionnaires among students for evaluating their teachers. The evaluation instrument was already designed, and she indicated that they would give them out after mid-term exams. The reason why she was attempting to do this was to provide some valuable information to teachers about their teaching styles and methods with the intention that it would help them to become better teachers. She also claimed that it would be helpful if students are involved in her evaluation.

First thing that stands out over here is that these attempts were made by female administrators with the intention of getting feedback and insight into the various perceptions of the people they serve. Second, they were exploiting non-traditional ways of obtaining feedback, instead of exclusively relying on feedback from assistant superintendents. It is interesting to see how the system is moving from closed to open with more contacts with outside community.

Even those principals who had not made any attempts to involve students and parents were willing to extend the opportunity to them. Ms. Stephen's remarks are particularly illuminating:

> I think it would give you a strong sense of what you are doing right. Like it would give you some of the confidence and some of the courage to keep going in the direction you are going in. I say that because I feel comfortable with it because I'm quite willing to have parents do that. But I think there is a tremendous fear; you are putting a lot of trust in people and I think that is what most of us fear.

Ms. Stephen was certainly right in her assumption. Principals who were open to the involvement of parents and students, were quick to add that one should be careful and use their input with caution. For instance, Ms. Ronald expressed the opinion: "We should first realize that we are dealing with human beings". She added, "If it is done properly, I think there could be valuable contributions."

Mr. Hayes was of the same opinion. He remarked:

> I think it is very important that the evaluation instruments are very carefully designed. So the biases can be put aside.

Even Ms. Vernal did not appear to be totally averse to the involvement of parents; she first wanted to see what the criteria, instruments, and the process would be like before committing herself to anything. It was not that other principals did not share Ms. Vernal's concerns, but the difference was that they noted:

1. parent and student input would be extremely valuable;
2. it is unavoidable to keep them out any longer, and
3. teachers and principals should be held *more* accountable for their actions.

The following cases would illustrate each point made above:

Ms. William: With parents I think we have to be really careful of them being objective and looking at the total picture as opposed to just little bits and pieces that they want to look at. But I do think that it would be really good to have their input, and I think there's a lot that they can tell us about what we need to do as well, but with caution definitely.

Mr. Brushett: Well as we move more and more into the school council notion, I would think you are going to find that with time parents are going to have a say.

Ms. Coish: It's a dangerous phenomena, but I personally don't see how we can avoid it. I think in many ways the whole education system is not terribly accountable for what it's doing, to be honest with

> you...I think teachers and people who work in schools they feel a lot of stress about it, but it's a very subtle thing. *I don't think that when it comes right down to it they are very accountable for what they are doing*...You can ask for feedback on issues and it might be: Do they feel that they're getting enough information, or there's enough channels of communication, or whatever, you know...Once you start getting feedback like that from parents then I think you do see yourself. You see things that you can change, or do more effectively, or you try and think, gosh, this seems to really be a problem in people's minds. I better try and do things in a different way.

It is important to note that although there is a lot of hue and cry about being held accountable, administrators like Ms. Coish and Mr. Myrick felt that educators are not really being held accountable for their actions. As mentioned earlier, Mr. Myrick criticizing the policy contended:

> I think it's basically full of these motherhood statements. Principals must be able to do A,B,C,D. Should do A,B,C,D,E. I think somebody will look at it and say well we do this stuff anyway. *But there's nothing ever been said that you are being held accountable for doing A,B,C,D.*

At another instance, while talking about identification and improvement of weak areas he remarked:

> I think I would be left on my own to fix the problems if they exist. And currently I think it's just as well if I chose not to fix them then that would be okay too. That's just my personal thoughts on it. *I don't see a lot of accountability.*

It appears that there is little penalty for poor performance by the individuals in charge. Our children,

however, pass through schools but once. Providing appropriate accountability will not only guarantee that the nation's goals are met, but enhance the trust society has in the education system (Allen, 1992).

Another theme that was gleaned from the interview data was the references made by principals to teachers' bias. As mentioned in Section III, teachers' voiced concern that parents often have their own personal agendas, and they tend not to be objective; therefore they should not be involved. Principals, on the other hand, claimed that both groups can have personal motives; still, they were in favour of involving both teachers and parents. The following examples will illustrate this point:

Ms. Daley expressing her concern about parental involvement said:

> I think the danger is always there. I think it is not a popularity contest either. It's the same thing as involving staff members. There is bound to be teachers on staff who don't like the principal, but hopefully they're professional enough to give fair assessment whether they like or dislike should not enter into it really. Some people, I think are going to judge the principal more harshly than others will, but I think that's all part of the process. I think once you have a variety of sources of data that very extreme opinions will come to balance out.

Mr. Dalton talking about parents' bias stated:

> That can happen. I think that would balance out depending upon how many parents you are dealing with. That's like in a teacher survey. You could have a teacher on staff who you've been in a

> process of evaluating yourself and have been bringing to task on something who could use this as a means of retaliation...I think when the evaluator looks at that and they see nineteen staff members that are responding in a positive way and one is not, I don't think they would put a lot of weight only on one.

Mr. Ivany expressing his views on parental involvement observed:

> Some parents would have their own personal agendas, but I'm sure that the evaluation would be such that any fears in that regard would be addressed. Let's put it this way, if I have nothing to hide, and people are afraid of others evaluating them then there's a reason for it.

Mr. Myrick was the only principal who did not express any concern at involving parents or students. In fact he told the researcher about a new concept which is called 360-degree feedback. This model is being used in business these days for employee appraisal (The model is discussed in detail in Chapter 2) It talks about getting feedback from all the stake-holders, and Mr. Myrick strongly believed that such a model should be utilized for evaluating principals. When pointed out by the researcher that some of the people are concerned about parents having their own personal motives, his reply was:

> It's quite simple. If every parent in the community thinks that I am not doing my job then no matter how good I think I am doing, there is something that I am not doing correctly. There is something that is not happening. And its my responsibility or somebody's responsibility to see that that gets corrected. Same thing here. If every student here hates me, I mean every teacher might love me, but

> then I have to question whether or not I am meeting students' needs, if they exist. I think every stake holder should be involved in the whole process.

He was cognizant of the fact that teachers and parents may have their own biases, but he thought the word of one or two would not make a difference, if the sample size is fairly large.

Except Mr. Brushett, all the other principals contended that if there is an opportunity to contribute then every parent should be extended the opportunity to participate; even if they do not want to participate they should be aware that there is an avenue which is available to them. Only Mr. Brushett thought that parents who serve on school committees or involved in some other ways should be given this opportunity. He stated:

> I think in order for that parent to be taken seriously on either side of the issue, that this is a wonderful person or this is an awful person, it has to be demonstrated that that person is really involved in the school, you know, and is serving on committee in here or is working extra here or is volunteering something there so that they know that they are part of the fabric as opposed to, you know, the two old guys in the muppet show taking pot shots.

One must note that Ms. Vernal, who was not yet ready to affirm to parental involvement, did mention that those parents who serve on committees may have some say, and that this is an area which is up for discussion.

Other principals, however, indicated that it is important to involve even those parents who are just part of the milieu, and are not actively involved in school activities. Two reasons were apparent for holding such a view. First, parents who are involved would have different perspectives than those who are not involved. Second, larger sample size would help in controlling biases.

The following two cases will serve to highlight these points:

Ms. Daley: Those who are at the school council, the home and school association would have a closer relationship with the principal, and they can see the principal in a variety of roles; but I think the parents who are not actively involved in the school on a regular basis even their opinion should count.

Ms. Coish: I would be much more interested in trying to get information from as many as possible because that's where you do get people with their vested interests or their own agendas... You should create a large enough sample to eliminate personal agendas, right.

Ms. Jeffery, a school board employee, was also against involving only those parents who serve on school committees. She observed:

> I would be somewhat hesitant to necessarily involve school council and that type of thing; they're too small for one thing. The other thing is if they're really involved in a committee they may be just directed in a particular way, and they might have a much more narrow focus.

In general, principals seemed willing to make the evaluation process more inclusive; the difference of opinion that appeared was regarding the technicalities. Their views with respect to the involvement of students, are explored in the following section.

Involvement of Students

Principals were not in agreement about which level of students to be involved. Some said only Senior High students would be able to comment properly.

A case in point: Mr. Dinzel, an elementary school principal, while talking about how policy can be improved said:

> We should involve a wider circle of people in terms of getting feedback. From parents, from teachers, may be in High School, older students even. That might help. Not with the goal of ousting the principal or whatever, but in terms of these are the areas s/he needs to work on for improvement. So it becomes formative evaluation rather than summative evaluation. That would be useful.

Others thought that even Junior high school students have a good sense of how things are going in school.

A case in point: Mr. Ellis, elementary school principal, remarked:

> I really think junior and senior high schools could involve students because students have direct contact with the principal. But not at this level.

Mr. Ellis was not in favour of involving elementary school students, but some of his peers like Mr. Roberts, Ms. William, Mr. Dalton, Ms. Ronald, and Mr. Ivany thought otherwise. Except Mr. Ivany, all the other four principals were from elementary schools. Views of Mr. Dalton, representing the views of all the other elementary school principals, and Mr. Ivany are as follows:

> Mr. Dalton: I think that High school students have a great deal of insight. Again filter out those who wouldn't take it seriously. I think things can be asked from even primary/elementary child if it were worded properly, and teachers administer it properly.

> Mr. Ivany: I think sometimes we underestimate kids, and I think there's a role that they could play. It would have to be something perhaps pretty simple because of the maturity obviously. But sometimes the simplest answers, you know, have a lot of profound truth to them.

Ms. Mullett, a senior high school principal, agreed that one can get some good results from upper elementary kids. However, she was of the opinion that it would be difficult to get an objective view from students at grade levels 7 and 8 because of the peer pressure. In her words:

> When you get into grade 7, especially 7 and 8 the peer pressure is tremendous. It is not cool to like anything about school at all, and not to let on that you do...I think if it was done in a classroom that you would probably find they are not willing to be themselves more so they are dying to be part of a group. I think you will find though they probably feel differently, the pressures would be on them not to respond in that way. If they were sent home I think they would be afraid to find out

> that they liked school or that they liked the teacher or that they liked what they did...It's the group that are together, and they are going through such difficult times in adolescence that it is very very difficult education wise to get a lot done in those years...I think students at this level would be able to say whether they feel that the principal is competent; the principal is presenting the school in a positive light; has brought positive initiatives to the school.

Mr. Hayes, a junior high principal, shared some of his colleague's views. While talking about the involvement of elementary level students, he stated:

> No. I've worked with kids on that level. I have worked with kids at this level, 7-8-9, and its been my experience that from one day to the next kids up to grade 9 at least, there can be a pretty wide gap in what their thinking is on a particular topic, just from day to day or week to week. They tend to react to things much more personally obviously, and it goes from bad days to good days...But once you get into senior high, you are at a level where hopefully most of the kids are much more mature, and reasonably look at tings. Makes some good judgements on things. At least that's been my experience. I was in a Senior High for 8 years as a principal and I certainly found the kids capable of responding to questions; giving you an informed opinion about how they felt about stuff.

These two administrators were not averse to the involvement of students as such, but they thought that students at junior high level, because of the reasons mentioned above, would not be a reliable source.

In a nutshell, the principals agreed to the incorporation of feedback from students; however, there was no agreement on which level of students could and should be involved.

The section to follow examines their views regarding the involvement of their peers and people from business community.

Involvement of Peers and Business People

Mr. Dinzel told the researcher about the involvement of other principals in the evaluation process. He reported that school principals are beginning to get involved in the evaluation of their peers. In his words:

> Actually one of the principals that I am aware of was telling me that he is doing some evaluation with another school board. So what they are actually doing is not using administrators in say our board to evaluate administrators in our board, but he is going from our board to another board, and becoming a part of evaluation team.

He elaborated that the principal in this case will go, and meet with the other principal. Discuss things with him/her; have a pre-conference, and talk about what is happening; spend some time in the school, and see how things are going. So the principal and the school is being evaluated by an external person "who has similar experiences and similar background." He felt that it would be very useful, as it would give them an opportunity to spend some time in another school, and see what is happening there. "How they relate to staff, how they relate to parents, how they run their schools in a sense."

However, Mr. Power informed the researcher that no such process is being utilized in their district. Mr. Hayes' friend

might have been talking about assessment team which would go to different schools and evaluate the entire school, not the principal as such. Mr. Hayes might have confused that pilot project with the evaluation of school principals. Whatever be the case, after getting such a positive response towards peer evaluation, the researcher asked other principals for their opinion on the issue. None of the principals she asked were against the involvement of their peers, but some of them indicated that it would be extremely difficult to do so because of time constraints. Nevertheless, they observed that even if it is not possible to involve their peers in the formal evaluation process, they should be extended the opportunity to go and work with other administrators; so that they can improve their weak areas, discuss various issues, and gain some valuable insight. The following quotes will reveal their positive feelings toward peer involvement:

Ms. Vernal: It has never been presented as an option. It's really a good idea, because we don't use other administrators.

Mr. Dalton: I think probably the suggestion of having other principals involved is a good one. I think that would be needed. I think I would like myself to give opportunity to go out, and develop relationships with other principals not because I would like to get out and get hands on other principals. I think I could grow from the experience; to go out, to observe, to work with somebody.

Ms. Mullett: I'd definitely welcome that. I think that is a good idea. We only meet so often, but I would have a definite idea of this principal's weaknesses

> and strengths; and I think sometimes I would aspire to do what they have done and sometimes that gives me part of my vision...I'd also like an honest opinion of what they think that I've done. I think other principals could possibly help out there...I would value that.

Ms. William and Mr. Dinzel suggested that the school board should identify people that have particular strengths. In the situation where an administrator is being evaluated, and was having difficulty, s/he should have the option to work with another principal, who has a strength in that particular area. Mr. Dinzel speaks to this point:

> It might be better for central office to say okay we surveyed our staff, our principals and these are the people who are basically making themselves available to become mentors; and this is your list who would you feel on this list that you might like to work with, and then I think you could make those sort of arrangements...

Ms. William expressed similar views. She observed:

> If record keeping happen to be a weakness of mine, and the principal at MacDonald drive has an efficient system of organizing, she will be an ideal person to work with. And I think coming from a fellow administrator you can relate to it more so than someone may be from district office level. I think that would be really good.

As mentioned earlier, Avalon Consolidated School Board has adapted the evaluation policy from the Conception Bay South Integrated School Board. According to Mr. Power, a school board employee, the policy has been reviewed every year since its adoption. In his words:

> We reviewed it on an annual basis, but we made very little changes; very few changes to it.

Apparently, the very changes they have made, are the ones administrators in this board would have preferred to keep. For instance, their evaluation process involves a component of "peer consultation and review." Following the completion of the self-evaluation component, principals engage in the process of peer consultation and review. As stated in the policy of the Conception Bay South Integrated School Board (1986), "the sole purpose of this exercise is to stimulate professional growth through consultation and relational learning" (p.3). The principal is given the opportunity to work with two other administrators and they meet at least three times a year to discuss, analyze, and review procedures in place in the evaluatee's school.

A few school principals highlighted another reason for involving their peers. They claimed if the assistant superintendent had the experience of working in an elementary school setting, s/he is not the best person to evaluate a high school principal, and vice-versa. Others argued that if the assistant superintendent is there for a long time, and had become distant from the school setting, then, it becomes difficult for him/her to understand the problems facing administrators today, as their role has changed and is changing quite rapidly. Their typical responses are as

follows:

Mr. Norman: My personal feeling is that the best people to do evaluation are people that are very familiar with what goes on in a school setting. I think in many cases that would be administrators, who are in similar positions, rather than people who are working out of the board office; many of whom have not been principals or vice-principals of High schools. So, if you haven't been in the position I think that in some ways has an impact on whether you evaluate somebody else in a position.

Mr. Hayes: Quite often people at the school board have never been in the administrative position; never been a principal or whatever, and that happens quite frequently. So sometimes what they can bring to the administrative roles is very limited.

Mr. Myrick was the only principal who suggested that business people in the community with whom a principal has dealings with should be consulted. The only other administrator was Mr. Clarke, a vice-principal, who seemed to be in agreement with Mr. Myrick.

As an analysis, this group of administrators was positively inclined towards the idea of involving their peers in the performance appraisal. The issue of evaluative criteria, discussed in the next section, will serve to illustrate the unanimity in the views of the school principals.

Evaluative Criteria

If there was one thing on which all the principals agreed, then it was on the issue of using different criteria.

Different groups of people should evaluate on different sets of criteria, with some questions that may be similar on different survey instruments. Mr. Dinzel's comments reflect the views of all the others:

> I think it would have to be different criteria because what parents are concerned about may not be what teachers are concerned about. The communication that we have with parents would be a lot different than what we would have with teachers. There are parents, especially in High School situation who would never come into your school. With regards to teachers you are working with them on a day to day basis...So I would think you need to have totally different instruments; there may be overlap like approachability; how approachable is the principal from a parents' perspective and the teachers' perspective. These sorts of things or the climate of the school; there may be some overlapping, but there would be certainly specific items to each instrument.

The consensus that had appeared among principals soon disappeared, when they were asked if parents on committees should evaluate by different sets of criteria than parents in general. The principal who presented a divergent view was Ms. Stephen. In contrast to the rest of the group, she said:

> Same criteria. They may not be able to answer it. In other words, if you're using a likert scale, for example they may end up saying, I don't know more than anything else. But that tells you something about the relationship between the parent and the school which says that this is a parent we need to make contact with. It actually provides a very important information in terms of if I had a parent evaluation say went out to seventy parents of the school, and I had a percentage of fifteen where the majority of the answers were "I don't know", then I would want to start a plan with my council and my PTA; ways of getting the parents involved in the

school.

The following section will show diversity of opinion among the on-site administrators on the topic of weighting.

Should feedback be weighted?

There was sharp division among principals on the issue of weighting. Six of them said different weightings be given to each source of feedback; seven thought no weighting should be given at all; three needed more time to think; one saw it as being weighted, but his reply was somewhat unique from the other six; one as mentioned earlier, saw no need for formally evaluating the principals unless and until it is required because of whatever reasons.

The principals, who thought no weighting should be placed, argued that each one of them is equally important; and would come together to provide a fuller, and more complete picture of what they do, and how they are perceived by various constituents. Illuminating this point Ms. Coish noted:

> Well, see this is the ultimate dilemma with evaluation because, you see, I'm just interested in having information for myself. From my perspective, I'm interested in having information about what all those people think about what's going on in the school...I don't want weight. I don't want to put a value judgement on it. I guess I am interested in the whole notion of gathering data to help things be improved...So I think all this information is equally valid and valuable.

Interestingly, the group which said that feedback should be weighted, placed more value on teachers' feedback than assistant superintendents'. Mr. Ivany's views are indicative of this feeling. He said:

> I would give more weight to teachers than anyone else. I'd put central office staff after teachers. I'd probably give more weight to what parents say than students.

The only thing one can say over here is: there goes the century-old hierarchical structure. Mr. Davis, a high school teacher, while talking about traditional model of evaluation said to the researcher:

> Young fresh people like yourself has the rein to change the traditional hierarchical systems that are found to be wanting.

It seems he underestimated the power of this group of principals. They were more than willing to change the direction of the winds themselves.

Mr. Roberts who agreed that different weightings should be given, however, stood out from the group in the way he placed the value. An excerpt from the interview with him, sheds some light on his views:

Mr. Roberts: It would depend on the type of thing that you're talking about. You're talking about administrivia kind of stuff that surely shouldn't be as important as things like instructional leadership like school-community relations and things like that obviously more important than day to day administrivia. You don't need somebody with eight years of university training, twenty-two

> years involved in a job to look after the day to day running of the building. You need a secretary for that. When it comes to curriculum development and all that kind of stuff then obviously yes professional training and all, the things that go into it. That where it comes from.

S.M: So you are saying that different criteria or different questions should be weighted differently.

Mr. Roberts: Yes, that's right.

In conclusion, the principals were never before as divided on any topic as they were on the topic of weighting. The section truly reflected variety in their viewpoints.

Disclosure of Information

Except one elementary school principal, Mr. Dinzel, all the other principals insisted that they should be told as to how each group evaluated them. If they are not told how each group felt, they would not be able to address the issues appropriately. Mr. Dalton's comments are typical of what these principals had to say:

> Yes, they should be told; otherwise it would lose it's benefit. If your students had a perception of the way you are doing things one way and parents had another way, you have to look at that and balance it. Now what is it about what I am doing that can't prove this, if this is the problem. Or what things I am doing right, because you are dealing with different groups. I think you'll lose the value, if you are not told as to how individual sources evaluated you.

Mr. Dinzel, on the other hand, was somewhat hesitant about disclosing that sort of information. He presumed that it could be counter productive in some cases. In his words:

> In an ideal world that would be useful. And I think that if you're going to affect the change that may be required. I think you need to know. Now there are problems with that as well. Of course, if you got feedback from teachers that was very negative then obviously that would probably change your relationship with those teachers.

To researcher's point that individual sources would be disclosed not the individuals, he replied:

> I know; but let's say as a group, the group is very negative that may cause some friction or some stress between the administrator and teachers. That may be a drawback, but I think it may be one of those necessary evils that you would have to deal with.

Mr. Dinzel may very well be right in holding such a view, and that may happen in some instances. But the critical point that one should remember is that, no matter which group owns that perception, it is a reality for them. Therefore, instead of defending the reason why certain behaviours exist, one should acknowledge it, and work towards changing it. Ms. Vernal captured this thought when she said:

> I think the thing to keep in mind with respect to evaluation regardless of the source it's a perspective that exists. A perception that exists and if the perception exists then you'd like to change it. Its helpful to know if the parents group or it's a group of teachers or it's the assistant superintendent, because then you have the means by which to, not raise other groups support for the

> stand that you've taken, but you have a reason to focus your efforts in changing that perception with that particular group.

She continued:

> The important thing to keep in mind is regardless of whether in an evaluation process, the evaluatee is right or wrong, the perception exists in the evaluator. It's the perception, if you can change that perception through a different approach in your message then you've achieved success. If that perception is true which it is for the evaluator, but if it is also true for you then you have to change your methods.

In analysis, all the principals were singular in their view that knowledge of how each group felt would enable them to deal with the situation appropriately. Only one administrator voiced the fear that in the case of negative feedback, it may have detrimental effect on the relationship that principal share with a particular group. Nevertheless, even he could not dismiss the fact that the benefits of disclosing such information outweigh those of withholding it.

The next section addresses a significant issue that is a major source of concern among this group of principals.

Principal As A Teacher

With regards to principals' teaching, none of the elementary school principals were directly opposed to being evaluated as teachers. Most of them thought as it is part of their job, therefore, it should be taken into consideration.

The issue with this group of administrators was not whether their teaching should be evaluated or not, the real issue was whether or not they should teach in the first place. They argued that the job does not become easier if the size of the school is small; in fact it gets more complex and multidimensional. The following comments made by different elementary school principals will highlight their feelings on this issue:

Mr. Roberts, principal of a school with 330 students, said:

> It's the part of that person's job, if you want to put it that way, and certainly your commitments to that should be looked in terms of your commitment to the other part of your job. I mean, if you're trying to achieve some of these goals that you're being evaluated against, well, may be some of the time you're spending in instruction in class might be preventing you from moving ahead with some of these other things. So, I think it should be. It never was in my case.

Mr. Dinzel, principal of a school with 340 students, stated:

> I think it's a good idea. Actually it is very stressful at times the biggest drawback is that there is so much going on in the office in terms of dealing with teachers and parents and students and so on, and unfortunately that is getting worse than better. I'm not sure that we always do justice to our students that we are teaching. That is the biggest problem. There are many occasions when I go to class and you have to go; my situation is that if I don't go there is nobody else to go, so I have to go. I have to drop whatever I am doing, and I have to go; and if you are dealing with a major crisis at the office, if it is a stressful time ... you are trying to think about something, so you are

> going into class, and your mind is not probably on what you are doing; not as much as it should be. So that is the major drawback.

He also added:

> If you are going to be fair and consistent to the teachers, and to be treated as other people are expected to be treated in terms of evaluations, then I think that will be useful. Actually it might be useful for principals as well, because many principals have argued for many years that they shouldn't expect to teach. That the workload at the office is enough. With teaching, of course, it's the planning, it's correcting, it's all of that has to go along with teaching; and may be if principals were evaluated, and some of these factors taken into consideration, the amount of absenteeism that is required, the mind-set when you go into classroom, all these sorts of things would be part of evaluation. Then may be something would be, you know, a proposal would be put forward that principals are not in a position to do a very good job at teaching.

Ms. Stephen, principal of a school with 406 students, observed:

> Probably it should be; but also it's not something that we all do on a regular basis. So to build that in, you'd have to build it in on an individual basis. The other part of this is, we've all come to the position as teachers. So we would have all been evaluated several times along the lines as teachers.

Ms. Stephen's statement about principals being evaluated several times as teachers in their career, raise several important issues:

- If a teaching principal is not being evaluated as a teacher on the basis that s/he has been teaching for the past several years, and the assumption is that s/he must be an effective

teacher, then, is it fair to evaluate those teachers who call themselves "master" teachers, and sometimes have more teaching experience than the principal? Is it appropriate to let the principal evaluate that teacher, even though s/he herself or himself is not being held accountable in that regard?

• Second, if an individual was effective once, does that mean s/he will continue to be effective? If such is the case, then, the whole notion of continuous evaluation for professional growth does not make sense.

• Third, as indicated by principals (above) often they do not do justice to their role as teachers, because of their administrative responsibilities. So the issue is not one of not being effective; the critical point is that, are they being effective or more appropriately can they be effective? If they are not, then, what should and could be done to address this.

The analysis of the data revealed that the amount of administrative work does not allow principals to perform their teaching duties effectively. This has given way to dissatisfaction and discontent with their role not only as teachers but also administrators. The problem associated with work overload is further highlighted in the section to follow.

Work Overload

There was not a single principal whom the researcher met, and s/he did not make a reference to the amount of work they are expected to do, and the work they have to take home to finish. In short, all of them indicated that they are overworked. The schedule of this principal will shed some light:

> I have fitted my average work week to 60-70 hours. When I came to work this year because I've made a decision I'm going to change my life style, I stopped doing this because I didn't have time. This is a factor. What I started doing is writing in my hours per day when I arrive and when I stopped working. For example, on the 13th of September, 7 in the morning I arrived here and I stopped at 10 p.m.; 7-5; 7-6:30, that was Friday. On Sunday, I came for a meeting from 2-4:30, worked from 6-9:30. On Monday 7-10p.m...

This was her schedule after she decided that she would spend more time home. This was not the only principal, who told the researcher about her schedule and how they are overworked; there were several others. It must be noted that in a national sample of principal in the United States, Doud (cited in Bognar, 1990) found that the average American principal works about 9.0 hours per day at school, and 6.0 hours a week on school related activities, for a total of just over 50 hours a week. In a study conducted in the Vancouver School Board, Bognar (1990) reported that school administrators spend an average of 9.3 hours per day at

school. Each administrator works an average of 54 hours per week. The figures given by administrators in this school board are somewhat higher than those indicated in other studies. Probably because of this reality some of the principals made references to having more support staff. The following principals shared their experiences:

Ms. Vernal: In some ways the more important aspects of leadership with respect to actual student performance have been diluted to the point of being ineffective, because of a broader definition of what our roles should be, which may indeed be the reality, but if it's the reality, we have to have the support system in place. For example, a colleague in B.C. who has a school of 400, has 3 vice-principals. Now, obviously that team's ability to serve a broader role as defined by society is much more within the realm of possibility than within our province, where the allocations of principals and vice-principals have not changed, but the work load has been broadened well beyond instructional leadership or curriculum development and I guess the question is: Who would indeed be responsible for curriculum , especially with educational reform. It's been broadened to the point where I believe that in many ways we have become, the role of educational leaders has been diluted. Our responsibilities have increased, our resources have decreased. The same quality is expected, but the quantity of performance has diluted our ability to be educational leaders at the level that I think many school administrators would like to see their roles being formed.

Mr. Myrick: One thing that we do not do as a profession is ever allow time for reflection. I mean we come in September, and we jump on a treadmill; and we don't get off the treadmill until June. And we rarely have time for reflection on the practice of a principal, on the practice of your job. And I think when you can step back from it, and look at what you are doing, and how you fit into the role of principal, then I think there is a much better chance for you to be effective...The time is just

> not there in a daytime. Because every principal that I know, or in the high school anyway, they are grossly overworked. And it's not all meaningful stuff that we are doing. Lots of the time, we are doing a lot of meaningless crap...I think it's absolutely criminal to try to run a school of this size with a principal, a half-time vice-principal, and one guidance counsellor. I can have 5 vice-principals and guidance counsellors in this school, and busy all the time. That would make me much more effective at my job.

Ms. Jones: We don't have any support. Most of the schools of this size could use another vice-principal. We have one guidance counsellor. One guidance counsellor! That guidance counsellor is suppose to do personal guidance, career guidance, and we also expect her to help with some administrative tasks.

It is true that shortage of human resources is just one problem; there are several others like broken homes and abused children, apathy and narcissism, discipline problems and alienation etc. These realities were always there, but not in such overwhelming magnitude. What is most disheartening is knowing that where the task is hardest, administrators are faced with fewest resources (Allen, 1992). These realities affect their performance directly, and in turn evaluation report. This group of administrators claimed that often central office staff does not understand the problems they face; their role is not only changing, but also becoming complex. Therefore, the person who is assigned the role of an evaluator must be cognizant of these realities.

It is important to note that evaluation policies of the

Avalon North Integrated School Board (1989), material obtained from the school principal, and the Conception Bay South (1986) state that during initial meeting, the administrator should familiarize the evaluator with the operation of the school. This gives the opportunity to the evaluator to understand the context in which the principal works. Furthermore, according to the evaluation policy of St. Vital School Division No. 6 (1987), document obtained from the school principal, the amount of time each administrator spends in the areas like conflict resolution, management, logistical support, political, and instructional leadership is given due consideration. This helps the evaluator to understand how that administrator operates, and the pressures, the constraints on his/her role in trying to be effective in any particular area.

In conclusion, the broadened work load plus multitude of expectations, plus shortage of human resources, does not provide a context where administrators can excel. There seems to be a mismatch between the availability of support staff and the changing demands on the schools and their principals.

Measuring Instruments

Most principals suggested that combination of tools should be used for gathering data, instead of relying on any one particular instrument. Nevertheless, they had their own preferences. Mr. Ellis liked rating scales. Ms. William, Ms.

Mullett and Ms. Ronald preferred narratives. Ms. Coish and Mr. Dalton thought that anecdotal reporting should supplement rating scales. Ms. Stephen and Ms. Vernal liked reflective journals. Mr. Dalton and Mr. Ivany thought shadowing would be helpful.

Principles of Teacher Evaluation

Ms. Trent first told the researcher about the *Principles of Teacher Evaluation (1995)* . She indicated that the same principles and recommendations will apply to the principal evaluation practices as well. After her, several other principals talked about it. Their views on some of the principles are as follows:

Principle # 8
Evaluator Credibility

The evaluation should be managed and executed by persons with the necessary qualifications, skills, and authority, and evaluators should conduct themselves professionally, so that evaluation reports are respected and used.

Regarding necessary qualifications and skills, administrators observed that evaluators should have: taken courses in evaluation and supervision and courses in management; training in a school setting; experience as an administrator; good sound knowledge of what the administration

is all about; insight into the school system and into school dynamics; and training in evaluation.

Experience as an administrator was considered very important; it was emphasized repeatedly that one does not understand the challenges and problems faced by principals unless the individual has experienced it first hand. They went to the extent of saying if the evaluator has worked in an elementary school then s/he is not the best person to evaluate a high school principal and vice-versa. Besides administrative experience, another aspect that was emphasized was the knowledge of the school setting; the feelings and sentiments prevalent in any particular setting; what has transpired and what is taking place; the past as well as the present. The incidents that may have occurred should all be noted, and in light of those events evaluative data should be read.

Principle # 14
Defined Role

The role, responsibilities, performance objectives, and needed qualifications of the evaluatee's position should be clearly defined, so that the evaluator can determine valid assessment criteria.

This was one principle, the administrators had difficulty with. Instead of an evaluator determining the valid assessment criteria, this group of principals felt that it should be a

collaborative process. They said that it should be collaborative to the point that even in the initial establishment of general criteria, principals should be involved. Some indicated that not only administrators, but also teachers should be involved.

This principle seemed to be in direct contradiction with the tone used throughout the document. The document seemed to be promoting collaboration at all levels. In particular, principle # 12 talks about developing and monitoring personnel evaluation system collaboratively so that "concerned parties are constructively involved in making the system work." (p. 9)

Principle # 14, however, provides a glimpse once again to the traditional model of organization, bringing with it the hierarchical structure of relationships.

Principle # 15
Work Environment

The context in which the evaluatee works should be identified and recorded, so that environmental influences and constraints on performance can be considered in the evaluation.

Principals contented that it is absolutely essential to take the whole context into consideration during evaluation. Most of them said that performance could be constrained by factors in the environment that are not under their control.

The factors identified by them that should be taken into account were: number of students and staff, number of special programs, physical environment, level of students whether it's an elementary, junior high, or senior high school, type of students whether disruptive or not, type of the school i.e., one-stream or two-stream school, and location of the school like inner or outer city school.

Educational Reform

Several principals talked about two pilot projects i.e., school report card and school assessment team.

School Report Card

Six to eight schools from the Avalon Consolidated Board are involved in this project. The board has already completed a student survey called "*Quality of School Life.*" This survey will provide information about student attitudes towards their school. The document will also contain information on attendance rates, course offerings, number of students and staff; their training and experience; information on class size, Canadian Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) results, Criterion referenced tests (CRTS) results, and things that are particular to individual schools. All schools will basically be providing the same type of information. The report will provide the snapshot of a school to parents in a particular

time period. It will give parents an idea of how the school is doing, and will point out the directions for improvement. This is one way of sharing the information and of measuring. The schools will benchmark their progress at a particular time, and then work from there. Every year they can compare their results with the previous one, to see what improvement has been made, and provide some indication as to future direction.

School Assessment Teams

A team of educators comprising of assistant superintendent, principal, teacher, program co-ordinator, and perhaps a university professor will go to different selected schools, and look at various aspects. In a sense, it will be the evaluation of the school which will involve all the aspects particular to that school.

Administrators observed that these pilot projects will draw more attention to the principal evaluation. Some thought that the principal evaluation would be one of the components of it. Others said that it will give them an opportunity to learn and grow. Still others felt that it is a move towards more accountability. Much more pressure is brought to bear on principals, teachers, school board staff, basically the entire education system.

Summary of the Section and Some Concluding Thoughts

The commonly used method of performance evaluation involves obtaining information about performance from one's immediate supervisor. However, if the intention is to obtain accurate evaluations, then one should be concerned with *who can do* the evaluation rather than *who should*. It is unlikely that performance appraisal system with its exclusive reliance on supervisor as the sole source of information will survive the ongoing changes in the context of work and organizations. Furthermore, when the position of principalship is so significant from the standpoint of its direct influence on students (Langlois & McAdams, 1992) then undeniably, clients/customers have a legitimate interest in appraisal; particularly when the job in question represents a boundary role that involves substantial contact with them (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

Much of the scholarship suggests the incorporation of information from multiple sources. Murphy and Cleveland (1995) contend that peer input will be the most important source of performance appraisal information in the future. The examination of the responses of the school principals in this study showed that majority of them were willing to involve parents, students, teachers, and peers in evaluation. The idea of involving peers in the evaluation process received a very positive reception from this group of administrators. They

cited several reasons and advantages of involving peers in the evaluation process.

An important point that was gleaned from the interview data was regarding their teaching responsibilities. Although the principals interviewed were not opposed to being evaluated in classrooms, they were opposed to teaching. They strongly felt that they are not able to perform their teaching duties effectively, because of the amount of administrative work. Almost all the principals were quite vocal in saying that their work load has increased, but their is no parallel increase in the support staff. This was one area which was a major source of concern for these principals.

With regards to the principals' feelings about the way evaluation is presently conducted, it would be an understatement if the researcher says that they were critical. Their responses gave the impression that they were on the verge of total alienation. In fact, two administrators were already of the opinion that administrators should not be formally evaluated. The only thing one can say over here is that if the present state of affairs prevail, then it would not be long before others join the band. Certainly, if negative attitudes prevail among principals, performance appraisal will be unacceptable to many principals, and its use may hinder rather than help achieve outcomes (Dickinson, 1993). In a similar vein, Murphy and Cleveland (1995) observe

that performance evaluations can affect employees' views of and attachment to their organization. They also state that an organization that does a *good job* with performance appraisal may help to build and cement employee commitment and satisfaction. It seems performance appraisal is integral to the successful operation of most organizations (Dickinson, 1993). In view of this reality, the most important thing to keep in mind is that public entrust us with two objects of great importance to them; *one is their money and the other their children.*

Section III

Teachers

A total of eight teachers were interviewed from primary, elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. This section outlines their views regarding the evaluation of principals. Their perceptions and suggestions have been presented under six different headings. Each subsection discusses the views of teachers in considerable detail, highlighting the similarities and differences in their opinions. To preserve confidentiality, real names of the research participants have not been used. Years spent as teachers in their current positions are reported in Table 4.5.

TABLE 4.5

INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHERS

Number of Teachers	Years of Experience In Current Position
4	1 to 5 years
2	6 to 10 years
2	11 to 15 years
8	Total

Experiences and Perceptions about Evaluation Practices

Out of eight teachers, only one had participated in the evaluation of the principal. Questionnaires were given to staff at the time, and according to Ms. Matt:

> We had a lot of time to fill them out. But we never received any feedback regarding that.

Ms. Cheadle provided a solution to the disappointment felt by this teacher. She suggested that the overall response of the teachers should be disclosed to them. In her words:

> I think you should give them something. They will feel that what they said was not disposed off; it was recognized.

Despite the fact that only one teacher had ever been consulted regarding the performance of principal, all the teachers were quite unanimous in their views that principals should be evaluated. Reasons given by these teachers are as follows:

Mr. Savoie: I believe their job is open to evaluation as well as anyone else.

Ms. Quinton: I think everybody need to have some accountability.

Ms. Cheadle: Principals have a very responsible position. They are liaison between staff and the school, between staff and parents. I think they have to be accountable. It's part of that process to be evaluated.

In the section to follow, the researcher explores the

views of the teachers on how the evaluation process might be performed in future.

New Paths to be Explored

> *The starting point of all achievement is desire. Keep this constantly in mind. Weak desires bring weak results, just as a small amount of fire makes a small amount of fire.*
>
> *- Hill*

Involvement of Teachers, and Parents

All the teachers interviewed were singularly emphatic about involving teachers in the principal evaluation. However, their responses to the involvement of parents were negative.

Teachers insisted that they should be involved in the evaluation of the school principals because they work with him/her very closely, and they would be able to provide some valuable insights regarding their principals' performance. Another reason for their involvement cited by the teachers was that principals are involved in the evaluations of teachers, therefore they should be involved in principal's. Ms. Quinton's comments illustrate this point:

> I think definitely teachers need to be involved. Just like principals are involved in teacher evaluation. It should be a two-way street.

Although all of them thought that teachers should be consulted, they were not ignorant of the fact that some teachers would be biased, and that one has to be careful.

Their views are reflected in the words of the following two teachers.

Mr. Savoie: You need input from teacher, but it has to be taken with **a grain of salt**.

Ms. Quinton: I think you have to be very careful that personalities and grudges don't come into play here and sometimes perhaps that becomes a factor and that's unfortunate. But I think an evaluation package that's well put together should be able to overcome some of that.

One should note that the very same teachers got very defensive and protective of their principals, when they were asked if input should be taken from parents. Ms. Cheadle, primary school teacher, said earnestly:

> I would not like to see the principal of this school placed on a set of scales for these parents to evaluate.

The researcher received some very interesting comments regarding the involvement of parents:

Ms. Quinton: Well, it is politically correct right now to say, "Yes involve everybody, including the garbage man and the police officer on the side of the road". Personally speaking, if you have the assistant superintendent and you have, say the vice-principal of a school and you have the staff of the school, I think that in itself is enough on a formal evaluation.

Interview with Mr. Savoie went like this:

S.M: Do you think parents should be involved?

Mr. Savoie: Parents aren't aware. I don't think they should be involved. I think this is a school, this is not a public facility.

After staring at the researcher for a while, he added chastisingly:

Mr. Savoie: This is a school, you know. It has its rules and it follows its rules. You don't follow the rules of the parents. So probably a superintendent assigned to the school and a few senior teachers should evaluate principals.

The researcher proceeded to interview him as follows:

S.M: What about school-community relationship?

Mr. Savoie: School community relationship is PR. I don't think the school is in the business of PR. I think the school is in the business to educate and that's its first job.

It is interesting to see the contrast between the views of teachers as to their own involvement and the involvement of parents. Comments regarding their own involvement are as follows:

Mr. Savoie: Yes, they should be involved.

Mr. Davis: I think there is room for teachers to be involved.

Ms. Quinton: Most definitely!

Comments regarding the involvement of parents:

Mr. Savoie: No. I don't think they should be involved.

Ms. Wilfred: It would not be fair to the person.

Mr. Wassell: I disagree with involving everybody.

Ms. Matt: Parents! what do they know?

Nevertheless, few teachers conceded that parents who serve on committees, like PTA and School Council, can be involved in formative evaluation. Mr. Davis and Mr. Wassell's views on this issue are as follows:

> Most variety, most input possible should be the aim, especially in formative evaluation.
>
> Parents involvement would be based on perceptions. Formative evaluation by its very nature is, you are looking at improving the situation.

Mr. Barrel's views are shared by Peter Oliva. Oliva (1993) in his book, ***Supervision for Today's Schools***, advises his readers that in seeking parental and student opinions, one should remember that their evaluations are perceptions that may or may not be accurate. Nonetheless, he contends that both student and parent evaluations can help individuals evaluate themselves.

The views of teachers regarding the involvement of parents in formative evaluation should be read in the light of the fact that although they contended that formative evaluation should be ongoing, they saw formative evaluation as informal everyday evaluation. This seems that formative evaluation, in which some of the teachers conceded to the involvement of parents, should be ongoing on an informal level. Ms. Quinton's comments are most illuminating in this respect. When she was asked if formative evaluation should be ongoing? She inquired, "Formal formative evaluation? Getting the researcher's

response in affirmative, she answered:

> No. I don't think so. I don't think anybody should have the pressure of that all the time. We have enough pressures in this school as it is.

Her colleague, Mr. Wassel's comments further highlight the informal nature of formative evaluation. When asked how frequent summative and formative evaluation should be, he remarked:

> Summative evaluation 3-5 years. Formative evaluation, I think formative evaluation goes on whether we like it or not. Parents often call school board and complain; they call the school principal and complain. So in a sense, formative evaluation goes on.

The first and foremost reason given by teachers for not involving parents in summative evaluation, or for that matter in any kind of formal evaluation, was that parents do not have any knowledge of the education system. Second, they thought that parents often have their own personal agendas; therefore it would be difficult to get an accurate evaluation.

The critical issue that arises over here is that when these teachers themselves admitted that "certain teachers will like a principal and certain teachers will hate him; and it is very difficult to get an unbiased evaluation of the boss", then why were they so much concerned about parents having their own personal motives? They themselves suggested that the person who is collecting and collating the data should be careful, and should take into consideration that some teachers

would not be objective, then why cannot the same person who is collecting and collating data cannot take into consideration that some parents would not be objective?

As to the other reason that parents are not aware about the education system, one wonders as to how much education and information is required regarding the education system for commenting on statements like: Do you feel welcomed in the school? Are there many school events happening under the direction of the principal? Do you feel your concerns are being listened to and addressed? Still if not 100% objective, can't this input be taken with a "*grain of salt*"?

The next section focuses on the areas of student and peer evaluation.

Involvement of Students and Peers

Teachers were not very enthusiastic about taking input from students and other school principals. Mr. Savoie observed that students at Senior High level could be involved. Mr. Wassell claimed that they should be involved only in formative evaluation. However, three teachers liked the idea of involving school administrators in evaluation; they thought that it would be useful. Mr. Savoie speaks to this point:

> I agree with that. I like that. Sort of a professional code of conduct thing. They know what to expect of their job. They are more of an expert at their job than a teacher or a board superintendent.

Mr. Barrel agreed with his colleague; however, he added:

> I think it's a good idea, but I don't think they can be involved because of time constraints.

The perceptions of teachers regarding some other important aspects of the evaluation process are discussed in the following section.

Other Relevant Areas

In response to a question that how should each source of feedback be weighted, teachers presented divergent views. Mr. Davis stated, "I don't think weighting is necessary. It's just another form of input." Teachers like Ms. Wilfred, Mr. Matt and Ms. Quinton, on the other hand, contended that feedback should be weighted; although they agreed that different values should be given, they parted company when it came to the issue of how these weights should be placed. Ms. Wilfred stated:

> Superintendents are not around much so they do not know what's going on as much as teachers do. I think more weighting should be given to input from teachers.

Ms. Matt and Ms. Quinton were unanimous in their opinion that equal weighting should be given. However, Ms. Matt added:

> They (assistant superintendents) should spend more time in school if they want to give more weighting to their evaluation.

To a question whether principals should be informed about how individual sources evaluated him or her, no difference of

opinion was evident among this group of teachers. All of them claimed that such information should not be withheld. The following quote from Ms. Dale is typical of the statements made by teachers:

> Ms. Dale: I think you certainly have a right to know what the groups are saying about you. If the PTA is saying something about the principal, then I think the principal deserves and has the right to know what they are saying so that he or she can, you know, may be address that at a meeting. It could be just a communication breakdown.

Once again, there was agreement among teachers that different sets of criteria should be given to different groups of people depending upon their dealings with the principal.

To summarize, then, all eight teachers were in agreement that different groups should evaluate on different criteria, and that principals should be told how each group evaluated them. This unanimity, however, was not evident on the issue of weighting. Some said feedback should be weighted, others did not want any weights to be placed.

The following section is concerned with the principals' teaching role.

Principal as A Teacher

When teachers were asked if principals' teaching be taken into consideration during formal evaluation, they expressed mixed feelings; some said that principals should not teach at

all, but at the same time admitted that if principals do not teach, they would not be able to stay in touch with kids at classroom level, and this would be a loss for them at professional level.

Despite their obvious concern and hesitation in reaching a decision whether principals should teach or not, they noted if it is a teaching principal, then his/her teaching should be evaluated "on level that any teacher's performance would have to be." Their typical responses are as follows:

Mr. Savoie: I think a lot of times the principal doesn't get to put in his best effort in teaching because he is concerned with other matters, and it is an afterthought. I am not citing examples, but I know if you try to do too many things at once you mess up.

Mr. Davis: You don't have to be a good teacher for being a good principal. Administrative responsibilities are not necessarily the same. Although I think, most people assume that a principal had been a good teacher.

Ms. Quinton: I've seen people who are administrators who are very good at being administrators, but very hard at being teachers and I can give you an example. Ah, there was a time, I'll be very general, when I remember this principal saying to us all, "If you're off sick, make sure you have a detailed lesson plan for your substitute teacher" and yet any time this principal was out of the school for illness or anything else, the substitute teacher would come in and say to the rest of us, "What do I do?" So here is an example where principals should do as I say, not as I do....And I hate to say this, but in most cases they emphasize the one to the detriment of the other.

In analysis, these teachers had some reservations about teaching duties of a principal; they were concerned that often principals neglect their teaching responsibilities in favour of their administrative ones. Nevertheless, they stated that teaching principals should be evaluated as teachers. The next section will discuss their views on measuring tools.

Measuring Instruments

There was no consensus evident among teachers on the issue of evaluation tools. Ms. Dale suggested that variety of instruments should be used. Ms. Cheadle thought shadowing would be good. However her colleague, Ms. Wilfred, stated:

> I don't think shadowing is any good there. I certainly think a good survey instrument is a very good thing to use.

To a question about rating scales, almost all of them said that they would prefer a rating scale with some anecdotal input. Only Mr. Savoie preferred rating scales with no space for any personal comments. The reason for this preference was rather personal. He likes to rate people. In his words, "I like to rate."

In summary, the section witnessed disagreement in opinion among teachers with regards to evaluation tools. In the section to follow, the researcher will explore their views with respect to the evaluation policy.

Evaluation Policy

None of the teachers interviewed were aware of the board's policy which is not so discouraging considering the fact that even some school principals were not aware. The following comments made by teachers reveal their ignorance as to the board's policy:

Ms. Quinton: Oh, I don't even know if we have one for principals. Do we?

Ms. Cheadle: I do not think that I know. I think they are evaluated every 5 years just like I am. Now I could be wrong. Let me say that I am not aware.

All eight teachers felt that principals should be involved in the development of the evaluation policy. Seven out of eight remarked that even teachers should be involved. Mr. Savoie was the only teacher who did not share the views of his group. He contended that even teachers should not be involved. In his words:

> Teachers expect the principals to not only know the principals job, but to know the teachers job pretty well; and you will end up concentrating on the wrong stuff.

The other seven teachers presented the argument that in order for anything to work, "all the participants" and "all the stake-holders" should be involved; however, it is important to note that parents were again excluded from the actual development of the policy. In view of this fact, one may question the use of the words like "all the stake-holders"

and "all the participants." One may also question if the term "all the stake holders" is restricted to only school board employees and teachers?

Summary of the Section and Some Concluding Thoughts

It goes without saying that principals get evaluated constantly by subordinates, students, parents, and the community in general. These evaluations take place every where whether administrators like it or not. The issue, therefore, is not whether subordinates should evaluate principals or not; the issue is whether there will be some formal mechanism for principals to become aware of the views of their subordinates. As mentioned in this section, teachers were unanimous in their view that they be involved in the formal appraisal process. Involvement of teachers in the evaluation process would certainly be helpful to the administrator, because teachers see their principals in action every day, and they know more about principals than administrators sometimes realize. An old military saying that comes to mind over here is that the commander who gets too far ahead of his troops is likely to get shot in the back. This adage applies beautifully to the relationship between principals and their staff. The public nature of the schools allows the staff to undercut the effectiveness and reputation of their principals not only in schools, but also in the community. Therefore, involvement of

staff in the performance appraisal can serve as a communication link between the principal and the staff (Langlois & McAdams, 1992).

With regards to the involvement of parents and students, these teachers were very reluctant to give them any say in the formal process. However, an important point stood out from their responses. This group of teachers regarded formative evaluation as informal everyday evaluation, and it was in this process of evaluation that they were willing to let parents and students have a voice. Two reasons were evident for not involving parents in the formal evaluation process: (a) parents do not have adequate knowledge of the education system, and (b) they often have personal motives which make their evaluations biased.

The advice from Wellins (cited in Budman and Rice, 1994) makes a fitting conclusion to the issues discussed in this section. He notes:

> To some extent the situation is like getting married. In marriage, I think it's usually best to wait a few years before having kids - before introducing a new person into the equation. (p.38).

So the moral of the story for those who want to get involved, and for those who want more inclusive performance is that one should be patient. Everyone should be adequately prepared before introducing a new dimension to performance evaluation. Quite evidently, teachers are not yet ready for

such a power shift in their working relationships, and they first need to get used to the idea of involving other stake holders besides themselves.

Section IV

Vice-Principals

Seven vice-principals were interviewed; three females and four males from elementary, and secondary schools. The close working relationship they share with front-line administrators provides a special significance to the views of the second member of this administrative team. This section provides a window on to the perceptions, thoughts, suggestions, and insights shared by them with respect to the principal evaluation system. All the names used in this section are fictitious. Data presented in Table 4.6 depict the total number of the vice-principals interviewed, and other related information.

TABLE 4.6

INFORMATION ABOUT VICE-PRINCIPALS

Number of Vice-principals	Years Of Experience In Their Current Schools
6	1 to 5 years
-	6 to 10 years
1	11 To 15 Years

<u>Experiences and Perceptions about Evaluation Practices</u>

Interview data revealed that all the vice-principals,

except Mr. Griffiths, were unanimous in their view that principals should be evaluated. They observed that evaluation should lead to professional growth and improvement. Even though they claimed that principals should go through an evaluation process, they were very critical of the actual process. Having witnessed such negative feelings and attitudes on numerous occasions, the researcher asked one vice-principal, Mr. Norman, directly as to the reason why people hold such negative feelings toward evaluation. Mr. Norman shed some light on why this might be so:

> The cynicism comes from the fact that school board talks about evaluation, and the policy is well laid out in their school board policy manual, but what is written and the reality and the time for the reality to happen are totally different.

He went on to say:

> Yes, there is a plan, but the time to do it and the mechanism to do it and specific steps and the personnel, all those types of things, is simply not working right now. So people are very cynical about the whole process.

His views were shared by another of his colleague, Mr. Clarke, who while talking about evaluation process noted:

> Evaluation generally in education, of teachers and administrators is not done thoroughly and adequately and that is basically only in place on paper.

Disappointed by the way evaluation is generally conducted in education, Mr. Griffiths was the only vice-principal who

expressed discomfort at evaluating administrators formally. He thought that administrators themselves continuously strive for improvement and seek parental and staff input wherever possible. He was very critical of the way evaluation is done and concluded that formal evaluation:

> is not best for the system. That is not the most efficient way to do it, and I don't think it is necessary, and the way that is going to bring about the most benefits in terms of evaluation. I think that evaluation, the notion of evaluation, particularly the formative evaluation needs to be ongoing because it is from your colleagues, it is from everything that you do, your results....

Quite evidently, Mr. Griffiths was disappointed with the way evaluation is conducted, and that is partly the reason for his obvious reluctance to evaluate administrators formally; but instead of saying that evaluation system should be improved like other administrators suggested, he felt:

> *We* all look at our results, *we* all look at our graduates whether *we* are on formal evaluation or not. If *we* see problems then *we* take measures to see that that kind of problem doesn't happen again. Now, that might not be what's called formal evaluation done from someone outside, but it's our assessment of our situation, perception of the problem, and our actions to correct that problem.

The critical issue that arises over here is: can we pass a blanket statement that all administrators strive for excellence? Cannot there be some who are not effective? When this was pointed out to him, his reply was:

> The principal may not be effective not because he

> could not be effective, but there may be other problems in the school that might be causing the principal not to be effective.

Mr. Griffiths seemed to be seeing only one side of the coin. He was just not able to perceive that some administrators may not be as motivated and as effective as he himself might like them to be or might have seen; but does that mean we should be oblivious of the fact that there might be some?

A teacher from the same school, Ms. Dale, and an elementary school principal, Ms. Vernal, showed the researcher a totally different side of the coin about which Mr. Griffiths seemed to be ignorant. From Ms. Dale the researcher heard:

> I know we have within our system some very weak principals but nothing seems to be done about it. They get shuffled along to another school, or they make mistakes even within probationary period that they have; and they generally do not go back to a previous position or they aren't seen as being incompetent, or whatever. *I see the system that we have in place being really ineffective in that regard.* If we are going to evaluate people, and you find things wrong with them do something about it.

Ms. Vernal's comments in this regard seem to be particularly illuminating:

> As long as we have mediocrity in the same frame of evaluation as exemplary then our evaluation process is not doing justice to the system. I do believe that there has to be a measure of evaluating who should be in the school. *You know what, there are people here who shouldn't be here.*

Having been disillusioned completely by the formal

evaluation process, Mr. Griffiths was of the view:

> self evaluation within school is far more effective because it occurs daily forever. Not a snapshot; it's more like a movie.

However he added, "If that is the school board's policy then that is something we have to live with." He also observed that the principal is only one player and since they operate on a collegial model in that school, they are a team. Therefore formal evaluation, if conducted, should not just look at one player of this team.

Another vice-principal who expressed similar views was Ms. Stanley. She had the experience of being evaluated along with her principal as an administrative team, as opposed to one evaluating the other. Ms. Stanley was never asked to comment on her administrative colleague's performance; and when she was asked if feedback should have been taken from her, she remarked:

> You're getting into a relationship, and evaluating a relationship is a very difficult thing to do.

She preferred to go to her colleague herself, and tell him what she thinks about various things rather than evaluating him formally. As she observed:

> You've got to be able to evaluate each other. I think you've got to have a trusting relationship, where you can evaluate each other's work in a fair, but a concerned manner or a respectful manner.

Based on her experiences, she went on to highlight some of the advantages and disadvantages of evaluating principals and vice-principals together. One of the disadvantages indicated by her was that teachers get overburdened as they have to evaluate two administrators at the same time instead of one. The advantage is that it gives a comprehensive picture of the team to the evaluator. In her words:

> Positive thing of doing them together is that you become aware quite quickly of the individual strengths and weaknesses. Like for the evaluator, he can say, "Well, oh sure she's got that strength there; he's got that strength there, so they're complimentary."

This was the only incident the researcher had encountered in which the principal and vice-principal was evaluated together; in other cases principals were evaluated separately from their vice-principals, and vice-principals were asked to comment on their colleague's performance. Two vice-principals who were involved in the evaluation of their principals were given same questionnaires as teachers. So it was basically input from staff. One of the vice-principals, Mr. Curtis, shared his experience:

> We never had any feedback as a result of that...I assumed she got feedback; but we never got feedback.

Sensing a twinge of disappointment in his voice, the researcher probed, "Do you think feedback should have been

given to the staff about how the group felt as a whole." Ever so reluctantly, he replied, "I don't know it's a touchy issue."

In conclusion, the move toward team-based approach raise several issues for the school board, which is responsible for conducting the evaluations. First of all, the school board has to make one critical choice, and that is: *Should appraisal of the team be conducted, its individual members, or some combination of two?* If individual members are evaluated, this might affect negatively the team's ability to function as a unit. If the team is evaluated, the board may lose important information about differences in performance (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

Secondly, in a team-based system behaviours such as helping others with their work, coordinating with others, or sharing information become part of the core definition of job performance. An organization which emphasizes team work will have to develop a different definition of individual job performance, than an organization that makes little use of teams (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

In light of the changing context of work, the school board is faced with the challenge of not only developing the basic definition of job performance, but also deciding who is to be appraised.

The following section will present the vice-principals

views with respect to the evaluation policy.

Evaluation Policy

All the vice-principals interviewed thought that administrators should be involved not only in the development of the policy, but also the entire evaluation package. The following comments are typical of what these vice-principals had to say:

Mr. Griffiths: Of course, you should be involved. If you're not involved in the development of it then I think you should be reluctant to take part.

Mr. Norman: They should be involved in the development of theory and deciding how the actual evaluation will be done.

He also added:

> To bring in a policy, to make it meaningful, to make sure everybody knows, and is very clear on how the policy is going to work then that requires a tremendous amount of in-service.

When this group of administrators was asked if they are aware of the current evaluation policy for the school principals, there replies went like this:

Mr. Griffiths: No.

Mr. Curtis: Yes, to a degree I am. I'm not as well versed probably as I should be; but yes I am.

Ms. Phillips: I'm not sure if I am or not.

Ms. Stanley: Current evaluation policy for what? The only current evaluation I know is what I mean is the only thing that I know the Avalon Consolidated Board does is evaluate principals and

> vice-principals who are on probation after being appointed to a new position. I'm not aware that they do anything else. Do they do anything else?

Having received replies like "to an extent", "to a degree" and "I am not sure" it is difficult for the researcher to know the exact degree of their familiarity. Probably they know that a policy is in place, but they are "not well versed" with the contents. Mr. Griffiths speaks to this point:

> Yeah, I **think** it's in policy manual, and I **guess** you are expected to know what's in the policy.

Although they were cognizant of the fact that there is a policy, they did not know when and how the policy was developed. Only Ms. Babb had a vague idea. She stated with an obvious effort at thinking:

> I *think* it was adapted from previous board. I could be wrong, but I *think*."

In analysis, the vice-principals appeared to have strong feelings about the involvement of administrators in the development of the evaluation package; they were of the view that their involvement is essential for the system to work.

The next section will highlight some of the weaknesses and/or strengths inherent in the policy.

Areas of Strengths and Weaknesses

As to the strengths and/or weaknesses inherent in the

policy, two vice-principals voiced their feelings, and suggested paths for improvement.

Mr. Norman, as indicated earlier, highlighted the gap between intended and actual practices. Based on this assumption, he suggested, "Go down to the grass roots. Yeah, I think you need to go back and start again." He also cautioned:

> If you're going to have a new policy you have to bring it with the realization that it is workable.

Another vice-principal who was quite vociferous in pointing out the weaknesses in the evaluation policy was Mr. Clarke. He stated unequivocally, "There's a phenomenal weakness because it presupposes something that does not exist." He explained further:

> Well, it presupposes the knowledge. The policy presupposes that whoever's going to evaluate me at this school understands fully what's going on at this school.

Having been a victim of evaluation himself, he strongly felt that the evaluator should have a thorough knowledge of the school setting in which the evaluatee works. The suggestion he made for improving the policy was to create "a greater degree of awareness and knowledge." While expressing his views on the same issue, he made a reference to the principle # 8 of the *Principles of Teacher Evaluation (1995)* which states:

> The evaluation should be managed and executed by persons with the necessary qualifications, skills, and authority, and evaluators should conduct themselves professionally, so that evaluation reports are respected and used.

The point that he highlighted was:

> There can be qualifications and skills coming out of your ears, but if there's not a total awareness of what the task is then how can you evaluate that task.

He elaborated:

> If I asked you to make a loaf of bread, and I am going to evaluate you on how well you made this bread. Right now I'd probably just go on flavour. I feel a little hungry right now. Right. I might know nothing about the texture of the bread and I might know nothing about that. So how can I properly evaluate you on your loaf of bread.

From a similar perspective a school principal, Ms. Ronald, remarked:

> They need to have insight into the school system and into school dynamics. I don't think that somebody could come in to evaluate a school setting without knowing what's happening, and who the players are.

Both administrators thought that it is important for the evaluator to understand the path of improvement the school is taking; the attempts and the initiatives made by the evaluatee in response to situational factors unique to that particular setting. Mr. Clarke was quite vocal in his criticism that evaluators not only lack the knowledge of the context, but also the task itself. He claimed:

> I can give you example after example after example

> of clear evidence that they don't fully understand what's going on.

Mr. Clarke did give a few examples to the researcher to show the lack of awareness of school board staff about the problems faced by administrators, and what it takes them to do their task effectively and efficiently. He also made references to the kind of politics that goes on within the board, and how it inhibits the individual and the organizational growth. The researcher is not at liberty of disclosing these incidents because of the fear that it might disclose the identity of the individual. However, it is important to note that Mr. Clarke was not the only administrator who talked about the role of power and politics in performance appraisal, a few principals also shed some light on this reality. For instance, one of the principals said:

> It's not so much what you do, but whether you are part of the current agenda, okay. So you might be on the one hand working your rear end off, and you may be doing a lot of good things but if you're not part of the current political agenda of the board may be it doesn't count much at that time. But then, another time *your star may rise*.

To conclude, the role of power and politics was brought forth by some of the administrators, who felt that their efforts are not appreciated, and as a result they suffer.

The next section is concerned with the frequency of

appraisal.

Time-Frame for Evaluation

To a question about how frequently evaluation should be conducted, their typical response was that every 5 years is often enough. Incidently, that is the time indicated for the evaluation of the professional personnel in the policy. However, most of them felt that formative evaluation should be ongoing. As noted earlier in teachers' section, the researcher got the impression that formative evaluation was regarded as informal evaluation which goes on all the time. The oft-repeated reply that the researcher received was that the "school board receives phone calls from parents and teachers if they are not happy about something". So in a way "they've got their finger on the pulse". It was this informal evaluation or formative evaluation that they felt should be ongoing.

First the teachers, and then the vice-principals talking about formative evaluation as informal everyday evaluation, sent the researcher back to her books. In the book, *Supervision as a proactive process*, Daresh and Playko (1995) describe formative evaluation as one which is designed to provide feedback with the intention of improving one's performance. This explanation did not help much, and this was not what the researcher was looking for. However, after a

while on page 287, she eventually found something which shed some light. The authors had used the term "conscious effort" in discussing formative evaluation. They had criticized the educational personnel for their failure to employ this form of evaluation. They stated, "For the most part, the conscious effort to employ continuous evaluation has not been implemented in the field of education" (p. 287). This shows that data collected through informal evaluations can be used for conducting formative evaluation, but informal evaluation in itself is not formative evaluation. What is important is that if the data collected is used for improving the situation, then, and only then it can be called formative evaluation.

However, the researcher could not understand the reason why educators had this false impression about formative evaluation being informal evaluation. So she picked up the *provincial collective agreement (1995)* and tried to see how the term is defined in there, which she hoped would shed some light. She came across with this definition:

> formative evaluation is a process which occurs to improve the professional performance of the teacher(s) (p.12).

This alone did not help much; however, on the same page it is written that "any summative evaluation made on a tenured teacher must be preceded by a formative evaluation" (p.12).

From this, one can infer that if school boards want to place any tenured teacher or principal on summative evaluation, they would have to show that formative evaluation had been conducted, and that every opportunity was extended to the individual to improve. Once all the channels were exhausted, the individual was placed on summative evaluation. The important point is that, in order to show that formative evaluation had been utilized, one needs to have proper documentation as to the kind of help provided and the time given to the individual to improve. In view of this reality, informal everyday evaluation is not a replacement for proper formative evaluation, and certainly the two terms are not synonymous.

The following section is devoted to the discussion of how the evaluation process might be improved.

New Paths to be Explored

> *It is because modern education is so seldom inspired by great hope that it is so seldom achieves a great result.*
>
> *- Russel*

Involvement of Parents

The majority of the vice-principals suggested that a team approach should be taken for evaluating principals, but the people to have most input would be the teachers. This group of educators seemed to be more receptive to involving parents

than teachers were. However, they were quick to acknowledge that parents may have their own personal agendas; therefore, one should be careful while seeking parental input. The responses of this group of vice-principals can be grouped into two distinct categories, i.e. those who were resigned to the idea of parents having more say in future, and those who were willing and considered parental input useful. The following comments will highlight the feelings of each group.

Mr. Curtis reflected on the issue as follows:

> Well it seems like that is what going to happen in the future.

When probed further if it would be helpful, he replied noncommittally, "Hopefully. I just hope it will." The same vice-principal when asked if teachers should be involved, stated without any trace of doubt:

> Of course, we're all professionals and it's not like working in a factory where foreman is in charge. We all have areas of strength and expertise.

Ms. Stanley and Mr. Norman's comments essentially sums up the views of the second group:

Ms. Stanley: I think that would be helpful because I think that could alert you to areas that you need to concentrate on more. And I think it's a good idea for kids to be involved. I mean it belongs to all of us right. The school belongs to all of us or is supposed to all a part of community. So I think that the more we can share our feelings and ideas about school the better principal you're gonna have.

Mr. Norman: I think parents should have some say. Ah, one needs to be very careful though in that the relationship that a parent has with an administrator is very wide and varied.

Expanding on this point, he said:

> School has to apply a discipline sanction that the parent is unable to work out at home. In many cases, that parent will come off believing the administrator has a very, you know, a very negative context...You get one or two parents like that in the run of a year, who are going to sit down, and fire off a letter to the school board to complain about that principal.

Mr. Brushett quickly added, "Often that's what counts."

His colleague, Mr. Norman, agreed:

> Often that's what counts. There will be a phone call, and we will be contacted, or whatever on that one negative thing you did; and 50 things that are positive nature you will never hear.

Mr. Brushett piped in, "Never hear anything." The vice-principal continued again:

> And unfortunately, if you get into an evaluation situation, you will find that one or two things on the negative side like that will tend to weigh heavy and will tend to stick in somebody's mind.

As some of the other school administrators had also voiced similar concerns, therefore, when the researcher met Mr. Power, she inquired, "What is done in a situation where a parent calls and complains about a principal, who is going through an evaluation process? What happens in that case?" The way Mr. Power described the situation:

> If a complaint comes into this office the parent is

> asked to put it in writing. They will either put it in writing or refuse. In any instance, I go and I will, out of courtesy to the principal and I expect them to treat teachers the same way, I'll say, "I had this complaint. Give me your side of it". Usually principal and the parent is called to the board office and we try to work it out.

In a case where a parent refuses to put the complaint in writing, the concern is related to the principal and his/her side of the story is heard. According to Mr. Power:

> Principal will generally say, yeah, that happened, and there's always a little twist the parent puts on it or a little twist that the principal would put on it. But the point is, the principal has gotten the message. Be careful, people are out there. They are observing what you're doing and so on, right.

The interview proceeded as follows:

S.M: Some administrators happen to think that more weight is given to the complaints of the parents than what they say; and one negative remark made by parents or teachers weighs heavily against them in evaluation.

Mr. Power: You should talk to some parents and see what they say. I think you'll get a totally different viewpoint.

After explaining the entire process once again of how complaints are generally handled, he stated:

> What principals have to realize is this, we're dealing with the public. The public are our customers. We're professional people. No matter how much a parent comes into my office and condemns me or criticizes me, I have to act in a professional fashion. You can't go shouting and bawling at parents. Parents have legitimate concerns. We have to be professional in the manner we deal with them. Nevertheless, he did acknowledge that there are

some parents who:

> no matter if God himself were here, he would never satisfy them. We have to live with that. We have to work with that and we have to do the best we can. You cannot in this day and age not have a good public relations program. You just can't.

In conclusion, the role of the school board as a mediator between its front-line administrators and its clients becomes evident in this section. The board seems to be in a critical position of balancing the interests of both the parties, and in so doing leaves one of the groups, the only one interviewed, with a feeling of vulnerability.

The next section will attempt to explore the views of the vice-principals with respect to the involvement of three more groups of people.

Involvement of Students, Peers, and Business People

On the issue of student involvement, three vice-principals responded positively. They thought that students should be involved in the evaluation process. One of them said that only High school students should be consulted. The other two felt that even younger kids can provide valuable information.

The only vice-principal who suggested that other administrators should be involved in the evaluation of their peers was Mr. Norman. He contended:

> My personal feeling is that the best person to do it are people that are very familiar with what goes on in a school setting who are in similar positions rather than people who are working out of the board office; many who whom have not been principals or vice-principals of High Schools.

Mr. Clarke differed from his group not only in his recommendation of a different team approach to evaluation, but also in his suggestion of involving people from the business community. He told the researcher that instead of an assistant superintendent collecting all the data from different sources, a team should be responsible for that. The team should involve someone from the superintendency, the elected School Board and the school Council. In his words:

> The team would identify specific groups of individuals or individuals that might become a part of the evaluation process in terms of gathering information.

He also indicated that in some cases the people from the business field should be consulted. The only other person of all the 36 people interviewed who was in agreement with Mr. Clarke was Mr. Myrick. Although Mr. Myrick's views differed considerably from Mr. Clarke's, both administrators agreed on one aspect, i.e. involvement of those people in evaluation with whom one has developed business partnerships. This was a significant departure from the usual trend set by the other people interviewed, some of whom were quite outspoken about keeping the business community out. Ms. Quinton, a teacher,

was quite adamant in her stand that no opportunity should be given to business people. Similarly, Ms. Daley thought that no input should be taken from business people. She voiced her feelings:

> A school is definitely a part of the community. I think there is no doubt about that. It needs to have links to the community, meaningful links that involve the community, but I don't think business community should be involved in evaluating the practices of the school.

Mr. Myrick's views stand in sharp contrast to Ms. Daley's. While talking about assessment teams, a pilot project of the provincial government, he observed:

> I think there should be people from business community. I think there should be parents involved. Now somebody else will come back to me and say we are talking about the day to day operations of your school and these publics can't possibly be involved in a day to day running of the school and I agree with that 100%. But I still think that parent, the business person, the teacher, the student all have very valuable information as to what is happening in school. I am not at all convinced that someone from the community should not have the opportunity to be a part of the assessment team which is coming to a school....Every teacher has been in school since s/he was 3 years old; someone who's been out working in business for 10-12 years will walk in this building and they will see completely different things than I will see. And I think its important that we understand what they see and understand what they expect.

As noted earlier, only Mr. Clarke and Mr. Myrick were willing to extend the opportunity to business people to participate, and in doing so blurred the boundary between

business and education, which other people were not willing to permeate.

The focus of the next section is on understanding the importance of organizational environment in performance appraisal.

Organizational Context

It was ascertained during the interviews that this group of administrators was insistent that the entire context should be taken into consideration while doing evaluation. The reasons given by them were quite similar. They claimed that factors in the environment can have a positive or negative effect on an individual's performance, therefore, these factors need to be recorded. It should be noted that the same recommendation was made by the committee which was formed last year to put in place provincial guidelines for teacher evaluation. This committee highlighted the need and importance of recording significant environmental influences and constraints on performance. According to Mr. White, a member of NLTA, same guidelines will be applicable to the evaluation of administrators as well. In his words:

> We do have the provincial guidelines that must be followed in terms of the evaluation of teachers that would include the evaluation of the administrators as well.

Ms. Stanley who also agreed with her colleagues that the

context in which the evaluatee works should be recorded, however, gave a different reason. She shed light on a different aspect of environment. It would be best to quote her exactly the way she narrated the entire incident. She shared her experience:

> Boards don't always handle things well. The principal whom we have at the moment was appointed to this school before I was because he chose me. He was appointed at this school at a time when the then principal retired, and the vice-principal was favoured by the staff. The staff very much wanted that person to go into that position. The board would not allow it. They caused grief to many people. It was just a horrible, very unprofessional situation...The board created a very bad situation. They entertained letters from parents, teachers and ah, it was very difficult to come into this school first and know they want somebody else and you're second choice. So, when I go back to thinking about evaluation, the important points about a principal that the situation into which he came, and the garbage, the emotional baggage and garbage that everybody was carrying around, I think directly affected what came out on the evaluation.

The principal in this situation received a very poor evaluation because of the personal biases of teachers. Looking at this situation, one wonders if the board learned anything from its past mistakes. More precisely, did the Lear case, document obtained from Department of Education, leave any lasting messages? The Lear case was somewhat similar to the one told by Ms. Stanley. Mr. Edward Lear was appointed to a tenured position as the principal of Morris Academy. Teachers and parents were not happy with the board's decision, and made

it clear to the staffing committee. On board's request, Mr. Lear agreed to be placed on probation for a period of one-year. Although the probationary period began in July, no formal evaluation was undertaken until late October. In April, the board decided to demote Mr. Lear to his former teaching position. The case was taken to arbitration, and the arbitration committee decided that Mr. Lear was improperly dismissed as the principal. In addition, the evaluation that was conducted was found to be wanting; objectives that were set were considered unrealistic; teachers' judgement of Mr. Lear was deemed to be coloured by his previous performance as a teacher. Still, it was considered inappropriate to reinstate Mr. Lear as a principal of Morris Academy because of parents and teachers' open antagonism and discontent. As a consequence, the school board had to pay appropriate compensation to Mr. Lear.

The case is similar to the one told by Ms. Stanley in one important respect, i.e. displeasure of the staff with the choice of the principal which directly affected the evaluation report. Ms. Stanley, therefore, asserted that the feelings and sentiments prevalent in any particular school setting need to be given due consideration in evaluation.

Evidently, the issue does not seem to be one of fair evaluation because even if the evaluator does take into consideration the obvious prejudices of teachers the question

is, can the principal under these circumstances perform effectively? No matter what mechanism is put into place to control biases, the question that still needs to be answered is: *Will that principal be able to provide adequate leadership to the staff when quite clearly the staff does not want to get led in the first place?* Further, if the principal is not able to provide the kind of leadership that is desirable, then certainly evaluation, fair or otherwise, will not go a long way towards calming the troubled waters.

In summary, the section highlighted the role of the contextual factors in performance appraisal, and how they affect the outcome.

The proceeding section deals with the issue of weighting.

Should feedback be weighted?

A clear difference in terms of gender was evident in the perception of female and male vice-principals. Male vice-principals were of the opinion that different weightings should be given to different sources of feedback. Female administrators, on the other hand, considered all sources of feedback equally important, and therefore, stated that no weighting be given.

Mr. Curtis's comments were representative of all the other male administrators. He remarked:

I think it has to be weighted in some ways. Certain

> people, certain parties only have a certain limited information or perspective from what they're evaluating.

Having asked the questior about weighting on numerous other occasions, the researcher was quite unprepared for the reaction it caused this time with Ms. Stanley. She said aloud: "Oh God, this sounds like..."

The researcher quickly added, "Or no weighting be given. Just look at the total picture." At first, Ms. Stanley was not sure what to say. Certainly, the question had thrown this subjectivist off-balance, and she needed a while to put her thoughts in some semblance of order. However, after a while she replied:

> I think that's just trying to quantitate; to put a quantitative perspective on something that's got too many variables, you know, and the human context and feelings and all of this type of thing. But I think teachers... would probably be your best source depending on what you're trying to evaluate. Now if you're trying to evaluate administrator-parent relationships, you're not gonna get it from teachers; you've got to go to the parents.

Ms. Phillips agreed with her colleague:

> Each one is going to be just as equally important. Like the parents are looking at probably what they see in a principal. It does not make it any less important than how the teachers see them in staff meetings and interacting with staff. I don't think one is more important than the other. They are equally important.

The next section examines the views of the vice-principals on the topic of evaluation tools.

Measuring Instruments

Divergent views were presented on the issue of evaluation tools. Some vice-principals preferred rating scales because "it's cut and dry and people don't have time." Others preferred open-ended questions. For instance, Mr. Curtis noted:

> I don't know how you can quantitate one's performance obviously it has to be a narrative evaluation.

Similarly, Ms. Stanley preferred open-ended questions. While talking about the questionnaire which the board uses for evaluating principals, she observed that when such a questionnaire is relied upon exclusively, a lot of things about an individual are left out. She stated:

> There are things left out. I don't know how this can be any better. Always, sometimes, seldom. It gives you some kind of idea but I like open-ended questions and I like examples.

Based on her experiences with evaluation, she made some suggestions for improving the evaluation system: "I think one thing they might do is put the word 'vice-principal' on the forms they send out." Secondly, she thought that "they could turn around and give the results very quickly so that you have immediate feedback instead of keeping them over a couple of months." Thirdly, she advised that "when they come to the school to explain evaluation to the teachers and how they're

to approach it" it should be taken into account that teachers sometimes are overworked. "They don't have time for anything and I think sometimes, to give them that little space of time, a half hour or an hour or whatever they need just to somehow give it to them without having them to take it out of their own personal time."

Ms. Stanley's point that assistant superintendents should give feedback quickly is certainly an important one. Bolton (1980) contends, "To be most useful feedback should be prompt" (p.92). He also argues that the accumulation of information over a long period of time is not as beneficial as providing it soon after events occur.

In conclusion, no consensus was evident on the topic of measuring instruments among this group of administrators.

Summary of the Section and Some Concluding Thoughts

The changing times with its emphasis on shared-governance and collaboration, pose new difficulties for performance appraisal. There has been a substantial increase in interest in teams and team performance in recent years. The adoption of a team based approach might have profound implications for performance appraisal such as, *who is to be appraised* and *on what basis*?

Evaluations by their very nature are individually oriented; when the performance of team becomes the focus of

attention, the issue of individual performance often becomes difficult to appraise. Moreover, advocates of team-work advise against performing individual performance evaluations in teams; they claim that individual evaluations undermines team's ability to function as a unit (Illgen, 1993). Most likely, the content of appraisals will have to shift from a focus on individual task accomplishment towards one that emphasizes an individual's contribution to the work, and an individual's fit to the work-team (Murphy & Cleveland, 1995).

Data collected as part of this study revealed that two vice-principals were in favour of conducting the evaluation of principals and vice-principals together. One of them wanted the performance of the team to be the unit of analysis, and the other preferred a combination of individual and team evaluations. It is important to note that a number of administrators in the survey conducted in the Vancouver School Board also expressed similar feelings. They stated that principals and vice-principals should be evaluated as an administrative team, rather than performing individual performance evaluations (Bognar, 1990).

Certainly, the changing environment places new demands that need to be met. It is vital that one should take into consideration the entire context, internal and external, during performance appraisal. It is of little surprise, therefore, that the vice-principals were singularly emphatic

that clear understanding of the environment and the job is essential for both performance assessment and performance improvement.

Apparently, this group of educators was more receptive to incorporating feedback from parents and students than teachers were. Nevertheless, like all the other groups, even they pointed out that one should be careful while seeking parental input as they often have personal vendettas.

A similarity that became apparent between the views of vice-principals and teachers during the analysis of the data was on the topic of formative evaluation. Vice-principals, just like teachers, regarded formative evaluation as informal everyday evaluation by parents, students, school board staff, community members, and others. It would be understandable if they viewed the process as *relatively informal* compared to summative evaluation; but they thought of it as informal evaluation that goes on without one's choice in the faculty room, in the cafeteria, in the supermarket, or any other place in the course of the day. The reason behind holding such a view was not entirely clear from the interview data; nonetheless, responses of the participants pointed towards two directions: (a) lack of in-service in the area of personnel evaluation, or (b) actual evaluation practices gave them this impression.

In a nutshell, all the vice-principals appeared to be

highly critical of the way evaluation is actually conducted. None of them looked at it in a positive light. Dickinson's (1993) views seem most appropriate to end this section:

> Of course, employees attach the same degree of importance to performance appraisal as they perceive being attached by their superiors. If performance appraisal has visible and continual support from all levels in the organization, employees should evaluate the appraisal positively (p. 153)

Summary of the Chapter

This chapter discussed the current evaluation practices for principals, and presented views of four different groups of educators relating to those practices. It served to highlight how different groups relate to this key figure, and in terms of that relation, what their expectations are from the performance appraisal process. It also illuminated the purpose and the role each individual group as well as all the groups in collective want the evaluation system to play in promoting individual and organizational growth.

In addition, the chapter emphasized the common assumptions held by people from different groups as well as the diversity in their views. At times, striking differences of opinions appeared within a particular group; at other times their unanimity was without question.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the purpose of the study and the methodology employed in the conduct of the study. Also presented is a summary of the major findings along with some conclusions, and recommendations for future directions.

Summary of the Study

Purpose

The present study was undertaken in an attempt to examine the evaluation practices utilized by the Avalon Consolidated School Board for assessing the performance of its school principals. The central purpose of this study was to probe the perceptions of selected groups of:

- superintendent and assistant superintendent, who are often responsible for conducting the evaluation;
- school principals, who get directly affected by the process;
- vice-principals, who work closely with their principals as administrative teams;
- teachers, who get influenced by the performance of their principals, and in turn affect the kind of learning that goes on in schools.

The experiences, suggestions, and criticisms made by the research participants became a major source of information,

and provided a better understanding of the impact of current evaluation practices. The study also served as a bridge between what is and what might be in order to point out the implications of what is known, and to provide guidelines for new initiatives and developments in the use of the principal evaluation system.

More specifically, this study attempted to explore:

- If the policy on evaluation was perceived to be necessary?
- Whether or not the policy was effective in terms of improving principals' performance?
- What had been the experiences of the principals with respect to the policy?
- Should an attempt be made to make the appraisal system more inclusive by incorporating data and feedback from other than traditional source(s)?
- What role, if any, "upward input" could play in employee development and employee evaluation?
- What weaknesses and/or strengths there are inherent in the evaluation system?
- How the system might be improved?
- How did the present policy fit with respect to the changing role of the principal?

Methodology

Eight teachers, seven vice-principals, eighteen principals, two school board employees, and one Newfoundland and Labrador Teachers' Association (NLTA) member in the St. John's and Mt. Pearl areas of the province were selected as the sample for this study. The administrators of nineteen of the twenty-two schools permitted their schools to take part in this study, and eighteen of these nineteen principals themselves participated in semi-structured interviews.

Based on the literature in the field of educational administration, related research and mapping, a set of interview questions was formed. This initial set of questions got refined and extended as the interview process proceeded. The initial data from interviews also directed the researcher to resource personnel outside the board, to follow-up calls, to other related documents, and additional searches of the literature.

In addition to semi-structured interviews, data for the study were obtained from the following sources:

- documentation from school boards, schools, principals, Department of Education, and Department of Environment and Labour;
- follow-up telephone calls to the principals and the teachers;
- researcher's daily notes.

The data collected from these sources were analyzed according to three categories which are as follows:

1. Why, what, how and by whom of evaluating principals.
2. How the perceptions about principal evaluation relates to actual practice.
3. New requirements, directions for the future.

These categories reflected major themes addressed in the literature, and are representative of issues most pertinent to the study. In order to preserve confidentiality, pseudonyms for all research subjects and schools were used.

Summary of the Major Findings and Conclusions

The major findings of the study along with the conclusions inferred from them are reported below:

1. The board's policy (1989) states:

> All professional personnel hired on a probationary contract will be evaluated as indicated by their contract. (p. A-13)

Although the policy does not clearly indicate as to what type of evaluation a school principal will go through, the annual report of 1994-95 does state that probationary personnel will undergo a summative evaluation.

The findings of this study showed the actual practice to be quite different from what is indicated in the board documents. Most of the school principals who were on probationary contract were not informed that they would be

evaluated. Some of these principals had come from a different school district where they had served as principal or vice-principal, and some had come to the principal's position from the same district. Ironically, most of them were neither evaluated in their previous positions nor they are being evaluated in their present ones.

To conclude, there seems to be a gap between actual and intended evaluation practices.

2. The current evaluation policy was adapted from the Conception Bay South Integrated School Board where the superintendent was working previously. The policy was adopted by this board in 1987, and has been reviewed every year since its adoption. It was evident from the conversations with the school principals that they did not like the way policy was reviewed at the time of its adoption. It was also ascertained that the very changes that were made in the policy were the ones this group of administrators would have preferred to keep.

The evaluation policy of the Conception Bay South integrated school board which was adopted on September 18, 1986 involves a component of peer consultation and review. The purpose of this module is to encourage professional growth through consultation and relational learning. Their policy states:

> The host administrator may request, from time to time, written feedback from other group members. This will be beneficial to the host. It should be pointed out that the group members are not to provide written or verbal reports of this process to an evaluator except where requested by the evaluatee. (p. 3)

In this way the host administrator is given the opportunity to work with two other administrators to discuss, analyze and review procedures that are in place in the evaluatee's school. The principals in the Avalon Consolidated School Board told the researcher repeatedly that they would welcome peer consultation and evaluation. In fact they pointed out many advantages of peer evaluation and consultation, and many disadvantages of depending solely on the assistant superintendent for the purpose of feedback and evaluation. One of the disadvantages cited by them was that often assistant superintendents do not have the "necessary background" which is essential for evaluating a principal properly. By "necessary background" they meant:

- administrative experience;
- experience of working at the same school level in which the principal, who is being evaluated, is operating. For example, elementary school background for evaluating elementary school principals.

In conclusion, the evaluation policy review process did not give adequate opportunity to the principals to express their opinions openly and clearly. Emphasis was apparently on

getting the work done rather than getting it done appropriately. Furthermore, it seems critical that assistant superintendents should have intimate knowledge of the nature of the work and the level at which the principal is performing.

3. The analysis of the responses of the school principals, vice-principals and teachers showed that they wanted all three groups to be involved in the development of the evaluation policies for administrators and teachers. They were of the opinion that the very nature of their role does not permit the isolation of one group from the other. Input from other groups could help in bringing forth those perspectives and ideas which only that group may have because of its very position in the organization.

Based on the interview data, it is concluded that principal evaluation policy should aim to obtain diversity of opinion from interested stakeholders, as it would give a much richer data base. The end result would be a policy that is meaningful for all those involved.

4. With reference to the evaluation process, the following characteristics stood out:

- absence of pre and post evaluation conferences is not uncommon;

- often the process does not get completed;
- there is no follow-up even in case of any deficiencies in performance. No time-frame for resolution, plan for improvement, or further evaluation is conducted.

In conclusion, lack of consistency and adherence to proper procedure is usual.

5. It was ascertained from the data gathered in this study that the school board staff had one set of expectations and the principals another. School principals were of the opinion that someone from the school board should explain and introduce all the necessary policies, rules and regulations to them. The board, on the other hand, had the expectation that since every school has a policy manual, the staff should make themselves familiar with its contents. These contradictory set of expectations had led to the state where majority of the research participants were not aware of the board's policy; some of them did not even know if the board had any evaluation system for school principals, including principals themselves. Interestingly, some of the administrators asked the researcher if the board had a formal evaluation system; others told her that probably she would know more about it then they would.

The prevailing condition led to the conclusion that there is a communication breakdown between the school board and the staff as far as principal evaluation is concerned.

6. A majority of the people interviewed observed that the five year time period stipulated in the policy for summative evaluation is fine. Some even suggested that principals should be moved after every five years. When this group of principals was asked if formative evaluation should be ongoing, most of them remarked that they would not like to have that kind of pressure all the time. The general feeling prevalent among principals was that formative evaluation is the first stage which eventually leads to summative. They were very critical of the way evaluation is presently conducted, and stated that there is no way it could have a beneficial or detrimental effect. Consequently, they stated that they would like to have ongoing communication, feedback, support and fostering of development.

It was gleaned from the responses of the participants that no clear distinction was made between the formative and summative evaluations. Evaluation, irrespective of the type, was not looked at as a positive and healthy process. People were very cynical of the whole evaluation system. In fact, the situation has worsened to such an extent that they were trying to avoid the use of the term "evaluation" altogether.

7. Teachers and vice-principals regarded any formal process of evaluation as summative, and informal everyday evaluation as formative.

Evidently, these two groups of educators were not clear about the two forms of evaluation. Two reasons might be the cause:

1. current process of evaluation might have given them this impression;
2. lack of in-service.

8. Most of the principals reported that they would like to incorporate feedback from multiple sources into the appraisal process. They thought it would be helpful, especially for professional growth and development. However, they cautioned that the evaluation process should be designed carefully so that the personal motives and biases should not sway the results in one direction or the other.

Teachers, on the other hand, did not think that parents should be involved. The reasons given by them for not involving parents were: (a) parents do not have knowledge of the education system, and (b) tney often have their own personal agendas.

On the issue of their own involvement they were singularly emphatic that they should be consulted. The reasons given this time were: (a) they work with principals very closely, therefore, they would be able to provide some valuable information, and (b) principals are involved in their evaluation so they should be involved in theirs.

The vice-principals were more receptive to involving parents and students than teachers were. Nevertheless, even this group pointed out that one should be careful while seeking parental input because parents often have personal vendettas.

It must be noted that the board does encourage the principals to do a survey of teachers and students; their involvement is optional; it is left up to the evaluator and the evaluatee to make such a decision collaboratively. As far as the involvement of parents is concerned, no attempt is yet made to incorporate their input into the appraisal process.

Based on the responses of the research participants, it is concluded that the principals are willing and ready for more inclusive performance appraisal provided that the evaluation package is carefully designed.

9. An examination of the responses of all the research participants showed that, with one or two exceptions, all of them agreed that different groups should evaluate on different sets of criteria, with a few questions that may overlap.

The issue that led to the sharp division of opinion was whether feedback should be weighted or not. Some said that no weights should be placed; others asserted that each source of feedback be given different weights depending on how close the relationship that group has with the principal. Although the

same group members agreed that feedback should be weighted, they differed in the way they placed the values. Some said that feedback from teachers should be given more weight than feedback from assistant superintendent; others were of the view that both should be given equal weighting. Nevertheless, a majority of them agreed that principals should be told how each group evaluated them, otherwise it would lose its benefit.

It is concluded that evaluation instruments should be designed taking into account the nature of the relationship each group has with the principal, and the access each group has to the information concerning the school and the principal. It is also concluded that the principals would be able to understand the issue much better and address the problem appropriately if they are told how each group felt.

10. None of the elementary school principals interviewed were opposed to being evaluated as teachers. They observed if it is part of the principal's job, then it should be taken into consideration during formal evaluation. However, the major source of concern among these principals was that they often neglect their teaching responsibilities because of their administrative ones. As a result, they held the opinion that principals should not teach at all.

Similarly, teachers were uncertain if principals should

teach or not. The reasons cited by them were very similar to the ones given by principals. Still, they contended if it is a teaching principal then part of their evaluation should be in classroom.

In conclusion, interviewees agreed that a broadened work load does not allow principals to do justice to their teaching duties. This, however, does not eliminate the need for evaluating their teaching; instead it heightens it.

11. In the interviews, administrators reiterated that the dramatic increase in the workload of front-line administrators has reduced the amount of time they have available to undertake leadership role(s). Principals observed that they are spending more and more time performing simple managerial duties. The irony of the situation is that at a time when strong emphasis is placed on the leadership role of school principals, this group of administrators saw themselves as becoming educational managers than leaders. As a consequence, they asserted that there should be an increase in all types of support staff. Perceived needs for additional staff were greatest in large schools. Administrators asserted that increased expectations and changing demands on the schools are not matched by increased levels of support staff.

To conclude, there is a need for adequate administrative and other support services at the school level in light of the

changing role of the front-line administrators, and emerging expectations and needs of the publics served by the schools.

Recommendations

The recommendations outlined below are made with the findings and conclusions in mind.

1. It is strongly encouraged that all the stake holders, especially teachers, vice-principals, principals, and school board staff should be involved in the development of the evaluation policy for school administrators. Participation should not be restricted to any one group of individuals.

2. It is suggested that pre-evaluation conferences should be used by the evaluator and the evaluatee as an opportunity to discuss and familiarize each other with the operations of the school, the board's evaluation policy, the job requirements, any duties or responsibilities unique to that particular school, or any other important aspect that needs to be clarified. This will enable the evaluator to read the evaluation results in proper context. It will also help the evaluatee to understand the expectations of the board clearly.

3. It is requested that the opportunity should be extended to the principals to obtain input from a variety of sources, especially for development purposes. The evaluations by

different groups should be restricted to those aspects of the principals' responsibilities that directly affect them, and for which they have direct evidence or experiences.

4. It is recommended that the school board set up an appropriate committee to explore ways and means for peer evaluation and peer network.

5. It is recommended that in the case of teaching principals, their teaching as well as their administrative responsibilities should be assessed; the amount of time spent in the two areas should also be taken into consideration when completing the evaluation.

6. It is suggested that adequate consultation and analysis should take place prior to key decisions being made. The urgent need for improved communication within the system is brought to the attention of the school board, with more meaningful exchange of ideas among the stake-holders.

7. Owing to the overwhelming concern regarding inadequate administrative and other support services, which becomes pronounced in larger schools, it is requested that the board review the adequacy of existing administrative and other support services available to individual schools.

8. It is recommended that the school board monitor the evaluation of administrators with particular reference to:

- consistency and feedback;
- evaluation report indicating areas of strength and/or weaknesses;
- a plan for improvement in case of deficient performance and further evaluation.

9. It is requested that every attempt be made to ensure that assistant superintendents have similar backgrounds and working experiences as that of the principals who are being evaluated.

Suggestions for Further Research

Some possible areas for further research are suggested by the findings of this study.

1. Future studies in this area should include parents and students in the sample.

2. A study comparing the level of productivity of teaching principals with non-teaching ones should be made.

3. Another researchable issue relates to whether school principals and vice-principals should be evaluated together as an administrative team, with special attention to the advantages and/or disadvantages associated with such a move.

4. Future work should focus on the changing role of the principals as a result of the added responsibilities, obligations and implications emerging from the new school act.

References

Abrahanson, B. (1994). *Supervision/Evaluation of Administrators and of their Responsibilities (SOAR)*. A paper presented at the National Evaluation Institute.

Allen, D. W. (1992). *Schools for a New Century: A conservative Approach to Radical School Reform*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Allexander, G. C., & Keeler, C. M. (1995). *Total Quality Management: The Emperor's Tailor*. Boise, Idaho: University of Idaho, Department of Educational Administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED387922).

Allison, D. J. (1984). The Principal: Prince, Pawn, or Prima Dona? *The Canadian School Executive*, 4(2), 11-13.

Andrews, R. L. Basom, M. R., & Basom, M. (1991). Instructional Leadership: Supervision That Makes a Difference. *Theory Into Practice*, 30(2), 97-101.

Avalon Consolidated School Board (1995). *Annual Report of the Avalon Consolidated School Board 1994-95*. St. John's, NF: The Board.

Avalon Consolidated School Board (1991). *Administrator Evaluation*. (Available from P.O. Box 1980, St. John's, NF A1C 5R5)

Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the Principalship: Metaphorical Themes, 1920s-1990s*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bernardin, H. J., Dahmus, S. A., & Redmon, G. (1993). Attitudes of First-Line Supervisors toward Subordinate Appraisals. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2 & 3), 315-324.

Berry, B., & Ginsberg, R. (1989). Legitimizing subjectivity: Meritorious Performance and the professionalization of teacher and principal evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* (2), 123-140.

Boyan, N. J. (1969). The emergent role of the teacher in the authority structure of the school. In F. D. Carver & T. J. Sergiovanni (Eds.), *Organizations and human behaviour: Focus on schools* (pp.200-211). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Boyer, R. (1991). Open letter to all principals-Is your assistant principal an 'allegator slayer' or a 'swamp drainer'? *NASSP AP Special Newsletter*, 7(1), 1,7.

Buckner, K., & Jones, L. (1990). In search of strong administrators - A worthy investment. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74(529), 20-25.

Callahan, R. H. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Callahan, R. E., & Button, H. W. (1964). Historical change of the role of the man in the organization:1865-1950. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.), *Behavioral science and educational administration: The sixty-third yearbook of the national society for the study of education, Part II*. (pp.73-92). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Benion, J. W. (1987). *A History Of Thought And Practice In Educational Administration*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Canada. Prosperity Secretariat. (1991). *Learning Well, Living Well*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and services Canada.

Caputo, E. (1991). School-Based Management: What Is It, Why Do It, Who Benefits? *Thresholds in Education*, 17(4), 2-4.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1977). Relation of school factors to achievement. In D. Erickson (Ed.), *Educational Organization and administration* (pp.131-149). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Press.

Coleman, P. & LaRocque, L. (1990). *Struggling to be 'Good Enough': Administrative Practices and School District Ethos*. London: The Falmer Press.

Conception Bay South Integrated South School Board (1986). *A Plan for Professional Growth and Evaluation. Part 2: The School Administrator.* (Available from P.O. Box 220, Manuels, Conception Bay, NF A0A 2Y0.)

Coppedge, F. L. (1993). Excellence in Education: Meeting the Challenge with Effective Practices. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(554), 34-40.

Cousins, J. B. (1990). Why don't principals use their own performance appraisal data? *The Canadian School Executive*, 9(10), 22-26.

Cunningham, W. G., & Gresso, D. W. (1993). *Cultural Leadership: The Culture of Excellence in Education*. Allyn and Bacon.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1995). *Supervision as a proactive process: Concepts and Cases. (2nd ed.)*. Prospects Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Dawe, R. A. (1983). *A Study of Evaluation Systems for School Principals in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Canada.

Department of Education (1996). *Proposed Bill: An Act to Revise The Law Respecting The Operation of Schools In The Province*. (Available from P. O. Box 8700, St. John's, NF A1B 4J6.)

Department of Education & science. (1967). *Children and their primary schools: A report of the central advisory council for education*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Department of Education & Science. (1991). *School Teacher Appraisal*. London: Elizabeth House.

Department of the Environment & Labour (1986). *Findings and Decision in a Dispute Between Her Majesty The Queen In The Right Of Newfoundland The Newfoundland And Labrador School Trustees' Association Of Newfoundland*: Avalon Consolidated School Board. (Available from P.O. 8700, St. John's, NF A1B 4J6)

Depree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an Art*. New York: Dell Publishing.

Dickinson, T. L. (1993). Attitudes About Performance Appraisal. In H. Schuler, J. L. Farr, & M. Smith (Eds.), *Personnel Selection And Assessment: Individual and Organizational Perspectives*. (pp.141-161). Hillsdale, N. J:

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Donmoyer, R., & Wagstaff, J. G. (1990). Principals Can Be Effective Managers and Instructional Leaders. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74(525), 20-29.

Douglass, H. R. (1963). *Modern Administration of secondary schools: Organization and administration of junior and senior high schools*. New York: Blaisdell.

Duke, D. L., & Stiggins, R. J. (1985). Evaluating the performance of principals: A descriptive study. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21, 71-98.

Dunlap, D., & Goldman, P. (1991). Rethinking power in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27(1), 5-29.

Dunnette, M. D. (1993). My Hammer or Your Hammer? *Human Resource Management*, 32(2 & 3), 373-384.

Eaton, W. (1986). From ideology to conventional wisdom: School Administration texts 1915-1933. In T. E. Glass (Ed.), *An analysis of texts on school administration 1820-1985: The reciprocal relationship between the literature and the profession* (pp. 23-39). Danville, IL: Interstate.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-27.

Erickson, J. W. (1988). Make principal evaluation more than a popularity contest. *The Executive Educator*, 10(2), 18-19.

Ernest, B. (1985). Can You Eat? Can You Sleep? Can You Laugh? The Why and How of Evaluating Principals. *The Clearing House*, 58(7), 290-292.

Farr, J. L. (1993). Informal Performance Feedback: Seeking and Giving. In H. Schuler, J. L. Farr, & M. Smith (Eds.), *Personnel Selection And Assessment: Individual and Organizational Perspectives*. (pp.163-180). Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Firestone, W. A., & Wilson, B. L. (1985). Using Bureaucratic and Cultural linkages to improve instruction: the principal's contribution. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(2), 7-25.

Fontanna, J. (1994). Principal Assessment: A Staff Developer's Idea for a Complete Overhaul. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78(565), 91-99.

Furtwengler, C. B. (1995). State Actions for Personnel Evaluation: Analysis of Reform Policies, 1983-1992. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 3(4).

Giles, T. E., & Proudfoot, A. J. (1994). *Educational Administration in Canada* (5th ed.). Calgary, AB: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Ginsberg, R., & Berry, B. (1990). The Folklore of Principal Evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 3(3), 205-230.

Ginsberg, R., & Thompson, T. (1992). Dilemmas and Solutions Regarding Principal Evaluation. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 58-74.

Glassman, N. S., & Heck, R. H. (1987). Administrator engagement in evaluation for decision making: The case of teacher assignment to classroom. *Administrator's Notebook*, 32(5), 1-4.

Glassman, N.S., & Heck, R. H. (1992). The Changing Leadership Role of the Principal: Implications for Principal Assessment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 5-24.

Goldman, P. Dunlap, D., & Conley, D. (1993). Facilitative power and non-standardized solutions to school site restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(1), 69-92.

Hagstrom, D. (1992). Alaska's Discovery School. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 23-26.

Hallinger, P. (1992). The Evolving Role of American Principals: From Managerial To Instructional to Transformational Leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(3), 35-48.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp.179-203). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hanson, C. (1989). How principals can develop the school's culture. *The Canadian School Executive*, 9(5), 33-36.

Hart, A. W. (1992, April). *The Social and Organizational Influence of Principals: Evaluating Principals on organizational criteria*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, San Francisco.

Hassenpflug, A. (1991). Commentary: What is the role of the assistant principal? *NASSP AP Special Newsletter*, 7(1), 1,7.

Hazucha, J. F., Hezlett, S. A., & Schneider, R. J. (1993). The Impact of 360-Degree Feedback on Management Skills and Development. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2 & 3), 325-351.

Heck, R. H., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional Leadership and School Achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(2), 94-125

Heck, R. H., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1992). Principal Assessment: Conceptual Problem, Methodological Problem, or Both? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 124-144.

Hitt, W. D. (1973). *Education as a human enterprise*. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones.

Hutto, J. R., & Criss, G. D. (1993). Principal, Finesse Your Way to Instructional Leadership. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553), 8-11.

Immegart, G. L. (1971). Suggestions for leadership research: Toward a strategy for the study of leadership in education. In L. Cunningham & W. J. Gephardt (Eds.), *Leadership: The art and the science today* (pp. 219-251). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock

Jacques, E. (1977). *A General Theory of Bureaucracy*. New York: Halstead Press.

Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Kelly, G. (1987). The assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71 (501), 13-20.

Koru, J. M. (1993). The assistant principal: Crisis Manager, Custodian, or Visionary? *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(556), 67-71.

Kroeze, D. J. (1984). Effective principals as Instructional leaders: New directions for research. *Administrator's Notebook*, 30(9), 1-4.

Lambert, L. G. (1988). Building school culture: an open letter to principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72 (506), 54-62.

Langlois, D. E., & McAdams, R. P. (1992). *Performance appraisal of school management: Evaluating the administrative team*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company.

LeBlanc, R. D. (1994). Accountability: hindsight and Foresight. *The Canadian School Executive*, 13(7), 21-24.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research (2nd ed.)*. New York: Academic Press.

Lee, G. V. (1987). Instructional Leadership in junior high school: Managing Realities and creating opportunities. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, issues, & Controversies* (pp. 77-99). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Leithwood, K. A. (1992). The Move Toward Transformational Leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 24(5), 28-31.

Leithwood, K. A., Begley, P., & Cousens, B. (1990). The nature, causes, and consequences of principals' practices: An agenda for future research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28(4), 5-31.

Leithwood, K. A., Begley, P., & Cousens, B. (1992). *Developing expert leadership for future schools*. Bristol, PA: Falmer

Little, J. W., & Bird, T. (1987). Instructional Leadership "close to the classroom" in secondary schools. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp.118-138). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

London, M., & Beatty, R. W. (1993). 360-Degree Feedback as a Competitive Advantage. *Human Resource Management*, 32(2 & 3), 353-372.

London, M., & Smither, J. W. (1995). Can Multi-source Feedback Change Perceptions of Goal Accomplishment, Self-evaluations, and Performance-related Outcomes? Theory-based Applications and Directions for Research. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 803-839.

MacDonald, J. (1984). Too Little Evaluation of Principals. *The Canadian School Executives*, *4*(2), 23-24.

Manatt, R. P. (1989). Principal Evaluation is largely wrongheaded and ineffective. *The Executive Educator*, 11(11), 22-23.

Marshall, C. (1992). *The assistant principal: Leadership choices and challenges* (1st ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Marshall, C. (1992). School Administrators' Values: a focus on Atypicals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 368-386.

Marshall, C., & Mitchell, B. (1991). The assumptive worlds of fledgling administrators. *Education and Urban Society*, 23(4), 396-415.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding Performance Appraisal: Social, Organizational, and Goal-Based Perspectives*. London: Sage Publications.

Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (1994). *Reshaping the Principalship: Insights From Transformational Reform Efforts*. California: Corwin Press.

Nalbandian, J. (1981). Performance Appraisal: If only People Were Not Involved. *Public Administration Review*, 392-396.

National Governors' Association. (1986). *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education*. Washington, D.C.

Newfoundland. Division of Curriculum. (1984). *Aims of Public Education for Newfoundland*. St. John's: The Department of Education.

Newfoundland. Royal Commission of Inquiry (1992). *Our Children Our Future*. St. John's: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Newfoundland Teachers' Association (1991). *Building a Vision for the future: A submission to the Royal*

Commission on Education. St. John's, NF: The Association.

Newfoundland Teachers' Association (1995). *Provincial Collective Agreement*. St. John's, NF: Dicks and Company.

New York. Office of Education Review. (1974). *School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of two inner-city schools*. New York: Author.

Noar, G. (1961). *The junior high school: Today and Tomorrow*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Nygaard, D. D. (1974). *Evaluating Administrative Performance*. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service.

Ondrack, D. A., & Oliver, C. (1986). *A review and analysis of performance appraisal processes: a review of the literature*. Toronto: Queen's Printer.

Orlosky, D. E., McCleary, L. E., Shapiro, A., & Webb, L. D. (1984). *Educational Administration Today*. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.

Pekoe, Jr., L. C. (1991). Expert Evaluation. *The Executive Educator*, 13(10), 39-40.

Peterson, K. D. (1988). Mechanisms of Culture Building and Principals' Work. *Education and Urban Society*, 20(3), 250-261.

Peterson, K. D., & Finn, C. E. (1985). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. *The Public Interest*, 79(1), 42-64.

Pounder, D. G. (1987). The challenge for school leaders: Attracting and retaining good teachers. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues, & Controversies* (pp. 77-99). Newton, MA: Alyn & Bacon.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427-449.

Rammer, R. A. (1991). How the literature on Administrator Evaluation relates to Actual practice. *NASSP Bulletin*, 75(539), 72-78

Rodrick, L. (1986). Working with assistant principals to achieve maximum value. *NASSP Bulletin*, 70(487), 91-93.

Rothe, J. P. (1993). *Qualitative Research: A practical guide*. Heidelberg: RCI/PDE Publications

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary principal: school leadership for the next century. *Education and Urban Society*, 20(3), 240-249.

Sclan, E. M. (1994, July). *Performance Evaluation for Experienced Teachers: An Overview of State Policies*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Evaluation Institute.

Schlechty, P. (1990). *Schools for the 21st century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). The roots of School Leadership. *Principal*, 74(2), 6-9.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1993). Frames of Leadership. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 2(1), 19-26.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective. (3rd ed.)*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Carver, F. D. (1973). *The new school executive: A theory of administration*. New York: Dodd, Mead.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1971). *Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional Leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Snyder, J., & Ebmeier, H. (1992). Empirical Linkages Among Principal Behaviours and Intermediate Outcomes: Implications for principal education. *Peabody Journal of*

Education, 68(1), 75-107.

Stewart, D., & Mickunas, A. (1974). *Exploring Phenomenology: A guide to the field and its Literature*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Stogdill, R. M. (1971). The trait approach to the study of educational leadership. In L. Cunningham & W. J. Gephardt (Eds.), *Leadership: The art and the science today* (pp. 83-107). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Stufflebeam, D., & Nevo, D. (1993). Principal Evaluation: New Directions For Improvement. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(2), 24-46.

Tornow, W. W. (1993). Perceptions or Reality: Is Multi-Perspective Measurement a Means or an End? *Human Resource Management*, 32(2 & 3), 221-229

Tyack, D. B., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980*. New York: Basic Books.

United States Department of Education. (1983). *A Nation At Risk: Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office.

Wadelieus, V. (1979). Evaluation of principals leaves much to be desired. *The Manitoba Teacher*, 57(6).

Weber, G. (1971). *Inner City Children Can be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools*. Washington: Council for Basic Education.

Wellisch, J. B., MacQueen, A. H., Carriere, R. A., & Duck, G. A. (1978). School Management and Organization in Successful Schools. *Sociology of Education*, 5193), 211-226.

Wimpelberg, R. (1990). The inservice development of principals: A new movement, its characteristics, and future. In P. Thurston & L. Lotto (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration (Vol. 1)*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Appendix A

Personal Letters to the
school board staff,
principals,
vice-principals,
and teachers

LETTER TO THE TEACHER

Dear_____:

My name is Shabana Muhajir and I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. As part of my thesis research I plan to investigate the current principal evaluation practices and perceptions by a group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers toward those practices.

To assist me with this study, I am requesting your consent to participate in an interview. The interview questions will deal with the current evaluation practices such as steps involved in the development of the evaluation system; purpose, criteria and process employed; weaknesses and/or strengths inherent in the current evaluation practices; and any suggestions for future development in this area. The interview should take approximately 45-60 minutes which would be taped and you will be given the opportunity to verify the final transcription. Upon completion of the study these tapes will be destroyed. The results of my research will be made available to you upon request.

The information collected in this study is confidential and at no time will any individual or school be identified. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time and are free to refuse answering any questions which you would prefer not to. This study has received the approval of the Faculty of Education's Ethics Committee. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 579-4719. If at any time you wish to speak with a resource person not associated with the study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education at 737-8693 or contact my thesis supervisor Dr. Clar Doyle at 737-7602.

If you are in agreement with participating in this study, please sign below and return one copy to me in the return envelope provided.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Yours sincerely,

Shabana Muhajir

CONSENT FORM

I,_____, hereby agree to participate in the study about the practices and perceptions toward principal evaluation system. I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw permission at any time. All information is strictly confidential and no individual will be identified.

_____ _____

Date **Signature**

LETTER TO THE VICE-PRINCIPALS

Dear _____:

My name is Shabana Muhajir and I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. As part of my thesis research I plan to investigate the current principal evaluation practices and perceptions by a group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers toward those practices.

To assist me with this study, I am requesting your consent to participate in an interview. The interview questions will deal with the current evaluation practices such as steps involved in the development of the evaluation system; purpose, criteria and process employed; weaknesses and/or strengths inherent in the current evaluation practices; and any suggestions for future development in this area. The interview should take approximately 45-60 minutes which would be taped and you will be given the opportunity to verify the final transcription. Upon completion of the study these tapes will be destroyed. The results of my research will be made available to you upon request.

The information collected in this study is confidential and at no time will any individual or school be identified. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time and are free to refuse answering any questions which you would prefer not to. This study has received the approval of the Faculty of Education's Ethics Committee. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 579-4719. If at any time you wish to speak with a resource person not associated with the study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education at 737-8693 or contact my thesis supervisor Dr. Clar Doyle at 737-7602.

If you are in agreement with participating in this study, please sign below and return one copy to me in the return envelope provided.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Yours sincerely,

Shabana Muhajir

CONSENT FORM

I, _____, hereby agree to participate in the study about the practices and perceptions toward principal evaluation system. I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw permission at any time. All information is strictly confidential and no individual will be identified.

_____ _____

Date **Signature**

LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL

Dear_____ :

My name is Shabana Muhajir and I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. As part of my thesis research I plan to investigate the current principal evaluation practices and perceptions by a group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers toward those practices.

To assist me with this study, I am requesting your consent to participate in an interview. The interview questions will deal with the current evaluation practices such as steps involved in the development of the evaluation system; purpose, criteria and process employed; weaknesses and/or strengths inherent in the current evaluation practices; and any suggestions for future development in this area. The interview should take approximately 45-60 minutes which would be taped and you will be given the opportunity to verify the final transcription. Upon completion of the study these tapes will be destroyed. The results of my research will be made available to you upon request.

The information collected in this study is confidential and at no time will any individual or school be identified. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time and are free to refuse answering any questions which you would prefer not to. This study has received the approval of the Faculty of Education's Ethics Committee and the Avalon Consolidated School Board. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 579-4719. If at any time you wish to speak with a resource person not associated with the study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education at 737-8693 or contact my thesis supervisor Dr. Clar Doyle at 737-7602.

If you are in agreement with participating in this study, please sign below and return one copy to me in the return envelope provided.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Yours sincerely,

Shabana Muhajir

CONSENT FORM

I,_____, hereby agree to participate in the study about the practices and perceptions toward principal evaluation system. I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw permission at any time. All information is strictly confidential and no individual will be identified.

_____ _____

Date **Signature**

LETTER TO THE PRINCIPALS

Dear _____:

My name is Shabana Muhajir and I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. As part of my thesis research I plan to investigate the current principal evaluation practices and perceptions by a group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers toward those practices.

I am requesting your permission to interview assistant principal, and some teachers in your school. Interviews will be conducted with these individuals which should take approximately 45-60 minutes. The interviews will be taped and upon completion of the study these tapes will be destroyed. The results of my research will be made available both to you and participants upon request.

The information collected in this study is confidential and at no time the name of the school or individuals will be identified in the writing up of the study. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw your school at any time. This study has received the approval of the Faculty of Education's Ethics Committee. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 579-4719. If at any time you wish to speak with a resource person not associated with the study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education at 737-8693 or contact my thesis supervisor Dr. Clar Doyle at 737-7602.

If you are in agreement with having your school participate in this study, please sign below and return one copy to me in the return envelope provided.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Yours sincerely,

Shabana Muhajir

CONSENT FORM

I, _____, hereby give permission to Shabana Muhajir to conduct the study about practices and perceptions toward principal evaluation practices involving assistant principals, and teachers in Bishop Abraham Elementary School. I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw permission at any time. All information is strictly confidential and the name of the school will not be identified.

_____ _____

Date **Signature**

LETTER TO THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS

Dear_ _____:

My name is Shabana Muhajir and I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. As part of my thesis research I plan to investigate the current principal evaluation practices and perceptions by a group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers toward those practices.

To assist me with this study, I am requesting your consent to participate in an interview. The interview questions will deal with the current evaluation practices such as steps involved in the development of the evaluation system; purpose, criteria and process employed; weaknesses and/or strengths inherent in the current evaluation practices; and any suggestions for future development in this area. The interview should take approximately 45-60 minutes which would be taped and you will be given the opportunity to verify the final transcription. Upon completion of the study these tapes will be destroyed.

I would like to inform you that I am requesting a copy of the board's formal evaluation policy as well s any evaluation report that can be disclosed. I would also request the documentation from individual schools regarding the description of their school settings. The information collected in this study is confidential and at no time will any individuals or school be identified. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time and are free to refuse answering any questions which you would prefer not to. This study has received the approval of the Faculty of Education's Ethics Committee. The results of my research will be made available to you upon request.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 579-4719. If at any time you wish to speak with a resource person not associated with the study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education at 737-8693 or contact my thesis supervisor Dr. Clar Doyle at 737-7602.

If you are in a[illegible] with participating in this study, please sign bel[illegible] eturn one copy to me in the return envelope provi[illegible]

Thank you fo[illegible] consideration of this request.

Yo[illegible] sincerely,
S[illegible] Muhajir

CONSENT FORM

I,_____, hereby agree to participate in the study about the practices and perceptions toward principal evaluation system. I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw permission at any time. All information is strictly confidential and no individual will be identified.

_____ Date

_____ Signature

LETTER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT

Dear_____:

My name is Shabana Muhajir and I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. As part of my thesis research I plan to investigate the current principal evaluation practices and perceptions by a group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers toward those practices.

To assist me with this study, I am requesting your consent to participate in an interview. The interview questions will deal with the current evaluation practices such as steps involved in the development of the evaluation system; purpose, criteria and process employed; weaknesses and/or strengths inherent in the current evaluation practices; and any suggestions for future development in this area. The interview should take approximately 45-60 minutes which would be taped and you will be given the opportunity to verify the final transcription. Upon completion of the study these tapes will be destroyed. The results of my research will be made available to you upon request.

The information collected in this study is confidential and at no time will any individual or school be identified. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time and are free to refuse answering any questions which you would prefer not to. This study has received the approval of the Faculty of Education's Ethics Committee. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 579-4719. If at any time you wish to speak with a resource person not associated with the study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education at 737-8693 or contact my thesis supervisor Dr. Clar Doyle at 737-7602.

If you are in agreement with participating in this study, please sign below and return one copy to me in the return envelope provided.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Yours sincerely,

Shabana Muhajir

CONSENT FORM

I,_____, hereby agree to participate in the study about the practices and perceptions toward principal evaluation system. I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw permission at any time. All information is strictly confidential and no individual will be identified.

_____ _____

Date **Signature**

LETTER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT

Dear _____:

My name is Shabana Muhajir and I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. As part of my thesis research I plan to investigate the current principal evaluation practices and perceptions by a group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers toward those practices.

I am requesting your permission to conduct the study in your school board; this will involve interviewing superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers. Interviews should take approximately 45-60 minutes and will be taped. Upon completion of the study these tapes will be destroyed. The results of my research will be made available both to you and the participants upon request.

The information collected in this study is confidential and at no time will any individual or school be identified. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw your schools at any time. This study has received the approval of the Faculty of Education's Ethics Committee. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 579-4719. If at any time you wish to speak with a resource person not associated with the study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education at 737-8693 or contact my thesis supervisor Dr. Clar Doyle at 737-7602.

If you are in agreement with having the individuals in your school board participate in this study, please sign below and return one copy to me in the return envelope provided.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Yours sincerely,

Shabana Muhajir

CONSENT FORM

I, _____, hereby give permission to Shabana Muhajir to conduct the study about practices and perceptions toward principal evaluation practices in Avalon Consolidated School Board involving superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers. I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw permission at any time. All information is strictly confidential and no individual or school will be identified.

_____ _____

Date **Signature**

LETTER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT

100 Prowse Avenue
St. John's, Nfld.
A1C 2M7

Dear _____:

My name is Shabana Muhajir and I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. As part of my thesis research I plan to investigate the current principal evaluation practices and perceptions by a group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and teachers toward those practices.

The purpose of this letter is to request a copy of your Board's formal evaluation policy for principals together with any evaluation reports that you may wish to disclose for my research regarding the performance of principals within your district. I would also like to know the instruments used in the evaluation and whether or not the evaluation practices and policy differ from school to school. Any other related information concerning principal evaluation that may be helpful to the study, would be greatly appreciated.

I would like to state that all information is strictly confidential and will be used for the purpose of my research. No attempt will be made to identify schools or principals; only aggregate results will be reported at the end of the study.
This study has received the approval of the Faculty of Education's Ethics Committee. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 579-4719. If at any time you wish to speak with a resource person not associated with the study, please contact Dr. Stephen Norris, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education at 737-8693 or contact my thesis supervisor Dr. Clar Doyle at 737-7602.

I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter, and I look forward to a reply at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Shabana Muhajir

Appendix B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

School principals

- What is the enrolment of your school?
- What are the grades in your school?
- When were you evaluated and by whom?
- How were you evaluated? (Questionnaires, teachers, assistant principal etc.)
- Prior to being evaluated were you informed of the purpose, criteria, instruments, and process that would be used?
- Was there a pre-evaluation conference? If yes, what areas were discussed during this conference?
- Was there a post-evaluation conference?
- What general topic areas were discussed during this conference?
- Did you benefit from the evaluation? If yes, how? If no, why?
- Did you receive a written report after the evaluation?
- Did the evaluator go over the report with you?
- If any weak areas were identified that needed further improvement, did you get any help from the supervisor to improve?

Teachers

- Are you aware of the current principal evaluation practices?

Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers.

- How long have you been in your present position?
- Do you think principals should be evaluated?
- Who should be responsible for conducting the evaluation?
- Do you have any suggestions for improving the current evaluation practices?

Superintendents and Principals

- What are the steps in designing a principal evaluation system? Were principals involved in the development of the evaluation system?
- If so, how do you feel about that? If no, do you think they should be involved?
- When was the system developed?
- Was the system piloted?
- How were principals informed about the evaluation system?
- Was there an in-service program developed to introduce principals to the evaluation system?
- Is the system reviewed regularly? How?

- Whether or not the policy on evaluation is effective in terms of improving principals' performance?
- What weaknesses and/or strengths there are inherent in the policy?
- How did the policy evolve?
- How the policy might be improved?
- What are the tools used in principal evaluation?
- What should be the focus of evaluation?
- What should be the conditions of evaluation? (evaluation procedures should be tailored for each person being evaluated; evaluation means should be designed for each particular school setting; those evaluated should be assured a conference with opportunities to discuss findings and recommendations.)
- What should be the purpose of evaluation? (to assist principals in professional growth; to improve educational leadership; to serve as a basis for salary determination; to determine employment status: promotion, retention, or dismissal).
- Should rating scale be used or you would prefer a narrative?
- What could be some of the criterion on which staff, parents and students can evaluate principals? (For instance, parents on school-community relations; staff on team-building skills, problem-solving, general attitude toward work; and school board staff on plant management, planning, supervising, decision-making).
- How each source of feedback should be weighted?
- All parents should be included or only those on school councils and PTA? Should criteria differ for parents on councils from other parents?
- Should principals be told as to how individual sources evaluated him/her or should it be kept confidential? If principals should be told, should they share results with staff or parents to discuss how best their needs can be met?
- Who would be in a best position to provide help to principals to improve? (peers, staff, school board employees etc.)
- If principals are doing well how should that be recognized? Should there be a pay-for-performance system?

Appendix C

EVALUATION OF NON-TENURED PRINCIPAL

A. The Assistant Superintendent of the Unit and Assistant Superintendent of personnel will hold initial meeting with the principal. During that meeting they will:

1) Explain the purpose of the evaluation
2) Give the principal the following handouts:
   a) Criteria for the Evaluation of Principals/Vice-Principals
   b) Administrator's Self-Evaluation
   c) Copy of "Evaluation Report"

B. Advise the principal to have developed within 2 weeks his/her:

1) Educational philosophy
2) Educational goals/objectives for the year

C. Advise the principal that these objectives and philosophy will be discussed at the next meeting.

D. Advise the principal that you will write up reports of all meetings or observation sessions, e.g. (staff meetings, I.P.P. meeting) to be signed by all parties.

E. Advise the principals that while the instruments given to him/her are to assist in the development of objectives;

1) The criteria for the evaluation of principals/vice-principals is the basis on which the principal will be judged along with the attainment of educational objectives.

F. Advise the principal that many factors will be taken into consideration other than pre-arranged meetings. Such factors all included in the "criteria for the evaluation of principals/vice-principals".

G. Advise the principal that a full report will be written at the end of the evaluation period and a copy will be given to the principal and a copy filed at Board Office. There will be no surprises.