A STUDY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' PRACTICES OF PRINCIPAL SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION: A CONTRAST OF LOW PERFORMING AND PERFORMING SCHOOLS

by

MIKE MATTINGLY

(Under the Direction of Sally J. Zepeda)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. The researcher sought to understand both the policy and implementation of principal evaluation through a survey administered to gain knowledge of implementation of policy. Superintendents from school systems across the state of Georgia ($N = 146$) were surveyed about their supervisory and evaluative practices related to principals of low performing, Title I schools before and after the school received the low performing ("in needs of improvement") status. Additionally, data were collected for superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of Title I performing schools so that comparisons could be made. The mixed method approach allowed for the collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. Structured interviews of five superintendents were conducted to gain perspectives of the superintendents' practices of supervision and evaluation of principals of Title I schools. The qualitative data collected from the interviews were combined with the current related literature of principal evaluation and supervision for the formulation of a survey instrument called the *Survey of Superintendent's Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals.* The responses from the statewide survey

plus demographic data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings of the qualitative data collected from the interviews ($N = 5$) aided in understanding the quantitative data collected from the surveys ($N = 105$) which yielded statistically significant results finding that both the superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices changed after a Title I school became low performing. Moreover, superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of Title I schools that remained performing did not change to the same degree as did for the low performing schools. The findings of the study will assist superintendents as they respond to schools in need of improvement and accountability policy mandates. For policy makers, an understanding of the supervisory and evaluative practices of superintendents in light of accountability are better understood.

INDEX WORDS: Principal Evaluation, Principal Supervision, Accountability, School Improvement, Superintendent, Low Performing Schools, Title I

A STUDY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' PRACTICES OF PRINCIPAL SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION: A CONTRAST OF LOW PERFORMING AND PERFORMING SCHOOLS

by

MIKE MATTINGLY

B.S. Ed., The University of Texas at Austin, 1980

M. Ed., University of North Texas, 1987

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2003

A STUDY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' PRACTICES OF PRINCIPAL SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION: A CONTRAST OF LOW PERFORMING AND PERFORMING SCHOOLS

by

MIKE MATTINGLY

Major Professor:	Sally J. Zepeda
Committee:	John Dayton C. Thomas Holmes Julius Scipio Anthony Strange

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2003

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the two strongest people that I know, my two sons, Ian Michael Mattingly and Stuart Klein Mattingly. I have learned from you that there are day to day challenges that are much more important and more difficult to conquer than writing a dissertation or completing a doctorate degree. Daily I am amazed by your personal triumphs. I know that you both will grow up to be fine men that will offer much to this world. Both of you have been my inspiration for completing this degree. I love you, Ian and Stuart, with all my heart and am proud to be your father.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This doctoral program was completed with the assistance, encouragement, and support of many loved ones, teachers, and colleagues. First, without the love and support of my precious wife, Sally, I would not have been able to complete the doctoral degree. Thank you, Sally, for crying and laughing with me throughout our life! You are everything to me.

To my parents, Jimmy and Delta Mattingly, you provided the foundation for me from a young age to always work hard, do the right thing, believe in myself, and to have pride in everything I did. Your support has always been there. I love you both.

Mom, Grandmom, and Aunt Linda helped me in different ways to become the person I am today. Other family and friends have assisted me with encouragement and supportive words along the way. You are all so special to me and my family. Jeff Young and Jan Heimann were especially helpful when I needed a friendly nudge to keep at it. At work, James Kinchen allowed me time and space to get the job done and Jan Morton was my strongest cheerleader.

Dr. Sally Zepeda, my major professor, has my deepest and sincerest appreciation for bringing out the best in me. You are second to none in your quest for quality. I cannot thank you enough for the long hours you sacrificed for me in the process of completing this dissertation. You taught me so many things beyond the dissertation, itself. I will always count you as a colleague and a friend. Special recognition and gratitude is sincerely expressed to Dr. Carvin Brown for your consultation and expertise in the research process. I am also grateful to my dissertation committee, Dr. Thomas Holmes, Dr. John Dayton, Dr. Julius Scipio, and Dr. Anthony Strange for their wise consultation and advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals in low performing schools by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. The researcher sought to understand both the policy and implementation of principal evaluation through a survey administered in order to gain knowledge of implementation of policy. Selected superintendents from school systems in Georgia were surveyed about their supervisory and evaluative practices related to principals of low performing, Title I schools. The knowledge discovered through such a study might assist superintendents and those who evaluate principals in understanding how supervision and evaluation impacts school improvement efforts in low performing schools. Stine (2001) wrote of the deleterious effect of principals who fail and the need for a comprehensive evaluation plan for principals. Stine explained:

> When the individual administrator fails, the school is in trouble. The process of replacement then becomes a critical issue in the carousel of activities which begins again with the announcement, recruitment, screening, selection, assignment, and orientation for the replacement as a new cycle begins again. To avoid this disruptive sequence of events, an evaluation process needs to be in place which will promote the priorities of the district and will model collaborative school improvement. (p. 3)

The current study can assist policy makers in assessing the impact of the evaluation of principals in light of accountability and low performing, Title I schools.

The State of Georgia has a policy that requires principal evaluation (Georgia Education Code 20-2-210), and in 1990, the State Department of Education developed an evaluation instrument known as the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI) which was recommended to be used by superintendents or designees for the purpose of evaluating school

principals. Until recent federal legislation, the results of principal evaluation had primarily been used as a means of determining school goal attainment, school community satisfaction, and compliance with rules and procedures (Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, & Thurston, 1999). The extent and purpose of principal evaluation use has traditionally rested with the local school system.

An increasing demand from the public for schools to be held accountable has resulted in unprecedented school reform and restructuring (Atkinson, 2002; Harris, Day, Hopkins, Hadfield, Hargreaves, & Chapman, 2003; Lee-Smith & Fey, 2000; O'Day, 2002). Policies mandating accountability for public schools have been enacted in recent years at the state and national level. Federal policy governing schools that receive Title I funding and schools with higher numbers of students receiving free or reduced price lunches have had in place a system for accountability for a number of years. Title I schools operating under these mandates are held accountable for annual student performance improvement known as "adequate yearly progress." Title I schools not meeting "adequate yearly progress" for two or more years have been labeled as "schools in need of improvement" or more commonly "low performing schools".

In 2000, the Georgia state legislature passed House Bill 1187, also known as the *A-Plus Educational Reform Act of 2000.* House Bill 1187 created policy governing school performance for the purpose of improving student achievement in Georgia public schools. The policy increased accountability for school performance. The accountability system for school performance brought sanctions for poor performance and rewards for high performance. This state policy called for K-8 schools in Georgia to receive report card grades and ratings with awards and interventions in 2003-2004. Schools with grades 9-12 will receive the report cards with grades and ratings that include awards and interventions in 2004-2005. The report grades

will be determined by "absolute scores and progress" toward improved student achievement on standardized tests (Office of Educational Accountability, Georgia, 2000).

Statement of the Problem

For the first time in the United States, a national policy has been legislated that calls for principals to be leaders in the areas of curriculum and instruction (Title II, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 2151B**)**. The reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002, also known as *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), underscored the importance of principals to schools by including a:

> …discretionary grant program that supports to recruit, retain, and provide training and continuing professional development to principals and assistant principals to create a high quality school leadership force. (Title II-A-5-2151-B)

The more stringent demands for accountability have included the expectation that school principals to be held accountable for school success (Ediger, 2001; Sirotnik & Durden, 1996). The public not only expects schools to meet academic challenges successfully, but also, the public has expected that the school principal to be held responsible for improved student learning (Cooley & Shen, 2000; Delaney, 1997; Ediger, 2001). To believe that the principal is the single most important figure in a school is a common expectation (Cooley & Shen, 2000; Davis, 1998; Delaney, 1997). Fullan (1997) concluded that educational reform has failed because reform has oversimplified what principals do. The U.S. Department of Education's website devoted to *No Child Left Behind* (2002) posted, "As schools are held accountable for increasingly higher academic standards, it is vital to have high-quality principals leading schools" (Title II, Part A, Subpart 5, Section 2151B). Because the principal is considered the single most important figure in the school (Davis, 1998; Delaney, 1997; Fullan, 1997), it is important to study the effects, if any, principal supervision and evaluation by the superintendent has on school improvement.

As political groups "take aim" at schools and their expected student performance, it becomes clear that the performance of the principal has squarely become the "target of criticism" (Ediger, 2001). Bray and Challinor (2001) helped explain how a former Texas superintendent in the Brazosport Independent School District based a school reform model on the concept that school leaders are the primary source of school ineffectiveness:

> Gerald Anderson, Brazosport's former superintendent, adapted his model based on the teachings of W. Edwards Deming, who pioneered the idea of Total Quality Management. According to Deming, it is business managers, not workers, who are responsible for the majority of the defects in products or services. Anderson took the same principles and applied them to education. It is the administration, not the students, who are responsible for the defects in learning. (p. 26)

With the attention brought about by recent policy action at the state and federal levels, principal performance and the supervision and evaluation of principals have created a need for close examination. A review of the literature revealed an enormous amount of research studies, qualitative and quantitative, regarding the supervision and evaluation of teachers (Blase & Blase, 1998; Calabrese & Zepeda, 1997; Glanz & Neville, 1997; Zepeda, 2003); however, there were a limited number of documented studies, either quantitative or qualitative, that examined the supervision and evaluative practices of superintendents relative to principals, especially in low performing schools. Ginsberg and Thompson (1992) concluded that "the state of research on principal evaluation emphasizes the lack of empirically supported information about best practices" (p. 67). The present study examined the supervision and evaluation provided by the superintendent of the principal of low performing, Title 1 schools to better understand the impact of the policy and the implementation of principal evaluation and supervision in light of accountability and low performing, Title I schools in selected districts in Georgia.

Traditionally, principal evaluations have focused on the demands of the management of the school taking into consideration the situational nature of the job (Davis & Hensley, 1999). Davis and Hensley stated:

> Judging the myriad of activities, decisions, and behaviors applied by principals in the course of the work day, for example, and weighing those judgments against an ever-changing array of situational variables (political influences, individual preferences and needs, availability of resources, etc.) is incredibly difficult. (p. 22)

Principals are beginning to consider themselves as leaders of instruction rather than as in the past, merely managers of the day-to-day operations of the school (Franklin, 2002). Now, the focus is to determine how well a school principal is facilitating school improvement (Fullan, 2002; Thomas, Holdaway & Ward, 2000). In light of the need for school improvement in low performing schools and the possibility of principals initiating school improvements, this study of principal supervision and evaluation is important and timely.

Policymakers and the public are demanding that schools not performing up to standard bring about improvements (Harris, 2001; Harris, Day, et al. 2003). Schools are finding that they must reflect the expectations of local and national priorities (Harris, 2001). In 1999, the American public rated education as a top priority (Kirchhoff, 1999). Kirchhoff summarized that the U.S. federal government had determined that the best way to increase student performance was through school wide improvement efforts.

Fink (1999) reported, "the concept of the 'school as the center of change' has become 'school as the center of blame'" (p. 131). The government has defended the practice of "naming and blaming" failing schools as a tool for reform (Fink, 1999). As schools are "named" with labels and identified for "blame" through report cards and the press, it will be important to identify influences that assist in bringing about school improvement.

School improvement has been researched relative to an array of reform efforts and educational programs (Danielson, 2002; Dufour & Eaker, 1998; Fielder, 2003; Harris, 2002; Haydn, 2001; Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001; Schmoker, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1992). To date, no examinations of the supervision and evaluation practices of superintendents relative to principals of low performing schools could be found in the literature. This study may add to the understanding of school improvement by studying the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents of the schools that are most in need of improvement.

For low performing schools to improve to a status no longer requiring a negative label such as "low performing," change is necessary. Change allows for new ideas to flourish. No one in a school building is expected to bring about more instructional change than the principal (Fullan, 1997; Meyer, 2000).

Many state governments have labeled schools based on state criteria. Those schools not meeting the state standard may be labeled as low performing or failing. Of the state criteria, the most common criteria used is student performance on achievement tests (Christie & Ziebarth, 2001). In 1994, when U.S. Congress rewrote the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which includes Title I, they mandated that each state would be responsible for the creation of academic standards. Each state would be expected to test students to measure their performance against those standards. As of 1999, nearly all states have in place standards based on standardized tests (Kirchhoff, 1999).

Schools are not always characterized by the student achievement test scores; however, test results remain the most commonly used indicator for labeling schools across the United States. A review of literature found studies related to principal supervision and evaluation (Davis & Hensley, 1999; Moore, 2000; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993; Clayton-Jones, McMahon, Rodwell,

Skehan, Bourke, & Holbrook; 1993; Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992); however, no studies could be found that sought to determine the impact of principal supervision and evaluation in low performing schools by superintendents.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the implementation of policy related to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. Policymakers have developed a rationale for creating an accountability system that used state achievement scores to assign labels to schools. Schools not meeting the standard of making adequate yearly progress are assigned a low performance status. Research on quantifying superintendents' supervision and evaluation of principals is lacking in the literature, and there is a need for such a study to provide an understanding of supervision and evaluative practices of the superintendent in light of the policy governing accountability and low performing, Title I schools.

Significance of the Study

It is important to document the supervisory and evaluative practices of superintendents and those who supervise and evaluate principals to guide others to the effective practices that may impact school improvement in low performing schools. The impact principals have on schools is generally determined through a performance assessment. The significance of principal evaluation has been emphasized by Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993):

> Consequently, systematic and careful evaluation of principal qualifications, competence, and performance is critically important to the success of America's elementary and secondary schools. The public interest is no less at risk from incompetent school principals than from incompetent doctors, lawyers, and accountants, and all such public servants should be carefully evaluated throughout their professional careers. (p. 24)

Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993) suggested that if there was to be school success, then success was dependent on the performance and competence of the principal. Studying the supervisory and evaluative practices of superintendents relative to the school principal, then, could provide needed insight to what principals do in low performing schools versus adequately or high performing schools. This type of examination would also be valuable to other superintendents as they supervise and evaluate principals in their own systems.

There is scant literature related to the supervision and evaluation of principals in comparison to the supervision and evaluation of teachers. Recent research studies completed by doctoral students have pointed to an increased need for additional examination of the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents (Albanese, 2003; Catano, 2002; Marcoux, 2002; Szakacs, 2002).

One important study, completed by Moore (2000), examined the perceptions of superintendents regarding the supervision and evaluation of high school principals. Moore's findings broadly emphasized that supervision and evaluation are needed to promote growth and accountability for principals. His study called for additional research in the area of principal supervision and evaluation. Additionally, Moore suggested that quantitative studies, or at least studies that employed mixed methods, be used in the future to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals. As more state and federal education reform policies are legislated, school improvement and accountability will be the expected outcome. A study such as this one will be important to the body of research because the study examined the superintendents' supervisory and evaluation practices of principals in low performing schools—schools that need improvement, in light of educational reform policy.

Four recent doctoral studies examined principal evaluation and supervision. Albanese (2003) examined the current practices in principal evaluation. Szakacs (2002) studied the principals' perceptions of evaluation. Catano (2002) investigated the congruence of principal job descriptions and the evaluation instruments used to determine their effectiveness. The study completed by Marcoux (2002) was concerned with the use of principal portfolios as a means to evaluate principals. Each of the findings concluded that principals indicated a desire to be held accountable. Yet, there was a dire need for additional study of supervision and evaluation of principals. The studies supported future empirical investigations of principal evaluation and supervision based on the need to determine effective principal practices. Albanese found that student achievement and effective schools are attributed to principal actions and additional studies should be carried out to further understand the relationship.

Overview of the Methods

A two-pronged data collection approach was used by the researcher for the purpose of examining the implementation of policy related to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. The data were collected through structured interviews of 5 superintendents, and a survey of 146 superintendents.

A mixed method approach was used for the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. The use of both quantitative and qualitative data allowed the researcher to gain broader perspectives, as opposed to relying solely on quantitative or qualitative data exclusively. The qualitative data, in part, assisted in developing and interpreting the quantitative findings. The mixed method strategy was used to determine statistically significant differences of

superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices before and after schools were labeled as low performing.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

Research Questions

The study sought answers to the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in principals' performance evaluation before and after the status of the school was announced?
2. Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses stated in the null form are enumerated for testing:

$H_0$1: There is no significant difference in the relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in principals' performance evaluation before and after the status of the school was announced.

$H_0$2: There is no significant difference in the relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined within the context of this study. These definitions are presented to help the reader understand and clarify the meanings of key terms.

Accountability System Each state sets academic standards for what every child should know and learn. Student academic achievement is measured for every child, every year. Results of these annual tests are reported to the public. The standards may be different from state to state.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) The term is used to describe the minimum level of improvement that states, school districts, and schools must achieve each year. Each state creates their own individual measures of yearly progress toward achieving state academic standards.

Evaluation A summative action by superintendents that makes judgment on principal performance. Evaluation usually includes a rating or ratings based on job performance.

Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI) The name of the instrument used to evaluate the job-related annual performance of all personnel employed by local units of administration who are required by the Georgia Board of Education to have a leadership certificate (*Georgia Leadership Manual,* 1992).

Low Performing Title I School A label assigned to schools receiving federal Title I grant monies and not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress as defined by the state of Georgia.

School Improvement An organizational effort by a school to effectively bring about increased student achievement.

School Principal A school leader charged with implementing the instructional programs and maintaining the operations at either the elementary, middle, or high school levels.

Superintendent A person in a school system who is the highest-ranking administrator who is responsible for reporting directly to the school board and is considered to be the chief executive officer.

Supervision A term that describes any model of supervisory practice that promotes formative or ongoing growth in school principals.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to public Title I schools in the state of Georgia. Additionally, superintendents that served in the capacity of superintendent in their current system for less than one year were not included in the survey. Systems that did not include a Title I school that was once performing and then became low performing and a Title I school that was performing and was still performing during the same time period were also excluded.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 provided the background and rationale for the present study, the statement of the problem, and the significance of the study including the research questions and the hypotheses stated in the null form. Chapter 2 presented a review of the literature relevant to supervision and evaluation of principals, the policies that govern the supervision and evaluation of principals, school improvement and low performing schools, and policies related to low performing schools.

Chapter 3 presented the research methods and the overall scope of the study. Included were the procedures used for the structured interviews and the construction of the instrumentation for data collection. Chapter 4 reported the data and its analyses. Chapter 5 provided a discussion of the results. Also included in Chapter 5 were implications for superintendents and those who evaluate principals of the impact on school improvement in low performing, Title I schools. This chapter also included implications for policy makers so that they may evaluate the impact of principals in light of accountability and low performing, Title I schools.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. The review of literature revealed a number of studies relative to the supervision and evaluation of principals (Clayton-Jones et al., 1993; Louden & Wildy, 1999; Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998; Sirotnik & Durden, 1996). However, no studies could be found in the literature that linked reform policy and principal supervision and evaluation in Title I low performing schools by superintendents. This lack of research underscored the need for the present study.

Reform policies were created by state and federal agencies for the purpose of bringing about school improvement through increased accountability (Dufour & Eaker, 1998; Fielder, 2003; Harris, 2002; Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001). The implications of reform for low performing schools or "schools in need of improvement" are many. Primarily, the manner in which schools increase student achievement or bring about school wide improvement has been the focus of school reform and has been the subject of recent studies (Datnow & Castellano, 2001; Harris, 2001; Mintrop, MacLellan, & Quintero, 2001; O'Day, 2002). Harris (2003) found that, "Even though there are few certainties about the ability of educational policy to secure higher performance from the educational system, the arguments for investment in education remain powerful and compelling" (p. 9). There are many unanswered questions about how reform policy impacts the workings of schools, especially in low performing schools.

Harris (2003) asserted that during a time of reform, "the potential of leadership to influence pupil and school performance remains unequivocal" (p. 9). Leadership is essential in sustaining school improvement and effectiveness (Harris & Bennett, 2001; Sammons, Thomas, & Mortimer, 1997). Barth (1990) asserted that quality educational programs are dependent on the principal and that "the principal is the key to a good school" (p. 64). Principals must adhere to mandated legislation while being held more accountable for the performance of students and teachers.

Moore and Slade (1996) reported that increased pressures have resulted for principals because of the emphasis placed on student performance and the impact this performance has on the principal's annual evaluation. With the federally legislated *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), the emphasis for students to meet established academic standards on state and national achievement tests has become a priority and has resulted in increased pressures on principals to be held accountable for student achievement.

From a policy maker's viewpoint, school leaders are the key to resolving the challenges that schools face today (Harris, 2003). According to Murphy and Louis (1994), measuring the work of principals against standards is not new; however, the call for educational accountability has resulted from the belief that the global economy is no longer led by the United States. The principal's influence in school accountability is significant and as Murphy and Louis indicated:

> In recent years, accountability has emerged as a central educational issue. Commentators on schooling from many quarters—assuming that the principal is the, not a, major influence on the quality of education in a school, have demanded that administrators demonstrate their competency by producing objective evidence that students and teachers are achieving desired outcomes. (p. 5)

Understanding if and how reform policy impacts the supervision and evaluation of school leaders of low performing, Title I schools by superintendents is unknown. Educational reform

has brought an expectation that principals are to be judged and to be evaluated based on the results of student performance. This study is needed to better inform policymakers to the role leaders such as superintendents take in school improvement through the supervision and evaluation of their principals.

A mixed method approach, employing a survey and structured interviews, was selected for this research to describe the manner in which superintendents supervised and evaluated principals of Title I, low performing schools. This chapter presented the three areas of literature in which this study is grounded—the principalship, principal supervision and evaluation, and accountability and school improvement.

The Principalship

Research has yielded various opinions regarding the principal's role in the educational organization (Daresh, 2002; Lyons, 1999; Ubben, Hughes, & Norris, 2001). These roles are characterized by the functions that principals carry out in their daily work. Some of these functions are defined as general job tasks (paper work, supervising student discipline, personnel management), administrative functions (planning, leading, organizing), and behavioral competencies (motivation, communication, leadership) (Daresh, 2002; Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992; Sergiovanni, 2001; Ubben et al., 2001). The principal's work is expanding and changing as Daresh (2001) reported:

> Providing fair and effective student discipline is important, but a good principal needs to do much more. Financial management and budgeting, staff development, community relations, instructional improvement, and so many other responsibilities make up the life of a modern principal. (p. 63)

The job of the principal has become much more than managerial as Ubben et al., (2001) noted that the complex leadership role of the principal is:

> a multifaceted task that requires continual learning and that effective school leaders must be strong educators anchoring their work on the central issues of learning, teaching, and school improvement. (p. xix)

There are many studies that have examined the job duties and roles of principals (Catano, 2002; Ediger, 2001; Lyons, 1999; Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998); rarely are empirical studies completed, however. Most of the research on the role of the principal has tended to describe systematically what principals actually do and the difference they make on school effectiveness (Cantu, 1994; Cheng, 1994; Leithwood, 1994). The use of time has been revealing when attempting to define the role of the principal, and research has shown that brevity, variety, and fragmentation characterize the working day of the principal (Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998; Williams, 2000).

The situational nature of the principals' work creates a dilemma for evaluating the principal (Davis, 1998; Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992; Seyfarth, 1999). Only recently have educational theorists and researchers begun to study the "numerous contexts and moment to moment processes of school life" (Waite, 1995, p. 94). The principal must be able to function in a contingent and situational manner. The interruptions and unexpected nature of the daily events creates an atmosphere whereby the principal's leadership is contingent on the short-term situation. A principal's daily routine may be filled with unexpected interruptions from parents or community members, and the work of the principal centers mostly on crisis strategies (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992; Seyfarth, 1999). As noted by Davis (1998), principals are "faced with the unrelenting task of maintaining structure and order within increasingly hostile, unpredictable, and conflict-laden environments" (p. 58).

Principals must be prepared to act on any given situation. The differing conditions occurring from school to school must be taken into account when evaluation systems and processes are used to assess the leadership of the principal (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992, Marcoux, 2002).

The role of the principal is ambiguous and contradictory (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992). Stine (2001) listed as many as 93 specific "indicators of effective leadership for principals" (p. 12). Yet, ambiguity remained at the top of the list when there were more specific functions delineated for principals mandated from district or state levels (Ginsberg & Thompson). The principal is responsible for setting the tone and climate of the school, for insuring a safe and secure environment, and for managing programs that are expected to run smoothly and efficiently (Griffith, 1999; Langlois & McAdams, 1992; Sergiovanni, 2001; Whitaker, Whitaker, & Lumpa, 2000).

The principal answers to many constituent groups. These groups include parents, students, teachers, staff, other school administrative personnel, clerical and maintenance staff, the superintendent, other central office administrative/supervisory staff, the school board, community organizations, parents' organizations, the state department, labor organizations, accreditation agencies, and professional organizations (Davis & Hensley, 1999; Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992). Given the range of people to whom the principal answers, the principalship is clearly in the middle of the "management bureaucracy" of the school system (Davis & Hensley, p. 22). The various constituencies can be problematic for principals, as determined by Ginsberg and Thompson (1993) because "each constituency has a well-developed and a forcefully asserted view of how the school should be run" (p. 63).

Supervision of the Principal

The purpose of this study was to examine the superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of low performing, Title I schools in light of accountability. The intents of supervision and evaluation have been broadly defined by several researchers relative to instructional supervision for teachers (Acheson & Gall, 1997; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998; Zepeda, 2003). The major difference between the intents of supervision and the intents of evaluation is that supervision is formative in nature. Supervision allows teachers to learn from reflecting on their classroom practices with the assistance of another professional (Glatthorn, 1984, 1990; Glickman, 1990). Additionally, supervisors that make "supervisory decisions based on data will yield more growth-oriented development" (Zepeda & Mayers, 2000, p. 150). Zepeda (2003) contrasted the intents of supervision with evaluation by explaining that "the intents of evaluation are summative; classroom observations and other assessments of professional performance lead to a final judgment or overall rating" (p. 19).

Because there are many definitions and purposes for supervision, Harris (1998) concluded that:

> Even though current thought does not represent full consensus, it does have many consistencies. Some of these are contained in definitions of supervision focused on:
>
> - teaching and learning;
> - responding to changing external realities;
> - providing support, assistance and feedback to teachers;
> - recognizing teaching as the primary vehicle for facilitating school learning; and,
> - promoting new, improved innovative practices. (p. 2)

Glatthorn (1998) went so far as to report that the quantity and quality of the instruction, curriculum, resources, climate, and school relationship with parents and community were the foci of instructional supervision.

Additionally, a review of other researchers by Zepeda (2003) included the intents of instructional supervision as:

- personal interaction and relationship building between supervisor and teacher (Acheson & Gall, 1997; Bellon & Bellon, 1982; Goldhammer, 1969);
- on-going learning (Mosher & Purpel, 1972);
- teachers' instruction improves, so does the students' learning (Blumberg, 1980; Cogan, 1973; Harris, 1975);
- data-based decision making (Bellon & Bellon, 1982);
- building capacity in the organization and individuals (Pajak, 1993);
- trust in the processes (Costa & Garmston, 1994); and,
- change that results in the betterment of the students and teachers' developmental lives (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). (p. 20)

The bulk of supervision and evaluation research has been conducted on the supervision and evaluation of teachers; however, it can be argued that there is a parallel between the supervisory functions of a principal supervising and evaluating a teacher and that of a superintendent supervising and evaluating a principal. Taking each salient point above, a carryover could be made that the principal functions in a capacity that could easily be supervised in a like manner just as a teacher is supervised by a principal. For example, a principal has a better understanding and trust of the process when a relationship is made with the supervisor (Szakacs, 2002). The capacity for new learning and improved instruction are two dimensions in which principals would have strong interests, as a result of being supervised and evaluated (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Principals use data in many of the functions that they carry out in their daily work (Schmoker, 1999). A supervisory task of determining when and how decisions are made based on data would be a natural carryover from teacher supervision to principal supervision. Finally, in light of educational reform, there is a great deal of change. Supervising change by superintendents would be another natural dimension as principals respond to changes by

improving professional development for themselves and their teachers as they work toward school improvements (Fullan, 1997).

As schools respond to improvement and accountability efforts, supervision may be one of the tools to bring about improved student achievement (Moore & Slade, 1996; Murphy & Louis, 1994). Supervision serves a purpose in any organization that is attempting to produce a product, even in schools, as Alfonso, Firth, and Neville (1975) pointed out:

> Supervision is found in all complex organizations. This is because organizations are determined to maintain themselves and are sometimes concerned about their improvement or refinement. The connection between supervision and organizations is clear and direct. (p. 3)

Duffy (1997) contended that a newer model of educational supervision has evolved from business management as evidenced in the literature on "knowledge work, sociotechnical systems design, business process reengineering, quality management, and organization development" (p. 202). Holdaway and Genge (1995) explained that "as chief executive officers of their school systems, superintendents occupy key positions in formal organizations" (p. 13), and superintendents assume the role of supervisors of principals. Holdaway and Genge contend that although superintendents "are usually far removed from classrooms, their actions can have an important, indirect effect upon student performance" (p. 13).

Supervision in schools is complex and is described by Acheson and Gall (1997) as a collaborative process that is "interactive and democratic, rather than directive and authoritarian" (p. 40). Other characteristics that good supervisors possess, according to Wiles and Bondi (2000), are process skills such as "thinking, planning, organizing, and evaluating" (p. 11). Wiles and Bondi concluded that "beyond being responsible for instructional improvement" (p. 14), the supervisors' job consists of "patterns of activity that give purpose to the role" (p. 14). The role of

the superintendent in the supervision of principals has not been examined in depth (Moore, 2000; Szakacs, 2002).

The research on the work of the superintendent is scant, and according to Kowalski (1999), the paucity of research on the superintendent is due to the "multiple contextual variables" of the school systems in which superintendents serve (p. 89). Murphy and Hallinger (1986) observed that "the research on the superintendency is remarkably thin" (p. 76). Similarly, the research related to supervision of principals is sparse and Duke and Stiggins (1985) reported that "since little research has been conducted on the actual procedures used to evaluate and supervise school principals, little is known about the nature, role, or quality of those procedures" (p. 71).

In examining educational journals, the number of journal articles directly related to the supervision of principals by superintendents was found to be lacking. An ERIC search for "principal supervision" in four premiere educational administration research journals provided the results shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Comparison of Articles on Supervision of Principals by Superintendents in Selected Educational Administration Journals

Span	Journal	Supervision articles	Total number of articles
1970-2003	*Educational Administration Quarterly*	0	606
1991-2003	*Journal of School Leadership*	0	352
1972-2003	*Journal of Educational Administration*	1	599
1988-2003	*Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*	1	256

Table 1 extends the review of research completed by Moore (2000) by providing additional review of journals through 2003. As Table 1 illustrates, there were 1,813 journal articles written from 1970 to 2003 in some of the most premiere educational leadership and administration journals yet only 2 articles related to the supervision that superintendents provide to principals were found in these publications.

After searching research journals and finding very little about the superintendent's supervisory and evaluative practices and the principal, several textbooks were consulted. Using superintendent and educational leadership governance textbooks, the results of the literature review found revealed little coverage on the topic of principal supervision and evaluation. Table 2 details the books consulted and the amount of coverage devoted to supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents.

Although the literature on teacher evaluation and supervision is abundant, very little research on this topic exists in the realm of the superintendent relative to the supervision and evaluation of the principal. There were no articles or coverage in books of the superintendent's responsibility to provide supervision or evaluation of principals in the school improvement literature.

It was interesting to see that the amount of coverage on the supervision and evaluation of principals and the work of the superintendent was equally sparse. From 1995 to 2002, there were 11 books dealing with the superintendency. Of the 11 textbooks, 5 textbooks did not refer to the work of the superintendent relative to the supervision or evaluation of principals. Three of the books had less than one page devoted to the supervision and evaluation practices of the principal by the superintendent. Of the remaining three books, there was a total of eight pages devoted to the supervision and evaluation of the principal by the superintendent.

Table 2

Comparison of Superintendent Supervision and Evaluation Practices in Selected Educational Leadership Textbooks

Year	Book and author	Supervision and coverage
1995	*Balancing Act: The Political Role of the Urban Superintendent* Jackson, B.	None
1996	*Making Sense As a School Leader* Ackerman, R. H., Donaldson, G. A., & Van der Bogert, R.	None
1996	*The School Superintendency: New Responsibilities New Leadership* Norton, M., Webb, L., Dlugosh, L., & Sybouts, W.	One Sentence
1996	*The Human Resource Function in Educational Administration 6th Edition* Castetter, W.	None
1997	*The American School Superintendent* Carter, G., & Cunningham, W.	None
1998	*The Superintendent of the Future: Strategy & Action for Achieving Academic Excellence* Spillane, R., & Regnier, P.	Four Pages
1999	*The School Superintendent: Theory, Practice, and Cases* Kowalski, T.	Eight Sentences
1999	*Educational Governance and Administration 4th Edition* Sergiovanni, T., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F., & Thurston, P.	Three Pages
2001	*Supervision As Proactive Leadership 3rd Edition* Daresh, J.	None
2002	*The Promises and Perils Facing Today's School Superintendent* Cooper, B. & Fusarelli, L. (Eds.)	One Page
2002	*Educational Leadership: A Reference Handbook* Williams-Boyd, P.	Four Sentences

Evaluation of the Principal

The purpose of evaluation is to create a basis for organizational change and an improvement in individual effectiveness (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1998; McCleary, 1979). Evaluations of principals serve many other purposes, as well. Of the other purposes, evaluation may assist in selection of students in principal preparation programs, certification for graduates, and selection of new principals for schools (Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993). Thomas et al., (2000) explained how principal evaluations serve many purposes in this way:

> In many jurisdictions, the primary purpose is to fulfill the need for the annual evaluation required by school boards. Evaluations can be conducted for other summative purposes such as certification and licensing. Formative purposes are also identified by some school districts: these relate to expected improvement of principals' performance following evaluation and identification of ways in which principals can change their administrative style and improve their skills, attitudes, and knowledge. (p. 216)

The results of principal evaluation can also assist in decisions about discipline, demotion, reassignment, termination, promotion, and compensation (McCleary, 1979; Stine, 2001). Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993) believed that sound principal evaluations eliminate poor school leadership, and sound principal evaluation systems assist competent principals in improving their aptitudes, proficiencies, performances, and special achievements. Principal evaluation is one method that determines the instructional impact that a principal has on student outcomes (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Moore & Slade, 1996).

The impact principals have on schools is generally determined through performance assessments. According to Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993), the success of American schools depends on the "systematic and careful evaluation of principal qualifications, competence, and performance" (p. 24). As education reform and accountability called for improved student performance, the principal performance, too, must be evaluated based on school improvement and performance (Moore & Slade, 1996). Ginsberg and Thompson (1992) found that "given the

many expectations and demands for accountability that principals face, typical approaches for evaluating educational personnel are simply not applicable for principals" (p. 68). Other factors such as cost and rational decision making create challenges for principal evaluation as Thomas et al. (2000) asserted:

> In the current climate, which emphasizes accountability and school effectiveness, school systems must pay careful attention to the evaluation of principals. Without sufficient resources, the effort expended may result in little improvement. Regardless of how carefully policies and practices dealing with evaluation of principals have been enunciated in school systems, human judgment is heavily involved. (p. 235)

The need for this study is supported because of a lack of research on the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability, especially in low performing, Title I schools.

To measure the work of the principal for the sake of evaluation is problematic (Ediger, 2001). First, the work of the principal is difficult to define. The principals' work responsibilities lack task specificity, includes varying expectations, and is situational in nature. Secondly, because of the difficulty in characterizing principals' work, it is, therefore, difficult to measure in the traditional sense the work that principals accomplish (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992). There are few studies that explore the nature of the principals' work and fewer that study the evaluation of the work of principals.

Table 3 provides an overview of the studies appearing in scholarly journals about the evaluation of principals by superintendents. Similar to the research about the supervision of principals by superintendents, it appears that the research in this area is lacking in coverage in the top-tiered educational leadership and administration journals (See Table 1). Table 3 summarizes that of the 1,813 articles, 12 articles on the evaluation of principals by the superintendent appeared. It is noted that none of these articles made the link between

accountability and the evaluation of the principal related to a factor in school improvement, the purpose of the present study.

Table 3

Comparison of Articles on Evaluation of Principals by Superintendents in Selected Educational Administration Journals

Span	Journal	Evaluation articles	Total number of articles
1970-2003	*Educational Administration Quarterly*	4	606
1991-2003	*Journal of School Leadership*	2	352
1972-2003	*Journal of Educational Administration*	1	599
1988-2003	*Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*	5	256

Table 4 provides an overview of the dissertations on principal supervision and evaluation from 1987 to 2003. It appears that the studies on the work of the superintendent relative to the supervision and evaluation of the principal peaked in 1993 with four dissertations and then again in 2002 with three dissertations. The lack of research studies supports additional research relative to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents. This study was important to the body of research because it examined the supervisory and evaluative practices of superintendents of principals of low performing, Title I schools in light of accountability.

Table 4

Doctoral Dissertations of Principal Supervision and Evaluation (1987–2003)

Date	Author	Dissertation topic of study
1987	Cammaert, R.	Studied the practices of evaluation and supervision of principals in Alberta, Canada
1991	Martens, P.	Studied the nature and extent of standards in principal evaluation including the perceptions of superintendents and principals
1992	Cole, C.	Studied the effective school research as it related to principal evaluation
1992	Frerking, R.	A nation-wide study of effectiveness of principal evaluation
1993	Brady, A.	A study that compared the supervision of principals
1993	Pullo, F.	Studied principal evaluation in Pennsylvania
1993	Settle, K.	Studied the perceptions of superintendents and principals relative to high school principal evaluation
1993	Wilson, R.	A study of principal evaluation practices in Arkansas
1995	Black, K.	Studied high school principal evaluations as compared to best practices found in personnel standards
1996	Johnson, J.	An analysis of secondary principal evaluation systems in Arizona
2000	Moore, G.	Studied central office personnel's supervision and evaluation practices as provided to high school principals
2002	Catano, N.	A study of the congruence between principal job descriptions and principal evaluation instruments
2002	Marcoux, J.	An examination of principal evaluation as it impacted leadership effectiveness, student achievement, and professional development through portfolio assessment
2002	Szakacs, B.	A study of the processes and influences of principal evaluations in Wisconsin
2003	Albanese, L.	Examined current practices and evaluation systems used to assess the performance of Rhode Island principals and their measured attitudes toward these appraisals

A review of the research finds a number of studies focusing on principal evaluation, competencies, supervision, or job responsibilities (Albanese, 2003; Catano, 2002; Marcoux, 2002; Moore, 2000; Stine; 2001). Yet, no studies could be found relative to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents of principals of low performing, Title I schools in light of recent educational reform policies. Perhaps, this lack of research on principal evaluation

and accountability is due to the fact that legislation which has called for more accountability of the principal has only recently been enacted at the federal level and policies at the state and local levels have been slow in responding to legislation. There is an increased need for the principal to assume the role of instructional leader as educational reform legislation such as *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* called for schools to improve. The NCLB mandate placed more accountability on the principal for achievement results of students resulting in the principal assuming a greater degree of responsibility for student achievement than in the past (Cooley & Shen, 2000).

The issue of context further complicates principal evaluations. Ginsberg and Thompson (1992) have determined that the contextual conditions and constructs create job functions for principals that are difficult to operationalize:

> Constructs which have emerged such as school climate, high expectations, coordination and organization, and instructional leadership don't easily lend themselves to observation and measurement for evaluation purposes. (p. 62)

Examples of contextual conditions may include the school's socioeconomic status, school level, parent support, and education level of the parents. The various contextual conditions have the capability of creating substantial differences among schools. The behavior of principals may vary due to differing contextual conditions of the school. An understanding of context must be established to better create an evaluation system that allows for differing contextual conditions and its relation to outcomes (Heck & Marcoulides, 1992).

The roles principals carry out create problems for principal performance assessments, too. The principal may be an instructional leader (Franklin, 2002; Smith & Andrews, 1989). That is, a leader that takes responsibility for organizing and coordinating learning so that achievement goals are attained (Schmoker, 1999; Smith & Andrews, 1989). As instructional leader, the

principal focuses others in the organization on the school's academic improvement plan for the purpose of goal attainment. Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis (1996) concluded that principals exert significant influence over student achievement. In their examination, Hallinger et al. (1996) found that it is the principal who implements educational programs and who builds relationships with staff, all of which greatly affects student performance.

Another type of leader is the transformational leader who values shared decision-making, collaboration, and communication (Burns, 1978; Ubben et al., 2001). Each leader may be valuable to the school and its outcomes. Observing, quantifying, and judging leadership aspects are a challenge when trying to create an effective performance assessment tool. There are also internal processes such as problem-solving and decision-making that are difficult to observe and to quantify (Heck & Marcoulides, 1992). In an Australian study, principals indicated that they were reliably appraised in areas of key responsibilities when those areas were quantifiable and documented (Clayton-Jones et al., 1993).

School principal evaluation has received limited attention in the literature. Principal evaluation is lacking in any empirical or conceptual synthesis of the literature (Rallis & Goldring, 1993). The scarcity of empirically driven research on principal evaluation created problems for those seeking to determine the most effective and appropriate means of evaluating principals (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1993). Heck and Marcoulides (1993) suggested that this void in theoretically-driven empirical research promoted the use of ineffective models that do not adequately provide a system for improving the performance of school principals.

Thomas et al. (2000) reported that an examination of relevant literature has revealed that there are four major approaches to principal evaluation based on the following aspects:

1. Results-based (outcomes)—focused on desired outcomes and the degree to which the principal has been able to achieve these outcomes. This aspect has received significant attention given the political attention on accountability;
2. Job description—focused on what principal are expected to do in their role. This aspect is supported by the *Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation*;
3. Personal qualities—focused on the qualities of the principal that are considered to be most likely to lead to academic effectiveness or quality; and,
4. Best practices—focused on research findings about important effects of the principal's activities upon improvements in school effectiveness and performance.

With the reform movement, the primary purpose of principal evaluation changed focus. No longer were principals expected to be judged on their managerial behaviors, but, also on their instructional leadership skills (Thomas, et al., 2000). The focus on the principal as instructional leader emerged in an effort to emphasize the importance of student achievement (Harrington-Lueker, 1998). Principals were expected to efficiently manage a school while bringing about school improvements. The managerial and instructional leadership behaviors have at times been portrayed in the literature as conflicting and at times as inseparable (Cascadden, 1998; Stronge, 1993). School principal evaluations have not evolved very far, and Hart (1992) suggested, "practices of principal evaluations have not kept pace in focus, sophistication, or reliability with changes in schools and schooling or with development in teacher evaluation" (p. 37).

With the increasing demand for school improvement, and accountability for principals in particular, it is timely that additional research be conducted relative to supervision and evaluation of the principal. The purpose of this study was to examine the implementation of policy related

to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools.

A review of four important studies among the very limited amount of research related to principal performance through supervision and evaluation revealed various, yet significant results for researchers and practitioners. In the first review, Louden and Wildy (1999) completed a study that:

> described an alternative method of developing a standards framework, combining qualitative vignettes with probabilistic measurement techniques to provide essential or ideal qualities of performance with contextually rich descriptions of variations in performance. (p. 398)

Louden and Wildy conducted their study in Australia in three stages. First, participating principals were asked to comment about how they would react to certain dilemmas that principals commonly face. The interviews were developed into vignettes that related to duties related to principal job descriptions. Next, another set of principals were asked to rate the performance of the principals in the various vignettes on a scale ranging from *poor performance* to *very good performance*. The final stage consisted of analyzing the ratings using the *Rasch* method for the purpose of providing statistical data. The purpose of the study was to illuminate the "ideal or essential characteristics of quality in the work or school of principals" (p. 405). The findings revealed that principals have a "very narrow range of opinion about what counts as good performance" (Louden & Wildy, 1999, p. 417). Louden and Wildy contended that they have provided an empirically grounded basis for the future development of performance assessments of the work of principals.

A second study completed by Rosenblatt and Somech (1998) examined elementary school principals using a structured observation technique. A formal job description, used as a performance criterion, was compared to the work functions of the principals in the study. The

researchers used the work dimensions of brevity, fragmentation, and variety as a means of determining the nature of the principals' work. Rosenblatt and Somech ensured that observers underwent extensive training in areas such as observation techniques and coding for the purpose of interrater reliability. The observers noted activities that occurred in a time block (in minutes). The observers in Rosenblatt and Somech's (1998) study analyzed the following variables:

- function—the content of the work as represented from the job description;
- location—where the activity was recorded, such as the principal's office, teachers' lounge, classroom, school yard;
- interaction mate—the people with whom the principal interacted such as teachers, students, parents, supervisors;
- communication means—the manner that communication was carried out such as face-to-face, telephone, writing;
- initiation—recorded whether the principal initiated each activity;
- planning—recorded whether the principal planned each activity; and,
- decision making—recorded whether each activity ended with a decision. (pp. 513-514)

Rosenblatt and Somech (1998) found that the results of the study revealed performances much like other types of managers, and the principals displayed similarities relative "to the brief, varied, and fragmented nature of principals' work" (p. 528). Rosenblatt and Somech concluded that "the contribution of this study lies mainly in the analysis of the gap between the expectations of principals and the way they fulfill them" (p. 528).

Clayton-Jones et al. (1993) considered "from a theoretical perspective performance appraisal as a concept" (p. 110) by principals. Using a questionnaire, perceptions and opinions regarding several dimensions of the appraisal process were gathered from 122 elementary and secondary principals. The questionnaire was developed into two parts. The first part served to gather general background information about the respondents and the second part sought perceptions of performance appraisal. The Clayton-Jones et al. research results were important because "principals felt that their key responsibilities can be reliably appraised, particularly those

which are quantifiable and documented" (p. 130). Additionally, Clayton-Jones et al. found that "the principals responded favorably to the appraisal process. ...In general, the future acceptance and usefulness of performance appraisal of principals would seem to depend on its flexibility, enabling it to be adapted to different situations and needs" (p. 130).

Finally, a study of administrator performance assessment centers was conducted by Sirotnik and Durden (1996). The researchers sought to investigate "the construct and validity of administrator performance assessment centers and systems in *Administrator Diagnostic Inventory* (ADI)" (p. 539). Administrative performance assessment centers are used for diagnosis, certification, and selection of administrators. Essentially, performance assessment centers enable current administrators to be evaluated and diagnosed with prescribed methods for assistance in areas needing professional attention. Preservice administrators may receive certification and prospective administrators may be judged for potential job selection. The assessment center model included role-playing, simulations, and other performance exercises. Although the model has been used in business for many years, Sirotnik and Durden reported:

> However, the increased attention to performance outcomes and alternative assessment generally, and the concern for quality school leadership particularly, has generated renewed interest in utilizing assessment centers in the preparation, selection, and development of school administrators. (p. 540)

The ADI was established to provide both diagnostic information useful to practicing administrators and predictive information useful to school districts for the selection of administrators. This study sought to determine the validity of the ADI by administering the ADI to over 300 administrators during a 2 year period. Participants were assessed in 12 skill areas through a personal interview and simulations. Sirotnik and Durden's (1996) findings suggested that:

> Until such time that large-scale predictive validity studies are conducted and replicated, it may be wise to concentrate more on the diagnostic utility of the system and less on the use of the system for prediction selection, or certification. (p. 558)

Assessment centers have potential but are expensive, time-consuming, and labor-intensive (Sirotnik & Durden, 1996). Until their trade-offs have been studied in more depth, the research suggested to use the assessment centers for diagnostic evaluation and to avoid the centers' use for predictive value in the selection and certification of administrators.

Each of the reviewed studies yielded important and significant findings for the field of principal evaluation. The studies suggested that there is a great deal of attention now being given to the importance of school leadership in light of accountability. These four studies demonstrated that various research approaches may be designed in regard to methodology and scope of examining the assessment of school principals. Along with the current intensity for school accountability, there is a critical need for effective and high quality performance evaluation for principals (Duke, 1992; Erlandson & Hoyle, 1991). A study, such as this one, that examined the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools is timely and critical to the body of research.

Evaluators have a need to study standards. For evaluators to recognize "good" performance by a principal as compared to the ideal performance, they should be able to distinguish between relatively weak and strong performances from the general population of school principals (Louden & Wildy, 1999). Many state and national organizations have developed standards for principal evaluator use. One such widely used set of standards is called the Standards for School Leaders developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (1996). The Interstate Leaders Consortium (ISSLC) is a collaboration of state education agencies and professional development organizations committed to raising

performance standards for school leaders. The ISSLC established a standards framework for school leaders that is defined by three components: knowledge, dispositions, and performances. The initiative focused on the goal of improved school leadership performance in which the following standards for administrators were identified:

> A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by:
>
> 1 Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
> 2. Advocating nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
> 3. Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient and effective learning environment.
> 4. Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interest and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
> 5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
> 6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger population, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (p. 1)

Standards, such as the ISLLC Standards can guide professional practice, assist in holding professionals accountable, help in the development of goals for principals, and ensure that the evaluation considers whether the needs of students are being met. By using an accepted standard, the assessment is ensured to be timely, informative, influential, efficient, accurate, and easy to use (Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993).

In 1988, the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation developed the *Personnel Evaluation Standards*. The committee was comprised of evaluators, administrators, policy makers, and other educators from higher education. The work of the committee resulted in standards for assessing and developing personnel evaluation systems. The *Personnel Evaluation Standards* included:

- proprietary standards that protected the rights of individuals;
- utility standards that ensured that the evaluation processes provided useful information for the purpose of improving the individual;

- feasibility standards that ensured the process worked within the context of the school or system, was cost-effective while maximizing the collection of needed information, included involvement of all parties involved the development of the assessment; and,
- accuracy standards that helped provide valid and reliable information about the assessed individual.

As with any use of evaluation standards, a school system must study the intents of evaluation before adopting alignment to all standards. To illustrate this point, the Joint Committee (1988) proposed that school systems should assess their needs and apply emphasis where needed:

> Even though, all of the standards may be relevant to all personnel decisions, different standards might warrant more or less emphasis depending upon the particular personnel actions. Moreover, excessive emphasis on one standard can weaken performance on another. (p. 15)

Martens (1991) reported that not all schools or systems can incorporate all of the standards because of a number of factors including lack of personnel, money, or time. Schools or systems that use evaluation standards must assess each standard and adopt according to the specific needs and intents of evaluation for that school or system.

Accountability and School Improvement

Accountability and Policymakers

The issue of school improvement and the accountability for such improvement has resulted in a proliferation of literature and studies over the past two decades (Haydn, 2001). The study of school improvement has only developed as a distinct body of approaches since the late 1970s and early 1980s (Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001). The large amount of research may be a direct result of political interest in school effectiveness, school improvement, and school accountability (Chatterji, 2002; Desimone, 2002; Spillane, Reiser, & Reimer, 2002).

For the last 20 years, each U.S. president has brought to attention the promise of school accountability through educational reform and mandates to resolve our schools' problems. *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* was published in 1983, during the

Reagan presidency. The language, both powerful and negative toward the state of education, aroused national controversy about America's declining state of education (Doud, 1989). The report sparked education policy makers to originate school reform legislation, and this report awakened the American public to school change (Bell, 1993). The George Bush presidency followed, and he was labeled as "The Education President." President Clinton, in his January 19, 1999 State of the Union address, said that he wanted the federal government to have an expanded role in education. President Clinton also supported that every state should have a comprehensive plan for improving schools (Kirchhoff, 1999). According to Kirchoff, the federal government expected states to rework their schools by upgrading curricula and by introducing academic standards. Meeting state standards through widespread student testing has become the "new focus" for school accountability (Houston, 2001).

In 1997, Richard Riley, the Secretary of Education during President Clinton's term, summarized the current reform movement in this way:

> We cannot and must not tolerate failing schools. We need to stop making excuses and get on with the business of fixing our schools. We have the unique opportunity to do what is best for our children. This should be our great patriotic cause, our national mission: giving all of our children a world-class education by putting standards of excellence in to action. (United States Department of Education, 1998)

President George W. Bush has continued with expanding the role of the federal government in educational reform by requiring testing of all students in grades three through eight. Additionally, all 50 states must participate in the National Assessment of Educational Progress as a means of monitoring accountability (Lewis, 2001). Roderick Paige, current Secretary of Education, continued with the call for policies relative to failing schools by stating, "I understand that education is primarily a local and state responsibility. But our federal government cannot stand by and tolerate failing schools, because America will not tolerate it"

(2001, ¶ 10). In January, 2002, President George W. Bush signed into law the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA).* This act called for sanctions to be imposed on schools failing to perform on mandated standardized tests.

School improvement is a topic that has stirred interest in other countries as well. Policymakers in the United Kingdom have instituted a system of inspecting school effectiveness and then ranking schools for comparison purposes (Haydn, 2001). The patterns of how "schools lose their way" (Fink, 1999, p. 132) cross national borders.

As states responded to federal demands, the topic of school improvement became increasingly important to researchers and practitioners. This study will add to the body of research as no research studies could be found that examined if the superintendent's supervisory and evaluative practices change when supervising and evaluating principals of schools that are in need of improvement. The study will add to the school improvement research in a narrow way, the work of superintendents in the realm of supervision and evaluation of principals.

History of School Improvement

The history of school improvement has undergone three different stages. In the late 1970s, school improvement focused on organizational change, the ownership of change by school personnel, and school self-evaluation. The free-floating approach lacked an emphasis on any programmatic, systematic, or coherent manner of connecting the organizational change to student learning (Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001). In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. The findings of this report were critical of schools, characterizing them as bureaucratic and short-sighted (Cookson 1995).

In the early 1990s, the communities of school improvement and school effectiveness began interacting. The school improvement experts advocated the practice of providing schools with guidelines and strategies for taking school improvement into the classroom (Evers & Walberg, 2002). The effective schools experts advocated for value-added methodologies for judging school improvements (Lezotte, 1997). Another practice used extensively was disaggregating student and school data by breaking down the component parts of departments and teachers (Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001). A link between organizational change and learner outcomes developed during this period. Near the end of this period is when governmental agencies started recognizing the insights of the effective schools and improving schools. At this point, agencies began to address the need for school improvement through their policies (Evers & Walberg, 2002).

The third and current phase of school improvement began in the mid to late 1990s. In 1994, President Clinton signed the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. *Goals 2000* was the Clinton administration's reform framework for the nation's schools. *Goals 2000* was a turning point for the federal government, as this period was the first time that the federal government claimed oversight to nationwide school reform (Cookson, 1995). The newest phase has developed out of the evidence that widespread educational reforms have not produced the expected results (Harris, 2002). Although there have been recent increases in the number of reform efforts, the results of these efforts have not been particularly successful (Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001).

The major differences between phases one and two and phase three of school improvement are numerous. In phase three, one would find:

- An increased focus on student outcomes;

- Teachers' instructional and behavioral practices are targeted for inspection;
- A knowledge base of the research and best practices which are supported with an infrastructure that allows for better utilization;
- An increased awareness of building capacity, including strategic planning, staff development, and the use of outside agencies;
- Quality measured in a manner that utilizes both qualitative and quantitative research data;
- An organizational control factor that insures consistency in practice among all members of program implementation;
- A balance of creating a vision and creating the support mechanisms to carry it out;
- An increased practice of insuring that there is adequate and appropriate training and professional development for all members of the improvement program (Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001).

The third phase consists of components that, when examined together, "represent an innovative approach to generating and sustaining improvement in the context of substantial external pressures upon schools to improve" (Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001, p. 463).

School Improvement and Low Performing Schools

Schools across the United States are working to improve student achievement (Bray & Challinor, 2001). Many schools are faced with socioeconomic issues and racial differences that can be used as excuses for school failure. All students are expected to meet high goals on state academic standards (Lezotte & Bancroft, 1985), yet schools have various demographics from which to work. Students from differing backgrounds have needs that may not be addressed by using traditional educational practices. Schools are searching for practices that ensure successful student achievement regardless of their backgrounds. Harris and Valverde (1976) asserted that

there is a growing urgency for a better education system to meet the needs of a multicultural society. Given the time and resources, many schools believe that all children can learn (Bray & Challinor, 2001).

Strong accountability factors have been placed on schools and teachers. Policymakers are observing these accountability approaches to determine if accountability factors are improving the performance of students (O'Day, 2002). O'Day suggested that the primary objective of standards-based reform is the opportunity for schools to develop curriculum goals that are consistent for all students. Sunderman (2001) asserted, "the expectation is that this should improve the performance of all students, including Title I students" (p. 503). Improving Title I performance is the greatest challenge among schools. Students in low-income schools are performing from two to four years behind students in affluent schools (Kirchhoff, 1999).

As the largest single federal investment in schooling, Title I of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) provides almost $7 billion to school systems across the country to improve education for children that are at-risk of school failure and who live in low-income communities (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2003). In 2002, 58% of all schools (47,500) received Title I supplemental instruction funding from the federal government. Title I funding reaches over 14.9 million children annually (U. S. Department of Education, 2002). Title I supports supplemental instruction.

The 1994 Title I reauthorization required states to establish rigorous and explicit criteria for measuring school progress. Schools not meeting the criteria for two out of every three years are considered low performing schools and labeled by Title I as "schools in need of improvement." In 1999, 20% of all Title I schools were designated as such. By 2001, the number grew to 47% (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). The enormity of schools and children

affected by Title I and the need to improve calls for additional research in a number of areas related to school improvement. With the increasing demand for accountability, a study such as this one, which examines the implementation of policy, related to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools is timely.

The work of the government, school systems, and school leaders to improve schools is complicated and includes a vast array of reforms, strategies, approaches, and interventions. Among almost all reform efforts is the formation of standards. *The Goals 2000 Act* set forth the notion that without standards, American students would not be able to be competitive within the increasingly competitive global economy (Cookson, 1995). The standards movement, a move by states to respond to federal reform, began to establish curriculum standards and tests to measure the achievement of students in meeting those standards. The focus of the standards movement has resulted in schools giving attention primarily to test results and meeting state standards (Houston, 2001).

An effective school can be defined as a school in which equal proportions of students master the curriculum regardless of the students' family income level (Bray & Challinor, 2001). It is difficult knowing what makes one school effective over another. It cannot be assumed that the practices that made one school effective would have the same effect if used at another school (Haydn, 2001).

There is a need to be able to bring school improvement and school effectiveness together within the scope of our educational knowledge base so that practices and policies are based on research and data. At this time, however, there are stumbling blocks that prevent a clear understanding of school improvement. According to Hopkins, Reynolds, and Gray (2001), there are four stumbling blocks:

- The existing studies of effective schools need more research on how schools become effective over time rather than just a point in time. The research must include what it takes to remain effective once deemed to be effective. This reflects a thought that it requires different strategies to remain effective.
- There is a need to understand how to improve ineffective schools. Policymakers have studied the practices of effective schools, yet, there appears to be no systemic quality that can be replicated in all situations. It is uncertain how these strategies would work at other sites with differing factors.
- The lack of historical data on improving schools creates problems in documenting change over a long period of time. Typical studies of school change exist over a relatively short time span.
- Although governments and school improvement experts have a strong interest in the outcome of school effectiveness, there are few studies that have researched the effect of improvement upon school processes and the outcomes of students.

School improvement suffers from a challenge of sustained effort. With many school improvement projects, "the momentum for innovation and development" (Harris, 2001, p. 264) is difficult to maintain. As organizations attempt change efforts, there is the expected "implementation dip" as they move forward. Schools that undergo change may have stakeholders that are experiencing anxiety and will question the value of the change.

Teachers may no longer have a feeling of being proficient at what they do because they do not readily see results. Effective leaders are prepared for the expected dip and are sensitive to the nature of the implementation. These leaders use their enthusiasm, optimism, and vision to keep people moving forward (Fullan, 2001). It is the leader that does not have these qualities that

allow reform efforts to lose momentum. The principal must prepare for changes if school improvement is to occur. The principal must get in the habit of constant learning, such as active experimentation, reflective practice, coaching, collegial learning, and assessing new ideas (Schön, 1987). School improvement requires change in a highly interactive organization—the school. Fullan (1997) summarized change in this way:

> Paradoxically, counting on oneself for a good cause in a highly interactive organization is the key to fundamental organizational change. People change organizations. The starting point is not system change, or change in those around us, but taking action ourselves. The challenge is to improve education in the only way it can—through the day-to-day actions of empowered individuals. (p. 47)

The role of the principal as an active and ongoing supporter of reform is critical to the success of a schoolwide change effort (Muncey & McQuillan, 1996). For improvements to occur at the district and building levels, the superintendent must build capacity for change, Schlecty (1997) deems this central concern as "the most critical work of the superintendent and those who work in the district office" (p. 100). As principals of low performing schools work toward school improvement, it will be important to determine if and how they are supervised and evaluated by superintendents. A study like this one which examines the implementation of policy related to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools will be important as it may add understanding to the process of school improvement and the work of the superintendent.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. The interest in increasing accountability for all schools has resulted in policies at the state and federal levels requiring

schools to make progress toward meeting established academic standards (Chatterji, 2002; Desimone, 2002; Spillane, et al., 2002).

Many schools have been identified by the Title I section of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* as being low performing. Education reform expects low performing schools to take action to improve student performance on standardized tests. Adequate yearly progress is required of these schools to have the "schools in need of improvement" label removed. In light of the policies, additional research is needed to determine what practices may impact school improvement.

The literature has revealed an abundance of research on teacher evaluation and supervision; however, there is a dearth of research on the supervision and evaluation of the principal (Rallis & Goldring, 1993). The importance of the principal's leadership in the school has been established in the school (Barth, 1990, Sergiovanni, 1995). Delaney (1997) reported that there is a general dependence of a school and its staff on the principal. According to Stufflebeam and Nevo (1993), the success of American schools depends on the quality of the principal and there is a need for careful evaluation of their performance. Yet, the supervision and evaluation of the principal by superintendents has not been researched a great deal.

Education reform has resulted in numerous policies. The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* as an educational reform has called for accountability through improved student performance, and this legislation has elevated the work and accountability of the principal. With the reform movement, the primary purpose of principal evaluation changed from judgments about their managerial behaviors to an assessment of their instructional leadership skills (Thomas, et al., 2000). The focus on the principal as instructional leader has emerged in an effort to emphasize the importance of student achievement (Harrington-Lueker, 1998).

Holdaway and Genge (1995) explained that superintendents occupy key positions in the school system, and superintendents assume the role of supervisors of principals. Holdaway and Genge stated that through their actions, superintendents indirectly impact student performance in an important way. More study is needed on the supervisory and evaluative practices of superintendents and their efforts of working with principals.

A review of premiere educational research journals and educational administration textbooks written for superintendents found scarce coverage devoted to either the supervisory or evaluative practices of superintendents. Additionally, a number of recent doctoral research studies related to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents called for more studies in light of the number of policies devoted to accountability and school improvement. This study will be important to the body of knowledge as it examined the implementation of policy related to the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of recent accountability policies of low performing schools that were identified and labeled as such by test-score data. The researcher sought to compare superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of low performing schools to the same superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of schools that were not low performing during the 2002 school year.

Employing various methods and corresponding analysis, the researcher examined state requirements for principal evaluation and the responsibilities of the local school superintendent to evaluate and to supervise school principals before and after implementation of state accountability laws related to the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (*NCLB*). Both qualitative and quantitative methods provided comparisons and contrasts of superintendents supervisory and evaluative practices of principals before and after the implementation of policies and practices related to school improvement.

The study used a mixed method research design to allow for a greater examination of the conditions and behaviors of two groups of superintendents and principals prior to and after major federal and state accountability policies were implemented, namely the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* and the *A-Plus Educational Reform Act of 2000*. The study used two approaches to collect data for the purpose of examining the superintendents' supervisory and evaluative

practices of principals of low performing Title I schools and comparing results of superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of Title I schools that were not low performing in the same time period. The data generated were used to determine if evaluative and supervisory practices of superintendents changed in light of the schools in which the principals served were labeled low performing according to "adequate yearly progress" (AYP) guidelines set forth in *NCLB*.

This chapter includes a description of the research design, a list of the research questions, the population and sample, the instrumentation used to collect the data, and data collection procedures. Finally, the chapter concludes with the procedures used to analyze the data.

Research Design

The overall research design employed both qualitative and quantitative methods. The model used was closely related to the "dominant-less dominant" design (Creswell, 2002) in which qualitative methods, including interviews with select superintendents ($N = 5$) allowed the researcher to develop the dominant method of data collection, the survey of superintendents ($N = 146$) from as many school systems in Georgia. The smaller qualitative procedures not only assisted with establishing internal validity but also assisted with providing richness of detail, a defining feature of qualitative methods.

A mixed method approach of study incorporates the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study. For this study, the mixed method procedure called the sequential exploratory model was used. Creswell (2002) described this model as one that explores the topic with a small number of participants in a qualitative manner and then explores in a quantitative manner using a larger number of participants. For this study, the predominant method is quantitative and the less dominant method is qualitative.

The integration of the quantitative and qualitative data occurred during the analysis phase in which the qualitative data were used to describe aspects of the quantitative data set, the results of the 44 item instrument, the *Survey of Superintendents' Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* (See Appendix A) and demographic data. The qualitative data may be used to describe an aspect of the quantitative study that is difficult to quantify. Creswell (2002) asserted that the mixed model "is used so that a researcher can gain broader perspectives as a result of using the different methods as opposed to using the predominant method alone" (p. 218). The review of literature and the qualitative data from the interviews with the superintendents informed the development of the instrument, the *Survey of Superintendents' Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* (*SSSEPP*).

Structured Interviews with Select System Superintendents

A small number of select system superintendent ($N = 5$) were interviewed. Reputational sampling was used to select the interview participants to gain the perspectives of superintendents relative to the supervision and evaluation of principals of Title I low performing and performing schools. The researcher consulted with members of the doctoral cohort in which he was enrolled. A list of names was developed and then the names of superintendents were reviewed by two members of the dissertation committee. From this list of nine superintendents, two were eliminated because the systems in which they worked were too geographically distant, and two names were eliminated from the list because they were new to their current system.

Each of the superintendents' school systems included Title I schools that were considered to be low performing and Title I schools that were considered to be performing based on AYP. The interviewed superintendents were selected using the following criteria:

1. The participants were superintendents who had a minimum of three years experience as superintendent.
2. The superintendent's system included low performing Title I schools and performing Title I schools.
3. The superintendents were actively involved in the supervision and evaluation of principals.
4. The superintendents' system was within 100 miles from the researcher's residence.

Interviewees signed copies of a Participant Consent Form (Appendix B). One copy was given to the participant and one copy was retained by the researcher. The researcher explained the interview process and assured confidentiality to each interviewee before the interview began.

The superintendents were assigned pseudonyms for the purpose of protecting the identities of the participants as well as the school systems. The superintendents selected were:

- Mr. Meriwether, the superintendent of a small middle Georgia school system that included four schools. He has been a superintendent in the system for five years.
- Mr. Somerset, the superintendent of a small middle Georgia school system that included seven schools. He has been a superintendent for four years.
- Ms. Rivers, the superintendent of a large, urban middle Georgia school system that included 44 schools. She has been a superintendent for four years.
- Mr. Bannister, the superintendent of a mid-size middle Georgia school system that included 10 schools. He has been a superintendent for 10 years.
- Mr. Darby, the superintendent of a mid-size north Georgia school system that included 18 schools. Mr. Darby has been a superintendent for 16 years.

Additionally, the gender makeup of interviewed superintendents reflected the same gender makeup of superintendents in the state of Georgia. Females made up18% of all superintendents in Georgia and 20 %, or one of five, of the superintendents interviewed, were female.

Each interview was scheduled for approximately 90 minutes. The interview questions were open ended. Probing questions were included for the purpose of gaining detail related to supervisory and evaluative practices. The following questions were used in the structured interview of the five superintendents to gain their perspectives on change in supervisory and evaluative practices of principals in performing and low performing Title I schools. The questions included:

1. How did you conduct your supervisory approach differently for those principals where changes occurred (change from performing to low performing)?
2. Explain how you collected sources of information in making evaluative decision regarding the performance of principals in schools where there were changes in status from performing to low performing.
3. Do you believe that the change in your supervisory practice cause a difference in school performance or school improvement?
4. Do you believe that the change in the evaluation of the principal cause a difference in school performance or school improvement?
5. What effect would you say that the school's low performance status had on the initiation of changes in your supervisory or evaluation practices?
6. What are the differences in supervisory and evaluative practices for principals in Title I low performing schools versus the principals of Title I schools that were performing?

Each interview was audio-recorded. Fieldnotes were taken by the researcher for the purpose of aiding clarification during the analysis phase. The fieldnotes also assisted the researcher when clarification was required of the interviewee. Transcripts were developed so that the researcher could read content, code major findings, and develop categories based on the superintendent interviews. Table 5 highlights the codes with corresponding categories.

Table 5

Highlights of Codes with Corresponding Categories

Codes	Corresponding Categories
SA	Student Achievement
GO	Goals
IP	Improvement Plan
EX	Expectations
STF	Staffing
PL	Planning
FA	Facilities
RE	Resources
TD	Test Data
TR	Training
IS	Instructional Support
SO	School Organization
SH	Stake Holders
SC	School Climate
SD	Staff Development
QC	Quality Delivery of Curriculum

Next, the transcripts were analyzed with the corresponding Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI) dimensions. The GLEI, originally developed in 1990 and revised in 1992, was designed to evaluate the job-related annual performance of those required to have a leadership certificate by the Georgia Board of Education. The GLEI consists of seven multidimensional performance areas that may be related to effective instructional leadership and management techniques. The performance areas include:

1. curriculum;
2. student performance;
3. staff performance;
4. academic focus;
5. communication;
6. organizational setting; and,
7. comprehensive improvement plans.

Trained evaluators conduct the evaluations by virtue of direct observation or through documentation including products prepared directly or indirectly by the employee. The superintendent is responsible for the evaluations for school-based leadership personnel, including principals. A designee may be named by the superintendent to conduct the evaluations of school-based administrators.

To further aid in the analysis of the interview transcripts, the researcher developed a coding system where the transcribed interviews could be matched to the corresponding GLEI dimensions. Table 6 highlights codes used to match the superintendents' thoughts with the GLEI dimensions.

Table 6

Highlights of Codes Matched to GLEI Dimensions

Codes	Corresponding GLEI Dimension
SI, PL, BP,	Improvement Plans
GO, IS, CA, QC	Curriculum
SO, FA, RE, OC, BU, BA	Organizational Setting

Then patterns were identified regarding the process factors related to the supervision and evaluation of principals by the superintendents. From this data and the review of current

supervision and evaluation literature, the researcher used the developed categories to construct questions for the survey instrument. Table 7 portrays the categories in which questions were developed.

Table 7

Codes with Corresponding Categories and Survey Questions

Codes	Category	Survey Question
SG, PG, IN, SCG, GO, IS	Curriculum	1. My practice of evaluating the principal's has changed.
QC, CA, IN, IS, CD	Curriculum	2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.
IS, IN, QC, IR	Curriculum	3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.
AD, PD, TD	Student Performance	4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.
AD, PD, DD	Student Performance	5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.
AD, PD, DD, TD, UD	Student Performance	6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.
LC, MT, SD, OL	Staff Performance	7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.
HP, PC, MP, TQ, PF, ES, RS. TA, SU, SN, HS, OE, STF, DO	Staff Performance	8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.
RL, ST, PS, PB, CL, TI	Staff Performance	9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.
IT, UT, KI, BK, PLT	Academic Focus	10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.
EX, SE, MS, OT SB, SA	Academic Focus	11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.
IP, IPR, DP, QT, WT, SR, SV, CR	Academic Focus	12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.

Table 7 (Continued)

Codes with Corresponding Categories and Survey Questions

Codes	Category	Survey Question
OB, SV, SR, TA, WT, VI, DC, CR, FB	Communication	13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.
CS, SO, HC, IM, CP	Communication	14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.
FB, LP, LB, SI, SH	Communication	15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stakeholder input and provide feedback has changed.
BA, MB, BS	Organizational Skills	16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.
FA, RE, SO, FC	Organizational Skills	17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.
SO, LC, QT, CD, STI	Organizational Skills	18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.
PL, UP, PP, SIP	Improvement Plans	19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.
MIP, UP, SIP	Improvement Plans	20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.
SIP, MIP, SR, WT, VI	Improvement Plans	21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.
SS, UI, IP, LD, IL, CA, PC, HL	Overall Improvement	22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.

Survey Development

The dominant approach of this study was a survey (Creswell, 2002). The research design included a survey developed for the purpose of quantifying descriptions of practices of superintendents that supervised or evaluated principals in low performing Title I schools and principals of Title I schools not labeled as low performing in the same time period across the State of Georgia in 2002. The survey generated data that were then analyzed in a descriptive

research approach so that the practices of the superintendents could be documented and analyzed by comparing and contrasting results with current literature relative to superintendent supervisory practices of principals.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' evaluative practices before and after the status of the school was announced?
2. Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced?

Instrumentation

Survey of Superintendents' Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals (SSSEPP)

Data were collected relating to the supervisory and evaluative practices of superintendents of principals of Title I schools that have a low performing status and of principals of Title I schools that did not have a low performing status. The low performing status was the independent variable and the supervisory and evaluative practices of the superintendents were the dependent variables. A questionnaire was developed by the researcher called the *Survey of Superintendents' Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* (SSSEPP). The instrument consisted of questions that were developed from specific indicators that were identified in the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI) and data collected from the qualitative interviews and that could be correlated to the existing body of research on principal supervision and evaluation.

The use of a questionnaire or survey was efficient for both the researcher and the members of the sample. A questionnaire is relatively inexpensive, and allows for more information from a larger sample that can be collected by mail (Gay, 1992). The use of the questionnaire was especially useful for this study since the schools surveyed were spread over a wide geographical area and included 146 school systems.

Using a five-point Likert scaled survey (See Figure 1), superintendents were asked to rate changes in their supervisory and evaluation practices related to the principals that they supervise and evaluate in Title low performing and Title I performing schools from the same system.

DIRECTIONS: The following statements relate to the supervisory and evaluative practices of principals by superintendents in two types of Title I schools in your system. READ the statements in the center column and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement. For each item, please CIRCLE the number that best describes your practices. Answer in **both** the left column for low performing Title I Schools and right column for performing Title I Schools. Your responses in the **left** columns relate to Title I schools that were once performing but became low performing. Your responses in the **right** column relate to Title I schools that were performing well and are still performing well (not low performing).

LOW PERFORMING SCHOOLS Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree		PERFORMING SCHOOLS Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
					CURRICULUM					
1	2	3	4	5	1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.	1	2	3	4	5

Figure 1. Survey of superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals; two parallel Likert scales to be answered by each superintendent.

Superintendents were asked to complete a survey consisting of one set of 22 questions to be answered under two different conditions for a total of 44 responses. The survey included a standard set of 22 questions that superintendents responded to relative to low performing Title I schools and then answered relative to performing Title I schools. The directions and a sample of questions are included in Figure 1.

Another part of the survey gathered responses to gain demographic data. The information consisted of:

- The superintendent's gender;
- The number of years the superintendent served as superintendent in the current school system;
- The total number of years the superintendent has served as superintendent; and
- The number of years the superintendent was in education.

To ease the burden of completing a lengthy demographic survey by the superintendents, the researcher collected additional demographic data for each system. The pilot study revealed that some demographic data could be easily collected without relying on the superintendent for each piece of data. As a result, the researcher was able to access public information for the following data:

- The number of Title I schools in each school system;
- The number of Title I schools in each school system considered low performing;
- Metropolitan Statistical Area status; and
- The geographical location of the system within the state of Georgia.

The U.S. Census Bureau states that the general idea of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) is that of a core area containing a substantial population nucleus, together with adjacent

communities having a high degree of social and economic integration with that core. MSAs are used by the federal government for purposes of collecting Federal data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). The demographic information was collected to better characterize the respondents and the systems that participated in the study.

Validity and Reliability of the Survey

The survey's content was developed by 1) researching the literature on the superintendent relative to the supervision and evaluation of principals, 2) correlating the seven dimensions of the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI) with current and relevant literature in supervision and evaluation of principals, and 3) examining the findings from the qualitative portion of the study through the transcripts from the interviews with the five superintendents.

Validity

The researcher sought to insure validity by using a panel of expert judges that reviewed for content validity. Written and verbal feedback was requested with regard to the quality of directions, clarity, content validity, and completion time of the draft survey. Gay (1992) believed that content validity can be determined only by a set of knowledgeable experts in the subject matter. The jury consisted of six superintendents from selected school systems and four university professors with expertise in the field of supervision and evaluation. The expert jury panel rated the survey questions on a scale of 1 to 5 to determine if the questions were relevant to the supportive literature and the intent of the questionnaire. The review by the panel served as the basis for the content validity. Based on the information received from the jury, the researcher made minor adjustments to the survey by making changes in the wording of the directions, rewording two questions for clarity, switching the order of two questions, and reducing the

number of demographic questions which reduced the time for survey completion from 20 minutes to 13 minutes.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was completed in which the *Survey of Superintendent Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* was given to a sample including superintendents (*N*=5), assistant superintendents (*N*=6), principals (*N*=22) and doctoral students (*N*=21) enrolled in University of Georgia EDUL 8990 during fall 2003 for determining reliability.

The use of Cronbach's coefficient *alpha* determined the degree of reliability and internal consistency (Gay, 1992). The Cronbach's coefficient *alpha* was calculated based on the results from the pilot study and again calculated from the responses in the full study. The data in the pilot study yielded an alpha coefficient of .9744. The Cronbach's *alpha* from the completed surveys of the *SSSEPP* yielded a coefficient of .9835. The *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* was used to calculate the Cronbach coefficient alpha.

Data Collection Procedures

The permission of the University of Georgia's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects was granted to conduct the study. Surveys were sent to school systems that included low performing Title I schools as of the 2002 school year. The researcher used the Georgia State Department of Education's list of Title I schools and their performance status to determine school systems that had low performing Title I schools. The State Department of Education publishes the list on an annual basis. The researcher then determined which school systems' superintendents would be sent the SSSEPP (See Table 8). After excluding all disqualifying systems, 146 school system superintendents received the SSSEPP.

Table 8

Systems That Qualified to Receive SSSEPP

Description	# of school systems
School Systems in Georgia	180
Systems with Superintendents New to System (disqualified)	16
Systems Undergoing Major Governance Restructuring (disqualified)	1
Systems Without a low performing and performing Title I school (disqualified)	17
TOTAL Systems Receiving SSSEPP (qualified)	146

The *Survey of Superintendent Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* was mailed to superintendents (*N*=146) that met the qualifying criteria. The surveys were mailed out in mid-September, 2003 with the latest return date of October 10, 2003. Included in the survey packet were a cover letter that gave instructions for completion and an explanation of the intent of the study (Appendix C) the survey itself (Appendix A), and a pre-addressed, stamped envelope to be used for returning the survey. A follow-up reminder was mailed after two weeks to non-respondents to encourage participation (Appendix D). Also, follow-up e-mails and telephone calls were made to system superintendents who did not respond. The surveys were coded for the purpose of tracking survey return. Of the 146 surveys mailed to superintendents, 113 were returned for a return rate of 77.40%. Eight of the surveys were not complete or returned after the deadline and were not used. There were 105 useable surveys from superintendents yielding a response rate of 71.91%.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The researcher used descriptive statistical procedures and inferential statistical procedures to analyze the data that were collected from the SSSEPP. Demographic data were produced for the purpose of describing the participants by number and percentage. Additionally, descriptive statistical procedures produced the frequency (number), the mean (average), and the standard deviation (amount of variability) for each response gained from the surveyed superintendents (N=146) for the five-part Likert scale.

Next, dependent paired sample t-test descriptive statistics were produced for the overall survey responses, the evaluation items only, the supervision items only, seven dimensional constructs of the survey, and each of the 22 survey items. The procedure yielded the number, mean, standard deviation, and standard error mean for paired samples of low performing and performing schools.

Inferential tests known as dependent paired sample t-tests were calculated for t-values to determine if the mean differences in each of the prior paired tests were statistically significant. In addition to the t-value, the mean, standard deviation, standard error mean, degree of freedom, and significance (2-tailed) were included in the results. These tests were completed for the overall survey, the evaluation items only, the supervision items only, the seven dimensional constructs of the survey, and each of the 22 items of the survey. All paired samples included the superintendents' Title I low performing school responses paired with the superintendents' Title I performing school responses.

Dependent paired sample correlations were calculated for the overall survey, the evaluation items only, the supervision items only, the seven dimensional constructs, and each of the 22 items of the survey to determine the magnitude of the relationship between each pair of

variables. The Pearson correlation coefficients (r) were calculated and reported with the statistical significance (p).

Finally, one-way ANOVA tests were completed. The ANOVA tests were performed for each group of demographic data to determine if there were significance among the groups within each demographic area. There were nine separate demographical areas for which the ANOVA tests were performed.

The data analysis included a variety of statistical tests to better characterize changes, if any, among superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of Title I schools that were once performing but became low performing and Title I performing schools that are still considered performing. All data were analyzed for the purpose of answering the overall research questions and accepting or rejecting the two null hypotheses.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses stated in the null form are enumerated for testing:

$H_0$1: There is no significant difference in the relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in principals' performance evaluation before and after the status of the school was announced.

$H_0$2: There is no significant difference in the relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced.

Chapter Summary

A two part data collection approach was used by the researcher to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. The study was a mixed method approach that was both quantitative and

qualitative in nature. The mixed method approach used was the sequential exploratory model. This method allowed for qualitative data to be collected through structured interviews followed by a survey sent to all qualifying superintendents across the state of Georgia (N=146) to quantify changes in superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices.

The single structured interview was conducted with selected superintendents (N =5) for the purpose of collecting data relative to their supervisory and evaluation practices of principals of Title I performing and Title I low performing schools. The audiotaped interviews were transcribed and then coded relative to emerging themes. The themes were used in the development of the *Survey of Superintendents' Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* (SSSEPP). The qualitative approach was the less-dominant component and was used to gain perspectives from the superintendent.

The researcher used methods to quantitatively determine if there were statistically significant patterns of school performance status and superintendent evaluative and supervisory practices using the data from the SSSEPP. The surveys were sent to 146 superintendents that met the qualifying criteria.

This chapter outlined the quantitative and qualitative study design and methods of data collection utilized to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. The knowledge gained by this study may assist superintendents and others that evaluate principals in understanding how supervision and evaluation impacts school improvement efforts in low performing schools. Policy makers, too, may gain insight in evaluating the impact of the evaluation of principals in light of accountability and low performing Title I schools.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents or designees in light of accountability and low performing schools. For this study, a mixed method approach of quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis was used. Creswell (2002) called this the sequential exploratory model. The researcher conducted structured interviews with selected school superintendents to gain perspectives about supervision and evaluation practices among superintendents of systems that have performing and low performing Title I schools. Additionally, the researcher sought to understand both the policy and implementation of principal evaluation and supervision through a survey administered to gain knowledge of implementation of policy. Selected superintendents (N=146) from school systems in Georgia were surveyed about their supervisory and evaluative practices related to principals of low performing, Title I schools. Of the 146 surveys mailed to superintendents, 113 were returned for a return rate of 77.40%. Five of the surveys were not complete, and three were returned after the deadline so those eight surveys were not used. There were 105 useable surveys from superintendents yielding a response rate of 71.91% (N=105).

The researcher reviewed current supervision and evaluation literature and found that limited studies have been conducted related to superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals. The researcher did not find any studies directly related to the supervision and evaluation of principals of low performing schools. Considering current federal and state

policies that impose student performance standards, the timeliness of this study is significant to superintendents that have low performing Title I schools in their school systems. The result of this study will also be important to policymakers as they consider the impact of school reform policy and school improvement initiatives.

A mixed method sequential exploratory approach was used to conduct interviews with selected superintendents (*N*=5) to gain perspectives of supervisory and evaluative practices. Those perspectives, the current related research, and the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument framework were used to formulate the survey called the *Survey of Superintendents' Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* (SSSEPP). The survey was then administered to all qualifying school superintendents (*N*=146) in the state of Georgia. See Table 8 in Chapter 3 regarding the sampling procedures and how superintendents were qualified or disqualified to participate in the study.

The information from the related research, the interview perspectives, the framework of the GLEI,[1] and the data from the survey were all used for gaining insight into possible changes in superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals in Title I schools after the initiation of major federal and state school reform policies. The researcher sought to gain insight into the areas of the principal's work that resulted in the superintendents supervising or evaluating differently since the initiation of a major federal school reform policy known as *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* and, in Georgia, a major state educational policy known as the *A-Plus Educational Reform Act of 2000*.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic information was collected about each superintendent including: (a)

[1] GLEI is the state-provided evaluation instrument used for evaluating principals in Georgia .

gender, (b) number of years as superintendent in current position, (c) number of total years as superintendent, (d) number of years in education, (e) number of principals evaluated by the superintendent, (f) number of Title I schools in the system, (g) percentage of low performing Title I schools in the system, (h) Metropolitan Statistical Area status,[2] and (i) system's geographical location within the state of Georgia. The demographic information allowed the researcher to create a profile of the respondents and then to compare the responses from the various demographic groups. The demographic summary profile results are reported in Table 9.

Table 9

Demographic Summary of Survey Respondents

Title	Category	Number	%
Gender			
	Male	87	82.9
	Female	18	17.1
Years as Superintendent in Current System			
	0-3 years	45	42.9
	4-10 years	37	35.2
	11-20 years	5	17.1
	20+ years	5	4.8
Total Years Experience as a Superintendent			
	0-3 years	52	49.5
	4-10 years	41	39.0
	11-20 years	7	6.7
	20+ years	5	4.8
Total Years in Education			
	0-10 years	4	3.8
	11-20 years	8	7.6
	21-30 years	49	46.7
	30+ years	44	41.9
Number of Principals Evaluated in the System			
	0-5	49	46.7
	6-10	28	26.7
	11-20	15	14.3
	20+	13	12.4

[2] See Chapter 3 for explanation of MSA status.

Table 9 (Continued)

Demographic Summary of Survey Respondents

Title	Category	Number	%
Number of Title I Schools in the System			
	1-5	75	71.4
	6-10	22	21.0
	11-20	4	3.8
	21+	4	3.8
Title I Schools Considered Low Performing			
	Less than 26%	8	7.6
	26-50%	27	25.7
	51-75%	33	31.4
	76-100%	37	35.2
Metropolitan Statistics Area (MSA) Status			
	MSA	28	26.7
	Non-MSA	77	73.3
Geographic Location of School System Within the State of Georgia			
	Northeast	21	20.0
	Northwest	13	12.4
	Metro Atlanta	10	9.5
	Middle	23	21.9
	Southeast	22	21.0
	Southwest	16	15.2

Gender was the first demographic item addressed in the demographic section of the survey. The survey revealed that of the 105 superintendents that responded, 87 (82.9%) were male and 18 (17.1%) were female.

The second item addressed in the demographic section of the survey was the number of years the superintendent had served in the current school system. Of the 105 respondents, 45 (42.9%) had served 3 or less years in their current system. Thirty-seven (35.2%) superintendents had served 4 to 10 years in the current system. Eighteen (17.1%) had served as superintendents in their current system for 11 to 20 years and 5 (4.8%) had served over 20 years in their current school system.

The third question in the demographic section of the survey inquired about the total number of years served as superintendent. Of the 105 superintendents, 52 (49.5%) have served as a superintendent for a total 3 years or less and 37 (35.2) have served for 4 to 10 years. Seven (6.7%) have held the position of superintendent for 11 to 20 years, total. Additionally, five superintendents have held the position for a total of over 20 years.

The next demographic item asked for the total number of years of experience in education. Four (3.8%) of the 105 superintendents had 10 years or less of experience in education. Eight (7.6%) had 11 to 20 years experience. For the range of 21 to 30 years, there were 49 (46.7%) superintendents. Forty-four (41.9%) superintendents had more than 30 years in education.

Another demographic item asked for the number of principals in the system that the superintendent evaluated. The survey revealed that 49 (46.7%) of the superintendents evaluated 5 or less principals. Twenty-eight (26.7%) superintendents evaluated from 6 to 10 principals. Of the 105 superintendents, 15 (14.3%) evaluated 11 to 20 principals and 13 (12.4%) evaluated over 20 principals.

The number of Title I schools in each superintendent's school system yielded the following information, 75 (71.4%) superintendents had 5 or fewer, 22 (21.0%) had 6 to 10, 4 (3.8%) had 11 to 20, and 4 superintendents (3.8%) had over 20 Title I schools.

Of the Title I schools in each superintendent's school system, the researcher wanted to know what percentage of his or her schools were considered low performing. Eight (7.6%) superintendents had less than 26% of their Title I schools considered as low performing. Twenty-seven (25.7%) superintendents had between 26% and 50% of their Title I schools

considered as low performing. Thirty-three (31.4%) superintendents had between 51% and 75%, and 37 (35.2%) superintendents had between 76% and 100% Title I schools considered low performing.

The Metropolitan Statistical Area status for the 105 superintendents' school systems revealed that 28 (26.7%) were considered to be located in Metropolitan Statistical Areas, whereas, 77 (73.3%) were not located in a Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Finally, the geographic location of each of the superintendent's school systems within the state of Georgia was determined. Twenty-one (20.0%) superintendents worked in the northeast region of the state, and 13 (12.4%) superintendents worked in the northwest region. Of the 105 superintendents that responded, 10 (9.5%) worked in school systems in the metro-Atlanta area, and 23 (21.9%) worked in middle Georgia. Twenty-two (21.0%) superintendents' school systems were located in the southeast region of Georgia, and sixteen (15.2%) school systems were in the southwest region.

Survey Analysis

The first data examined were the descriptive information. The descriptive data in Table 10 included the frequency, mean, and standard deviation for each variable used in the analysis of the five-part Likert scale survey, the SSSEPP. The variables were paired using a paired sample technique. Each question served as a separate variable and was paired with itself because each question was answered under two conditions. Respondents answered each question for a Title I school that was once performing and then became low performing and again answered the same question for a Title I school that was once performing and is still performing. The performance status of the schools served as the two conditions.

Table 10

Frequency, Mean, and Standard Deviation Scores From Survey of Title I Low Performing (N=105) and Title I Performing Schools (N=103)

Questions		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Some-times	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	*S.D.*
CURRICULUM								
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.								
	Low Performing	13	14	10	43	25	3.50	1.32
	Performing	18	22	22	32	9	2.92	1.26
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.								
	Low Performing	10	9	14	38	34	3.73	1.27
	Performing	15	19	25	32	12	3.07	1.25
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.								
	Low Performing	9	11	17	39	29	3.65	1.23
	Performing	14	20	28	30	11	3.04	1.21
STUDENT PERFORMANCE								
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.								
	Low Performing	9	9	18	35	34	3.72	1.24
	Performing	14	20	21	31	17	3.17	1.30
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.								
	Low Performing	8	8	7	40	42	3.95	1.21
	Performing	11	20	18	31	23	3.34	1.31
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.								
	Low Performing	8	6	13	39	39	3.90	1.19
	Performing	12	17	23	33	18	3.27	1.26

Table 10 (continued)

Frequency, Mean, and Standard Deviation Scores From Survey of Title I Low Performing (N=105) and Title I Performing Schools (N=103)

Questions	Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Some-times	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	*S.D.*
STAFF PERFORMANCE							
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.							
Low Performing	10	9	19	37	30	3.65	1.25
Performing	13	17	32	28	13	3.11	1.20
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.							
Low Performing	11	14	22	32	26	3.46	1.29
Performing	14	25	36	24	4	2.80	1.07
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationhips with staff has changed.							
Low Performing	14	16	25	30	20	3.25	1.30
Performing	16	25	34	21	7	2.79	1.14
ACADEMIC FOCUS							
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.							
Low Performing	9	9	18	31	38	3.76	1.27
Performing	11	18	29	31	14	3.18	1.19
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.							
Low Performing	11	10	13	33	38	3.73	1.21
Performing	15	19	23	30	16	3.13	1.30
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.							
Low Performing	8	12	10	32	43	3.86	1.28
Performing	12	19	20	29	23	3.31	1.32

Table 10 (continued)

Frequency, Mean, and Standard Deviation Scores From Survey of Title I Low Performing (N=105) and Title I Performing Schools (N=103)

Questions	Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Some-times	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	*S.D.*
COMMUNICATION							
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.							
Low Performing	10	16	28	33	18	3.31	1.20
Performing	14	23	36	26	4	2.84	1.08
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.							
Low Performing	11	19	32	23	20	3.21	1.25
Performing	15	24	36	18	10	2.84	1.17
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.							
Low Performing	10	16	30	27	22	3.33	1.24
Performing	13	23	35	22	10	2.93	1.16
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING							
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.							
Low Performing	9	13	23	37	23	3.50	1.21
Performing	13	21	30	31	8	3.00	1.15
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.							
Low Performing	9	21	28	30	17	3.24	1.20
Performing	12	28	33	23	7	2.85	1.11
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.							
Low Performing	8	17	23	35	22	3.44	1.21
Performing	11	26	34	21	11	2.95	1.15

Table 10 (continued)

Frequency, Mean, and Standard Deviation Scores From Survey of Title I Low Performing (N=105) and Title I Performing Schools (N=103)

Questions	Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Some-times	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	*S.D.*
IMPROVEMENT PLANS							
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.							
Low Performing	8	7	11	34	45	3.96	1.22
Performing	11	18	23	29	22	3.32	1.29
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.							
Low Performing	8	7	16	36	38	3.85	1.21
Performing	10	19	24	33	17	3.27	1.22
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.							
Low Performing	8	8	22	37	30	3.70	1.19
Performing	11	19	27	33	13	3.17	1.19
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.							
Low Performing	6	4	24	33	38	3.89	1.12
Performing	7	12	32	27	25	3.50	1.18

In each of the 22 paired samples, the mean was greater for the Title I low performing schools than the Title I performing schools. Overall, the superintendents' responses indicated that there was more change that occurred in their supervisory and evaluative practices for Title I low performing schools than Title I performing schools. The determination of statistically significant different scores are represented through t-test and ANOVA test results in later tables. Qualitative interview data were not only used to assist in the development of the SSSEPP but also this data were examined to see if any additional meanings or explanations of the quantitative results could be made.

One superintendent noted in the interview that supervision is different for low performing schools. Ms. Rivers pointed out that schools in her system that were labeled low performing have more focused school visits from the central office. She shared:

> What I don't want us to do is have something called the 'superintendent visits.' It ought to be more about 'let's talk about specific goals and specific purpose.' There is a lot of 'come in and let's talk.' You know, how do you do stuff, where do you get things done? How do you get things done? What's the strategy for getting things done? Again, I think the talk is about a plan. You know, we've got this issue, then let's plan to work on it as opposed to events.

Another superintendent, Mr. Darby, viewed his supervision of low performing schools much the same as he supervises the performing schools. He stated,

> Again, the process isn't really any different, the expectations are that working through the school improvement plan process of what needs to be done and what attention it gets can be different. But, as for as the process itself, it isn't any different. The only difference may be that we work closely with them and try to support them and help them. We are here to help. I push it really hard. I don't know that I supervise them any differently in terms of what I do. My expectations of individual schools are basically the same in terms of performance.

Mr. Meriwether, a superintendent of a small school system stated that the small system size allows him to talk to principals routinely. He said, "There's probably not a day that goes by that we don't actually talk with every principal and it's not top-down type stuff. It's collaboration." He goes on to say:

> Principals are given certain latitude within a range to do what they think is the right thing to do. Take it and run. As long as they stay in that range and it's safe and it meets the needs of kids, they're going to make that decision. We're not going to run down and try to micromanage and second guess every decision. But because we do supervise principals on a regular basis, we know what their plan is. We are very aware of what's going on there.

Table 11 examined dependent paired samples t-test descriptive statistics for each pair of variables. In Table 11, the test was performed between all 22 questions for Title I low performing schools as a whole and the same 22 questions for Title I performing schools as a

whole. Additionally, the table shared the t-test descriptive statistics for a second pair of variables that included all evaluation items for Title I low performing and performing schools. The third paired sample listed in the table examined all supervision items for Title I low performing and performing schools. Then each dimensional construct of the survey was included as a paired sample.

Table 11

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test Descriptive Statistics for the Overall Survey, Evaluation, Supervision, and Survey Dimensions

Pair	Sample	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Standard Error Mean
			Overall		
1	Low Performing survey &	103	3.61	1.05	.1034
	Performing survey (items 1-22)	103	3.08	1.01	.0997
			Evaluation and supervision		
2	Evaluation (items 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22)				
	Low Performing	103	3.67	1.05	.1038
	Performing	103	3.14	1.02	.1007
3	Supervision (items 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22)				
	Low Performing	103	3.58	1.05	.1034
	Performing	103	3.06	1.00	.0989
			Survey dimensions		
4	Curriculum Dimension (items 1, 2, 3)				
	Low Performing	103	3.61	1.22	.1197
	Performing	103	3.01	1.17	.1155
5	Student Performance Dimension (items 4, 5, 6)				
	Low Performing	103	3.85	1.14	.1119
	Performing	103	3.26	1.20	.1187

Table 11 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test Descriptive Statistics for the Overall Survey, Evaluation, Supervision, and Survey Dimensions

Pair	Sample	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Standard Error Mean
6	Staff Performance Dimension (items 7, 8, 9)				
	Low Performing	103	3.44	1.77	.1160
	Performing	103	2.90	1.04	.1022
7	Academic Focus Dimension (items 10, 11, 12)				
	Low Performing	103	3.76	1.24	.1224
	Performing	103	3.21	1.21	.1195
8	Communication Dimension (items 13, 14, 15)				
	Low Performing	103	3.26	1.18	.1161
	Performing	103	2.87	1.08	.1064
9	Organizational Setting Dimension (items 16, 17, 18)				
	Low Performing	103	3.39	1.12	.1106
	Performing	103	2.94	1.05	.1035
10	Improvement Plans Dimension (items 19, 20, 21, 22)				
	Low Performing	103	3.82	1.17	.1151
	Performing	103	3.26	1.20	.1184

From the information in Table 11, the mean was higher for low performing schools as a whole than it was for performing schools. This indicated that a greater amount of change in supervision or evaluation occurred in Title I schools after the school became low performing than Title I schools that were performing during the same period.

In the second dependent paired sample, the mean is higher for Title I schools that were low performing than performing Title I schools indicating that superintendents changed their

evaluative practices to a greater degree in low performing schools. Also, superintendents changed their supervisory practices of principals of Title I low performing schools more than with principals of Title I performing schools, as indicated by a higher mean score for pair three. Of the seven dimensions, each pair yielded a higher mean for Title I low performing schools and Title I performing schools.

One superintendent, Mr. Bannister, stated the difference in supervision of a low performing school is that more time is spent at a school once it is considered low performing. It has also caused some turnover at the leadership level. He explained,

> I think part of it is they have a difficult time working with me. My leadership style is to say what I want it to look like and this is where we are going. Now, how you get there and how you take your team there is your business. Just be there at the right time. So, I am not one prescribing a plan. They did not get tot be principals to have someone tell them how to run their schools. We work strictly from strategic plans here. If I have to come and run your school you are not going to be there. So that is the way we operate.

When considering evaluative factors, Mr. Somerset explained it this way for principals of low performing schools, "The sense of urgency should be evident for a principal of a low performing school. I need to see that they understand the immediacy of their shortcomings. How they respond to their situation is important to me." He went on to say that his expectations for school improvement goals were different for principals of low performing schools. He indicated:

> Their goals should be narrow, simple, and direct. For performing schools they should be able to identify areas for growth, but again, it may be broad in focus, whereas, the low performing school is expected to narrow and focus on very specific areas—very direct.

Table 12 continued with the examination of dependent paired samples t-test descriptive statistics by pairing each item in the survey with itself. Each item in the survey was asked twice, once under the conditions of Title I schools that were once performing but became low performing and again for Title I schools that were once performing and were still performing during the same time period.

Table 12

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test Descriptive Statistics for Each Item in the Survey for Two Conditions

Pair	Sample	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Diff. in Means	*S.D.*	*t*	*Sig.*
CURRICULUM								
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.49	1.33	.563	1.01	5.68	*
	Performing	103	2.92	1.26				
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.72	1.27	.651	1.02	6.49	*
	Performing	103	3.07	1.25				
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.64	1.24	.602	.994	6.15	*
	Performing	103	3.04	1.21				
STUDENT PERFORMANCE								
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.71	1.25	.544	1.06	5.23	*
	Performing	103	3.17	1.30				
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.94	1.22	.651	1.02	6.09	*
	Performing	103	3.34	1.31				
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.89	1.20	.621	.981	6.43	*
	Performing	103	3.27	1.26				

Table 12 (Continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test Descriptive Statistics for Each Item in the Survey for Two Conditions

Pair	Sample	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Diff. in Means	*S.D*	*t.*	Sig.
STAFF PERFORMANCE								
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.63	1.25	.524	.884	6.02	*
	Performing	103	3.11	1.20				
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.45	1.30	.602	1.00	6.62	*
	Performing	103	2.80	1.07				
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.23	1.31	.447	.905	5.01	*
	Performing	103	2.79	1.14				
ACADEMIC FOCUS								
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.75	1.27	.563	.957	5.97	*
	Performing	103	3.18	1.19				
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.88	2.24	.757	2.14	3.58	*
	Performing	103	3.13	1.30				
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.84	1.29	.534	.937	5.78	*
	Performing	103	3.31	1.32				

Table 12 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test Descriptive Statistics for Each Item in the Survey for Two Conditions

Pair	Sample	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Diff. in Means	*S.D.*	*t*	Sig.
COMMUNICATION								
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.29	1.20	.534	.937	5.78	*
	Performing	103	2.84	1.08				
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.18	1.24	.456	.764	6.06	*
	Performing	103	2.84	1.17				
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.31	1.24	.340	.722	4.78	*
	Performing	103	2.93	1.16				
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING								
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.50	1.22	.495	.895	5.61	*
	Performing	103	3.00	1.15				
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.23	1.21	.379	.818	4.70	*
	Performing	103	2.85	1.11				
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.43	1.22	.476	.873	5.53	*
	Performing	103	2.95	1.15				

Table 12 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test Descriptive Statistics for Each Item in the Survey for Two Conditions

Pair	Sample	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Diff. in Means	*S.D.*	*t*	Sig.
IMPROVEMENT PLANS								
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.95	1.23	.631	1.00	5.61	*
	Performing	103	3.32	1.28				
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.84	1.21	.563	.882	5.53	*
	Performing	103	3.27	1.22				
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.								
	Low Performing	103	3.68	1.19	.505	.884	5.80	*
	Performing	103	3.17	1.19				
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.								
	Low Performing	103	3.87	1.13	.379	.756	5.09	*
	Performing	103	3.50	1.18				

* $p \leq .001$

From Table 12, the mean is consistently higher for the low performing schools. The superintendents indicated that their evaluative and supervisory practices of principals of Title I low performing schools changed more than it did for Title I performing schools during the same time period. For each pair of variables, the standard deviations, the differences in means, and *t* values are also reported. The greatest amount of variability appears to be associated with the practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students, the smallest amount appears to be associated with the superintendents' perception that their supervisory and evaluative practices assisted with school improvement.

Mr. Darby stated that he perceived that his supervisory practice did make a difference in school improvement. He stated:

> I sure do. Everyone of our schools in this district is making positive improvements. They are not where they need to be, but they are focused with good leadership. We brought in new leadership, stabilized the teaching force, and the turnover is not as high as it once was.

Mr. Meriwether said that he would like to think that he has had an impact on school improvement. He shared that principals would "say that the superintendent supports the instructional program, and that it is a priority." Ms. Rivers was uncertain if her supervisory practice caused a difference in school improvement because some schools were no longer in needs of improvement and others were now considered low performing. She explained it this way:

> I think it's problematic in the sense that if you look at that grid, there's probably 40 ways that you can be on the schools 'in need of improvement list.' I'm a little concerned about hope for our schools.

Mr. Bannister did not feel that his supervisory practices caused a difference, and he indicated:

> I cannot say that my supervision has done anything. I think the fact that I have confidence in people and entrust people has made a difference. But, as for as what I actually do, I don't think I have had any impact on that.

Mr. Somerset had similar perceptions and explained his supervisory impact on school improvement:

> As superintendent, I don't think so. I know that improvements have been the result of group work and having good leadership. I try to build those good relationships and to build trust among the leadership and trust with me. I trust them. I feel like we can share information both ways.

Table 13 examined the dependent paired sample t-test results. The information reported in Table 13 included the mean and standard deviation of the difference between the paired variables. The mean was the average difference between the pair, whereas the variability was

represented by the standard deviation. Also, the standard error of the mean difference, the t value (*t*), degrees of freedom *(df),* and a 2-tailed significance were included in the table. Table 13 listed the results of the dependent paired samples t-test that were performed between all 22 questions for Title I low performing schools as a whole and the same 22 questions for Title I performing schools as a whole. Additionally, the table shared the t-test results for a second pair of variables that included all evaluation items for Title I low performing and performing schools. The third paired sample listed in the table examined all supervision items for Title I low performing and performing schools. Finally, the table included t-test results for each of the 7 survey dimensions.

Table 13

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test for Entire Survey, Evaluation, Supervision, and Survey Dimensions

Pair	Sample	*M*	*SD*	Std. Error *M*	*t*	*df*	2-tailed Sig.
				Overall			
1	Low performing & Performing (items 1-22)	.530	.752	.0741	7.157	102	.000**
				Evaluation and supervision			
2	Evaluation (items 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20, 22) Low performing & Performing	.527	.766	.0756	6.978	102	.000**
3	Supervision (items 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22) Low performing & Performing	.520	.743	.0733	7.102	102	.000**

Table 13 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test for Entire Survey, Evaluation, Supervision, and Survey Dimensions

Pair	Sample	*M*	*SD*	Std. Error *M*	*t*	*df*	2-tailed Sig.
				Survey dimensions			
4	Curriculum Low performing & Performing	.605	.955	.0941	6.430	102	.000**
5	Student Performance Low performing & Performing	.589	.956	.0942	6.255	102	.000**
6	Staff Performance Low performing & Performing	.541	.844	.0832	6.497	102	.000**
7	Academic Focus Low performing & Performing	.553	.908	.0895	6.184	102	.000**
8	Communication Low performing & Performing	.392	.690	.0680	5.761	102	.000**
9	Organizational Setting Low Performing & Performing	.450	.803	.0791	5.688	102	.000**
10	Improvement Plans Low Performing & Performing	.566	.872	.0859	6.593	102	.000**

*$p<.05$, **$p<.001$

In Table 13, the researcher found that each of the paired samples yielded 2-tailed significance of .000. This meant that the same results would be expected to occur less than one

time in 1,000 ($p<.001$) if the null hypothesis were true. The highest t-value ($t = 7.157$) was reported for the overall set of survey items and the lowest t-value ($t = 5.761$) was reported for the communication dimension of the survey. The mean difference is lowest ($M = .391$) for the communication dimension of the survey and highest ($M = .605$) for the curriculum dimension of the survey.

Table 14 examined the dependent paired sample t-test results for each survey item paired with itself. Each item in the survey was asked twice for two separate conditions, for Title I low performing and Title I performing schools. The information reported in Table 14 included the mean and standard deviation of the difference between the paired variables. The mean was the average difference between the pair, whereas the variability was represented by the standard deviation. Also, the standard error of the mean difference, the t-value (t), degrees of freedom (df), and a 2-tailed significance were included in the table.

Table 14

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test for Each Item in the Survey Under Two Conditions

Pair	Sample	*M*	*SD*	Std. Error *M*	*t*	*df*	2-tailed Sig.
CURRICULUM							
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.							
	Low Performing & Performing	.563	1.01	.0992	5.678	102	.000**
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.							
	Low Performing & Performing	.651	1.02	.1002	6.494	102	.000**

Table 14 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test for Each Item in the Survey Under Two Conditions

Pair Sample	*M*	*SD*	Std. Error M	*t*	*df*	2-tailed Sig.
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.602	.994	.0979	6.149	102	.000**
STUDENT PERFORMANCE						
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.544	1.06	.1037	5.230	102	.000**
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.651	1.02	.1002	6.089	102	.000**
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.621	.981	.0967	6.426	102	.000**
STAFF PERFORMANCE						
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.524	.884	.0871	6.020	102	.000**
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.602	1.00	.0989	6.621	102	.000**

Table 14 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test for Each Item in the Survey Under Two Conditions

Pair *Sample*	*M*	*SD*	Std. Error M	*t*	*df*	2-tailed Sig.
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.447	.905	.0891	5.011	102	.000**
ACADEMIC FOCUS						
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.563	.957	.0943	5.974	102	.000**
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.757	2.14	.2112	3.584	102	.001*
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.534	.937	.0924	5.781	102	.000**
COMMUNICATION						
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.456	.764	.0753	6.061	102	.000**
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.340	.722	.0711	4.779	102	.000**

Table 14 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test for Each Item in the Survey Under Two Conditions

Pair Sample	*M*	*SD*	Std. Error M	*t*	*df*	2-tailed Sig.
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.379	.729	.0719	5.270	102	.000**
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING						
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.495	.895	.0882	5.613	102	.000**
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.379	.818	.0806	4.698	102	.000**
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.476	.873	.0860	5.532	102	.000**
IMPROVEMENT PLANS						
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.631	1.00	.0985	5.613	102	.000**
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.						
Low Performing & Performing	.563	.882	.0870	5.532	102	.000**

Table 14 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples T-Test for Each Item in the Survey Under Two Conditions

Pair	Sample	*M*	*SD*	Std. Error M	*t*	*df*	2-tailed Sig.
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.							
	Low Performing & Performing	.505	.884	.0871	5.795	102	.000**
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.							
	Low Performing & Performing	.379	.756	.0745	5.086	102	.000**

*p<.05, **p<.001

The *df* for each of the 22 paired samples (*N =146*) were 102 because each t-test was based on a sample of 103 respondents. The lowest t-value (t = 3.584) was reported for pair number 11, the superintendents' practice of supervising the principal's expectations of students. The practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel had the highest t-value (t = 6.621). The highest mean difference (M = .757) was found to be for pair number 11. The lowest mean difference (M = .3398) was for the superintendents' practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources, pair number 17. In all but one case, the reported 2-tailed significance was .000, significant for $p < .001$. Only item, number 11, reported a 2-tailed significance of .001, which was significant with $p < .05$.

The next table examined the correlation coefficients. Pearson correlation coefficients (r) described the magnitude of the relationship between each pair of variables. In Table 15, the correlation between all 22 questions for Title I low performing schools as a whole and the same 22 questions for title I performing schools as a whole was examined. Additionally, the table

shared the correlation between all evaluation items for Title I low performing and performing schools, paired sample number two. The third paired sample listed in the table examined the correlation for all supervision items for Title I low performing and performing schools.

Table 15

Dependent Paired Samples Correlations for Entire Survey, Evaluation, Supervision, and Survey Dimensions

Pair	Sample	*N*	Correlation	Sig.*
			Overall	
1	Low Performing survey & Performing survey (items 1-22)	103	.735	.000**
			Evaluation and supervision	
2	Evaluation (items 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22) Low Performing & Performing	103	.728	.000**
3	Supervision (items 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22) Low Performing & Performing	103	.739	.000**
			Survey dimensions	
4	Curriculum Dimension (items 1, 2, 3) Low Performing & Performing	103	.680	.000**
5	Student Performance Dimension (items 4, 5, 6) Low Performing & Performing	103	.688	.000**
6	Staff Performance Dimension (items 7, 8, 9) Low Performing & Performing	103	.716	.000**

Table 15 (continued)

Dependent Paired Samples Correlations for Entire Survey, Evaluation, Supervision, and Survey Dimensions

Pair	Sample	*N*	Correlation	Sig.*
7	Academic Focus Dimension (items 10, 11, 12) Low Performing & Performing	103	.727	.000**
8	Communication Dimension (items 13, 14, 15) Low Performing & Performing	103	.817	.000**
9	Organizational Setting Dimension (items 16, 17, 18) Low Performing & Performing	103	.729	.000**
10	Improvement Plans Dimension (items 19, 20, 21, 22) Low Performing & Performing	103	.729	.000**

*$p<.05$, **$p<.001$

In Table 15, all paired samples revealed correlations that were statistically significant ($p <. 001$). Moreover, the correlation was strongest ($r = .817$) for the communication dimension sample, but only slightly greater, as each of the paired samples revealed strong correlations. The items related to supervision ($r = .739$) had a slightly higher correlation than the items related to evaluation ($r = .728$).

Table 16 continued with the examination of paired sample correlations by pairing each item in the survey with itself. The item was asked twice, once under the conditions of Title I schools that were once performing but became low performing and again for Title I schools that were once performing and were still performing.

Table 16

Paired Samples Correlations for Each Item in the Survey for Two Conditions

Pair	*N*	Correlation	Sig.
CURRICULUM			
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.698	.000**
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.674	.000**
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.673	.000**
STUDENT PERFORMANCE			
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.658	.000**
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.688	.000**
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.682	.000**

Table 16 (continued)

Paired Samples Correlations for Each Item in the Survey for Two Conditions

Pair	*N*	Correlation	Sig.
STAFF PERFORMANCE			
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.742	.000**
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.660	.000**
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.735	.000**
ACADEMIC FOCUS			
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.701	.000**
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.360	.000**
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.742	.000**
COMMUNICATION			
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.780	.000**

Table 16 (continued)

Paired Samples Correlations for Each Item in the Survey for Two Conditions

Pair	*N*	Correlation	Sig.
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.823	.000**
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.816	.000**
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING			
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.717	.000**
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.753	.000**
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.730	.000**
IMPROVEMENT PLANS			
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.685	.000**
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.738	.000**

Table 16 (continued)

Paired Samples Correlations for Each Item in the Survey for Two Conditions

Pair	*N*	Correlation	Sig.
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.724	.000**
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.			
Low Performing & Performing	103	.786	.000**

*p<.05, **p<.001

In Table 16, all 22 pairs had a statistically significant correlation result. Each of the paired samples yielded a significance of .000 (p<.001). The strongest correlation coefficient (r = .823) was for the paired items that asked superintendents if their practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed. The weakest correlation coefficient (r = .360) was for the paired items that asked superintendents if their practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.

In Tables 17 through 25, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were used to determine significant differences between the demographic descriptors for the surveyed superintendents. An alpha level of .05 was used in determining statistical significance. The ANOVA test was used to determine significant differences among gender, number of years the respondents had served as superintendent in the current system, the total number of years the respondent had served as superintendent, the total years each superintendent has been in education, the number of principals evaluated in the system, the number of Title I schools in the system, the percentage of Title I schools that are considered low performing, the Metropolitan Statistical Area status, and the geographical location of the respondent's system within the state

of Georgia. The *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) was used for the purpose of analyzing the data.

Table 17 includes the means for gender for each paired sample of questions. The ANOVA was used to determine significant differences among gender for both Title I low performing and performing schools.

Table 17

Results Compared by Gender for Title I Low Performing and Performing Schools

Questions	Male	Female	Sig.*
CURRICULUM			
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.			
Low Performing	3.63	2.88	.029*
Performing	3.04	2.39	.047*
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.			
Low Performing	3.82	3.33	.141
Performing	3.15	2.67	.133
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.			
Low Performing	3.71	3.33	.236
Performing	3.15	2.50	.037*
STUDENT PERFORMANCE			
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.			
Low Performing	3.84	3.17	.036*
Performing	3.25	2.78	.165
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.			
Low Performing	4.05	3.50	.082
Performing	3.41	3.00	.228

Table 17 (continued)

Results Compared by Gender for Title I Low Performing and Performing Schools

Questions	Male	Female	Sig.*
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.			
Low Performing	3.98	3.56	.172
Performing	3.35	2.89	.157
STAFF PERFORMANCE			
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.			
Low Performing	3.72	3.28	.168
Performing	3.18	2.78	.203
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.			
Low Performing	3.49	3.28	.518
Performing	2.82	2.67	.574
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.			
Low Performing	3.33	2.83	.138
Performing	2.86	2.44	.163
ACADEMIC FOCUS			
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.			
Low Performing	3.86	3.28	.075
Performing	3.26	2.83	.171
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.			
Low Performing	3.80	3.22	.091
Performing	3.18	2.83	.294
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.			
Low Performing	3.97	3.33	.056
Performing	3.39	2.94	.197

Table 17 (continued)

Results Compared by Gender for Title I Low Performing and Performing Schools

Questions	Male	Female	Sig.*
COMMUNICATION			
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.			
Low Performing	3.41	2.83	.062
Performing	2.93	2.39	.052
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.			
Low Performing	3.30	2.78	.107
Performing	2.92	2.50	.170
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.			
Low Performing	3.43	2.89	.094
Performing	3.05	2.39	.028*
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING			
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.			
Low Performing	3.55	3.22	.295
Performing	3.05	2.78	.371
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.			
Low Performing	3.30	2.94	.255
Performing	2.92	2.56	.209
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.			
Low Performing	3.50	3.17	.297
Performing	2.99	2.78	.483

Table 17 (continued)

Results Compared by Gender for Title I Low Performing and Performing Schools

Questions	Male	Female	Sig.*
IMPROVEMENT PLANS			
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.			
Low Performing	4.02	3.67	.263
Performing	3.36	3.11	.450
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.			
Low Performing	3.89	3.67	.487
Performing	3.34	2.94	.213
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.			
Low Performing	3.80	3.22	.063
Performing	3.26	2.78	.120
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.			
Low Performing	3.92	3.72	.499
Performing	3.54	3.28	.392

*$p<.05$

Table 17 displayed each area of statistically significant differences among the means. The first item in the survey yielded higher means from male superintendents. Male superintendents indicated a higher degree of change in their practice of evaluating the principal's goals for both Title I low performing schools ($p < .029$) and Title I performing schools ($p < .047$).

Likewise, the male superintendents that were interviewed elaborated on the importance of how they used principal's goals in their evaluation practice and for school improvement. Mr. Meriwether shared that principals of both low performing and performing schools bring goals as part of their GLEI evaluation process. He indicated that one of their goals would be to make adequate yearly progress. Mr. Meriwether pointed out:

> The only difference for a low performing and a performing school is that we are going to specify what your goals are. It is a written goal that we will evaluate. We'll talk about it. We'll look at how we were doing it in the middle of the year and then at the end of the year somehow, we're going to say, 'How did we do?'

The other male superintendents had similar viewpoints about goals. Mr. Darby noted, "A part of the accountability piece is to see what goals they have achieved and where are they going. We talk about it and it is okay." Mr. Bannister indicated that the goals for the principals are set in the fall formative conference. He said, "Whatever the goals for the principal better be the goals of the building." Mr. Somerset, too, shared the role of goal setting in the evaluation process. He explained:

> The school's goals and the principal's goals should be aligned. The GLEI is also used and then the school improvement plan becomes the important part of a principal's evaluation when it comes time to make judgments about a principal's performance. I certainly want to know if the principal has worked to broaden their scope in setting goals not only for themselves but for the school goals, too.

Additionally, the table included a statistically significant difference for item three ($p<.037$). Male superintendents responded that their practice of supervising the principals' use of instructional support staff and resources had changed more than their female counterparts in Title I performing schools. Mr. Darby used the school system's Teaching and Learning Staff in the schools as a resource and for support more than in the past. He said, "I use them as a resource as to what is going on in the school in terms of resources, staffing, and the weakness of the principal."

Finally, there was a statistically significant difference among males and females for item 15. Males, to a greater degree than females, reported that their practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stakeholder input and provide feedback had changed ($p<.028$).

Table 18 compared the number of years the respondents had served in their current system as superintendent to the survey responses. ANOVA was used to determine areas of significant differences among the means.

Table 18

Results Compared by Number of Years as Superintendent in Current School System

Questions	Years				
	0-3	4-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
CURRICULUM					
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.					
Low Performing	3.29	3.61	3.86	4.40	.220
Performing	2.63	3.05	3.33	4.40	.012*
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.					
Low Performing	3.60	3.73	4.00	4.80	.216
Performing	2.79	3.23	3.33	4.40	.024
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.61	3.66	3.57	4.00	.927
Performing	2.81	3.15	3.17	4.40	.033*
STUDENT PERFORMANCE					
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.					
Low Performing	3.63	3.68	4.29	4.20	.486
Performing	2.94	3.28	3.67	4.00	.190
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.					
Low Performing	3.87	3.88	4.58	4.60	.302
Performing	3.17	3.35	4.00	4.20	.211

Table 18 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Years as Superintendent in Current School System

Questions	Years				
	0-3	4-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.					
Low Performing	3.87	3.80	4.57	4.20	.419
Performing	3.21	3.23	3.67	3.80	.657
STAFF PERFORMANCE					
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.67	3.59	3.86	3.60	.956
Performing	3.02	3.18	3.00	3.60	.737
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.					
Low Performing	3.46	3.46	3.71	3.00	.827
Performing	2.67	2.90	3.33	2.60	.438
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.10	3.41	3.43	3.20	.682
Performing	2.58	2.98	3.17	3.00	.302
ACADEMIC FOCUS					
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.					
Low Performing	3.73	3.63	4.43	4.20	.399
Performing	3.15	3.10	3.50	3.80	.583
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.					
Low Performing	3.63	3.71	4.00	4.00	.868
Performing	3.04	3.13	3.33	3.80	.634
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.					
Low Performing	3.88	3.66	4.43	4.40	.352
Performing	3.29	3.18	3.67	4.20	.375

Table 18 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Years as Superintendent in Current School System

Questions	Years				
	0-3	4-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
COMMUNICATION					
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.17	3.44	3.42	3.60	.688
Performing	2.71	2.95	2.67	3.40	.452
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.					
Low Performing	3.04	3.41	3.43	3.00	.490
Performing	2.63	3.10	2.83	3.00	.302
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.					
Low Performing	3.21	3.44	3.29	3.80	.683
Performing	2.79	3.05	2.83	3.60	.408
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING					
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.					
Low Performing	3.48	3.59	3.14	3.40	.839
Performing	2.90	3.13	2.83	3.20	.781
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.23	3.27	3.14	3.20	.995
Performing	2.78	2.95	2.67	3.20	.742
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.					
Low Performing	3.40	3.41	3.43	4.00	.773
Performing	2.94	2.90	3.00	3.40	.840

Table 18 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Years as Superintendent in Current School System

Questions	Years				
	0-3	4-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
IMPROVEMENT PLANS					
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.					
Low Performing	4.02	3.71	4.71	4.40	.159
Performing	3.31	3.10	4.33	4.00	.096
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	3.92	3.59	4.43	4.40	.187
Performing	3.23	3.10	4.17	4.00	.118
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	3.62	3.59	4.29	4.60	.155
Performing	3.08	3.05	4.00	4.20	.059
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.					
Low Performing	3.96	3.73	4.00	4.20	.693
Performing	3.42	3.48	3.83	4.00	.662

*$p<.05$

The results of the ANOVA indicated in Table 18 that superintendents with 20 or more years as superintendent in their current system had more significantly changed their practice of evaluating the principal's goals in Title I performing schools ($p<.012$). The superintendents changed their practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources in Title I performing schools ($p<.033$).

Table 19 compared the total number of years the respondents had served as superintendent to their responses on the survey. To determine statistically significant differences among the means, the ANOVA test was used.

Table 19

Results Compared by Total Number of Years as Superintendent

Questions	Years				
	0-3	4-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
CURRICULUM					
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.					
Low Performing	3.31	3.62	3.65	4.00	.597
Performing	2.76	3.00	3.00	4.00	.366
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.					
Low Performing	3.60	3.73	3.95	4.33	.630
Performing	2.89	3.06	3.32	4.33	.190
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.62	3.65	3.70	3.67	.997
Performing	2.93	3.00	3.26	3.67	.614
STUDENT PERFORMANCE					
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.					
Low Performing	3.60	3.81	3.80	4.00	.842
Performing	3.02	3.25	3.18	4.33	.377
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.					
Low Performing	3.87	3.94	4.10	4.33	.849
Performing	3.24	3.28	3.58	4.00	.640
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.					
Low Performing	3.80	3.95	4.05	4.00	.874
Performing	3.24	3.17	3.42	4.00	.680

Table 19 (continued)

Results Compared by Total Number of Years as Superintendent

Questions	Years				
	0-3	4-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
STAFF PERFORMANCE					
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.62	3.73	3.50	4.00	.877
Performing	3.04	3.28	2.89	3.33	.679
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.					
Low Performing	3.47	3.57	3.30	3.00	.817
Performing	3.78	2.89	2.68	2.67	.914
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.16	3.46	3.15	2.67	.595
Performing	2.71	2.89	2.79	2.67	.918
ACADEMIC FOCUS					
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.					
Low Performing	3.64	3.92	3.65	4.33	.639
Performing	3.11	3.33	3.00	3.67	.649
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.					
Low Performing	3.56	3.87	3.75	3.67	.775
Performing	3.04	3.19	3.11	3.67	.852
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.					
Low Performing	3.78	3.86	4.00	4.00	.930
Performing	3.24	3.33	3.67	3.67	.947

Table 19 (continued)

Results Compared by Total Number of Years as Superintendent

Questions	Years				
	0-3	4-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
COMMUNICATION					
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.13	3.46	3.50	3.00	.531
Performing	2.73	3.00	2.74	3.00	.694
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.					
Low Performing	3.04	3.41	3.30	2.67	.503
Performing	2.69	3.14	2.68	2.67	.324
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.					
Low Performing	3.24	3.54	3.10	3.67	.538
Performing	2.84	3.17	2.63	3.33	.340
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING					
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.					
Low Performing	3.15	3.46	3.55	3.33	.988
Performing	2.96	3.08	2.95	3.00	.962
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.29	3.27	3.15	2.67	.830
Performing	2.84	2.97	2.68	2.67	.818
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.					
Low Performing	3.36	3.49	3.45	4.00	.825
Performing	2.93	3.00	2.84	3.33	.904

Table 19 (continued)

Results Compared by Total Number of Years as Superintendent

Questions	Years				
	0-3	4-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
IMPROVEMENT PLANS					
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.					
Low Performing	3.98	3.89	4.00	4.33	.937
Performing	3.38	3.28	3.26	3.33	.983
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	3.93	3.81	3.65	4.33	.739
Performing	3.31	3.22	3.26	3.33	.990
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	3.62	3.81	3.55	4.33	.645
Performing	3.20	3.17	3.11	3.33	.987
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.					
Low Performing	3.98	3.84	3.75	4.00	.878
Performing	3.51	3.52	3.47	3.00	.906

*$p<.05$

There were no statistically significant differences among the means for each item in either survey results as listed in Table 19.

Next, the researcher compared the superintendents' responses from both surveys to the total number of years served in education. ANOVA was used to test for statistically significant differences among the mean.

Table 20

Results Compared by Superintendents' Total Number of Years in Education

Questions	Years				
	0-10	11-20	21-30	30+	Sig.*
CURRICULUM					
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.					
Low Performing	3.75	3.50	3.57	3.40	.923
Performing	3.25	3.00	2.85	2.95	.925
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.					
Low Performing	4.00	3.88	3.78	3.66	.933
Performing	3.00	3.13	3.04	3.09	.996
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	5.00	4.13	3.57	3.52	.082
Performing	4.00	3.25	2.94	3.02	.380
STUDENT PERFORMANCE					
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.					
Low Performing	3.75	3.63	3.73	3.73	.997
Performing	3.25	3.13	3.13	3.20	.992
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.					
Low Performing	4.75	3.88	3.92	3.93	.617
Performing	4.25	3.25	3.23	3.39	.513
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.					
Low Performing	4.50	4.00	3.90	3.84	.763
Performing	4.25	3.38	3.17	3.27	.435

Table 20 (continued)

Results Compared by Superintendents' Total Number of Years in Education

Questions	Years				
	0-10	11-20	21-30	30+	Sig.*
STAFF PERFORMANCE					
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.					
Low Performing	4.50	3.63	3.69	3.52	.504
Performing	3.75	3.13	3.11	3.05	.745
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.					
Low Performing	3.75	3.63	3.61	3.23	.488
Performing	3.50	2.88	2.77	2.75	.601
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.00	3.25	3.43	3.07	.592
Performing	2.75	2.75	2.81	2.77	.998
ACADEMIC FOCUS					
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.					
Low Performing	4.00	3.75	3.86	3.63	.841
Performing	3.75	3.25	3.13	3.18	.799
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.					
Low Performing	3.75	3.63	3.82	3.59	.876
Performing	3.25	3.13	3.17	3.07	.982
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.					
Low Performing	4.13	4.50	3.88	3.73	.617
Performing	3.75	3.50	3.28	3.27	.883

Table 20 (continued)

Results Compared by Superintendents' Total Number of Years in Education

Questions	Years				
	0-10	11-20	21-30	30+	Sig.*
COMMUNICATION					
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.00	3.50	3.41	3.20	.776
Performing	2.25	3.25	2.85	2.80	.492
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.					
Low Performing	2.75	3.25	3.41	3.02	.430
Performing	2.25	2.75	3.02	2.73	.463
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.					
Low Performing	3.00	3.38	3.45	3.23	.794
Performing	2.25	3.00	3.02	2.89	.629
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING					
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.					
Low Performing	4.50	3.75	3.49	3.36	.307
Performing	3.75	3.13	2.96	2.95	.597
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.50	3.63	3.27	3.11	.682
Performing	3.25	3.13	2.89	2.73	.659
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.					
Low Performing	4.25	3.13	3.49	3.37	.463
Performing	3.75	2.75	2.94	2.93	.538

Table 20 (continued)

Results Compared by Superintendents' Total Number of Years in Education

Questions	Years				
	0-10	11-20	21-30	30+	Sig.*
IMPROVEMENT PLANS					
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.					
Low Performing	4.75	3.88	3.92	3.96	.629
Performing	4.25	3.25	3.19	3.39	.444
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	5.00	3.88	3.76	3.84	.270
Performing	4.25	3.25	3.15	3.32	.380
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	4.50	3.50	3.73	3.61	.514
Performing	4.00	3.00	3.13	3.18	.545
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.					
Low Performing	4.75	3.75	3.92	3.80	.425
Performing	4.50	3.25	3.49	3.45	.351

*$p<.05$

The results indicated that the number of years in education for superintendents did not yield significant differences among their responses.

Table 21 included the number principals evaluated in the system by the superintendents compared to the superintendents' responses. ANOVA was used to determine significant differences.

Table 21

Results Compared by Number of Principals Evaluated by the Superintendent

Questions	Principals				
	0-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
CURRICULUM					
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.					
Low Performing	3.57	3.61	3.53	3.00	.540
Performing	2.65	3.22	3.40	2.77	.100
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.					
Low Performing	3.92	3.64	3.73	3.23	.360
Performing	2.94	3.19	3.53	2.77	.311
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.80	3.43	3.67	3.54	.643
Performing	2.81	3.19	3.45	3.08	.269
STUDENT PERFORMANCE					
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.					
Low Performing	3.76	3.82	3.67	3.46	.850
Performing	2.85	3.56	3.47	3.15	.110
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.					
Low Performing	3.98	4.04	3.73	3.92	.887
Performing	3.00	3.63	3.53	3.77	.097
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.					
Low Performing	3.91	3.89	3.80	4.00	.977
Performing	3.00	3.44	3.60	3.54	.229

Table 21 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Principals Evaluated by the Superintendent

Questions	Principals				
	0-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
STAFF PERFORMANCE					
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.67	3.79	3.20	3.77	.496
Performing	2.90	3.33	3.00	3.54	.240
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.					
Low Performing	3.78	3.46	2.87	2.92	.036*
Performing	2.79	2.96	2.67	2.62	.747
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.27	3.39	3.40	2.69	.406
Performing	2.60	3.04	3.20	2.46	.136
ACADEMIC FOCUS					
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.					
Low Performing	3.80	3.96	3.47	3.54	.585
Performing	2.92	3.48	3.33	3.38	.197
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.					
Low Performing	3.80	3.86	3.47	3.31	.530
Performing	2.85	3.52	3.27	3.15	.190
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.					
Low Performing	3.98	3.75	3.73	3.76	.843
Performing	3.13	3.44	3.40	3.62	.582

Table 21 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Principals Evaluated by the Superintendent

Questions	Principals				
	0-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
COMMUNICATION					
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.45	3.39	3.33	2.62	.163
Performing	2.77	2.93	3.20	2.46	.305
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.					
Low Performing	3.33	3.29	3.27	2.54	.228
Performing	2.83	2.93	3.07	2.46	.564
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.					
Low Performing	3.39	3.42	3.40	2.85	.515
Performing	2.88	3.04	3.07	2.77	.854
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING					
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.					
Low Performing	3.55	3.39	3.47	3.54	.956
Performing	2.88	3.00	3.20	3.23	.681
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.41	3.43	2.60	2.92	.074
Performing	2.88	3.07	2.47	2.77	.396
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.					
Low Performing	3.49	3.50	3.00	3.62	.497
Performing	2.81	3.11	2.80	3.31	.440

Table 21 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Principals Evaluated by the Superintendent

Questions	Principals				
	0-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Sig.*
IMPROVEMENT PLANS					
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.					
Low Performing	3.98	4.00	3.73	4.08	.882
Performing	3.04	3.52	3.53	3.69	.222
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	3.82	3.93	3.67	4.00	.876
Performing	2.98	3.52	3.40	3.69	.134
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	3.67	3.89	3.67	3.38	.644
Performing	2.96	3.44	3.33	3.23	.357
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.					
Low Performing	3.76	3.93	4.07	4.08	.694
Performing	3.15	3.74	3.93	3.77	.040*

*p<.05

The results included in Table 21 revealed that superintendents that evaluated five or less principals (p<.036) changed their practices of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel in Title I low performing schools more than other superintendents. Ms. Rivers explained that personnel management was one of the most important components of supervising principals. She explained:

> I spend more time talking about personnel management with them. Really, I am saying, "What kind of support are we providing to teachers," and then what are we doing for teachers who are not performing? We have a real emphasis on the performance and quality of work in our classrooms with our teachers.

Ms. Rivers continued:

> I will be bringing all the principals in during November and talking with them about their staff. Let's talk about the development of people on your staff. Where are you with you high quality teachers? Where are you with your National Board Certified teachers? Which teachers are the TAPP teachers? Which teachers are the Zero One teachers? Which ones need assistance? Which ones with a plan will you see us needing to terminate? So, my involvement is more around their working with teachers.

Similarly, Mr. Darby believed school improvement was related to personnel and reported:

> My priority is recruiting the best and the brightest. If you don't have good employees, you will not have a good product. I am willing to make the hard decisions in terms of personnel in the interest of our children.

One other significant area was found. Superintendents that evaluated between 11 to 20 principals ($p<.033$) perceived that their supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement for performing schools more than others.

Table 22 compared the superintendents' responses from both surveys to the total number of Title I schools in their school systems. ANOVA was used to test for statistically significant differences among the means.

Table 22

Results Compared by Number of Title I Schools in System

Questions	Schools				
	1-5	6-10	11-20	21+	Sig.*
CURRICULUM					
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.					
Low Performing	3.56	3.27	4.75	2.50	.082
Performing	2.96	2.91	3.50	1.75	.224
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.					
Low Performing	3.81	3.41	4.50	3.25	.287
Performing	3.14	3.00	3.25	2.00	.350

Table 22 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Title I Schools in System

Questions	Schools				
	1-5	6-10	11-20	21+	Sig.*
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.64	3.36	4.75	4.25	.149
Performing	3.01	3.05	3.50	3.00	.896
STUDENT PERFORMANCE					
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.					
Low Performing	3.77	3.41	4.75	3.50	.225
Performing	3.21	3.14	3.50	2.25	.512
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.					
Low Performing	3.93	3.77	4.50	4.75	.388
Performing	3.25	3.50	3.50	4.00	.627
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.					
Low Performing	3.89	3.73	4.50	4.50	.480
Performing	3.19	3.41	3.50	3.75	.744
STAFF PERFORMANCE					
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.65	3.59	4.00	3.50	.938
Performing	3.05	3.32	3.00	3.00	.835
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.					
Low Performing	3.52	3.32	3.50	3.00	.819
Performing	2.86	2.73	2.50	2.25	.637

Table 22 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Title I Schools in System

Questions	Schools				
	1-5	6-10	11-20	21+	Sig.*
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.28	3.23	3.25	2.75	.891
Performing	2.86	2.68	2.75	2.00	.498
ACADEMIC FOCUS					
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.					
Low Performing	3.77	3.55	4.75	3.75	.384
Performing	3.16	3.23	3.50	3.00	.937
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.					
Low Performing	3.76	3.55	4.00	3.25	.780
Performing	3.15	3.23	3.00	2.25	.573
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.					
Low Performing	3.89	3.55	4.50	4.25	.438
Performing	3.33	3.23	3.50	3.25	.980
COMMUNICATION					
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.40	3.23	2.75	2.75	.527
Performing	2.95	2.77	2.25	1.75	.106
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.					
Low Performing	3.27	3.18	2.75	2.75	.745
Performing	2.92	2.91	2.25	1.75	.180
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.					
Low Performing	3.40	3.32	2.75	2.75	.579
Performing	3.03	2.91	2.25	2.00	.214

Table 22 (continued)

Results Compared by Number of Title I Schools in System

Questions	Schools				
	1-5	6-10	11-20	21+	Sig.*
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING					
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.					
Low Performing	3.45	3.59	3.75	3.50	.941
Performing	3.01	3.00	3.00	2.75	.979
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.31	3.00	3.25	3.25	.778
Performing	2.95	2.64	2.75	2.50	.623
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.					
Low Performing	3.40	3.32	4.00	4.25	.402
Performing	2.96	2.77	3.00	3.75	.486
IMPROVEMENT PLANS					
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.					
Low Performing	3.93	3.82	4.75	4.50	.433
Performing	3.26	3.41	3.50	3.75	.856
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	3.80	3.77	4.75	4.25	.415
Performing	3.19	3.45	3.50	3.50	.786
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	3.71	3.59	4.00	3.75	.932
Performing	3.18	3.18	3.50	2.75	.852
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.					
Low Performing	3.88	3.68	4.25	4.75	.320
Performing	3.44	3.55	3.50	4.25	.610

*$p<.05$

Table 22 compared the means between the number of Tile I schools for each superintendent for Title I low performing and Title I performing schools. There were no statistically significant differences found among the results.

Next, the percentage of Title I schools considered low performing were compared for each superintendent to determine if there were any statistically significant differences among the responses. ANOVA tests results are presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Results Compared by Percentage of Title I Schools Considered Low Performing

Questions	Percentage				
	<26	26-50	51-75	76-100	Sig.*
CURRICULUM					
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.					
Low Performing	3.38	3.19	3.61	3.68	.488
Performing	2.88	2.44	3.03	3.20	.117
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.					
Low Performing	3.75	3.37	3.81	3.92	.371
Performing	3.13	2.41	3.12	3.51	.006*
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.63	3.41	3.72	3.76	.698
Performing	3.25	2.56	3.12	3.29	.103
STUDENT PERFORMANCE					
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.					
Low Performing	3.88	3.59	3.79	3.73	.920
Performing	3.50	2.81	3.15	3.37	.340

Table 23 (continued)

Results Compared by Percentage of Title I Schools Considered Low Performing

Questions	Percentage				
	<26	26-50	51-75	76-100	Sig.*
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instruction-al program has changed.					
Low Performing	4.00	3.89	4.00	3.95	.987
Performing	3.75	3.07	3.33	3.46	.543
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.					
Low Performing	4.00	3.81	3.94	3.92	.972
Performing	3.75	3.11	3.27	3.29	.667
STAFF PERFORMANCE					
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.88	3.52	3.70	3.65	.898
Performing	3.38	2.89	3.09	3.23	.655
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, term-ination, and use of personnel has changed.					
Low Performing	3.38	3.37	3.64	3.38	.821
Performing	2.75	2.62	2.88	2.86	.811
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.00	2.89	3.48	3.35	.300
Performing	2.88	2.44	2.88	2.94	.347
ACADEMIC FOCUS					
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.					
Low Performing	3.88	3.59	3.82	3.81	.884
Performing	3.75	3.00	3.24	3.14	.470
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.					
Low Performing	3.63	3.48	3.82	3.78	.768
Performing	3.63	2.85	3.24	3.11	.452

Table 23 (continued)

Results Compared by Percentage of Title I Schools Considered Low Performing

Questions	Percentage				
	<26	26-50	51-75	76-100	Sig.*
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.					
Low Performing	3.75	3.81	3.94	3.84	.974
Performing	3.63	3.07	3.42	3.31	.674
COMMUNICATION					
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.					
Low Performing	3.38	2.85	3.55	3.43	.133
Performing	2.88	2.44	3.00	2.97	.179
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.					
Low Performing	3.25	2.93	3.39	3.24	.546
Performing	2.88	2.56	2.94	2.97	.522
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.					
Low Performing	3.63	2.93	3.52	3.41	.242
Performing	3.38	2.59	2.97	3.06	.270
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING					
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.					
Low Performing	3.88	3.00	3.82	3.49	.051
Performing	3.63	2.41	3.21	3.11	.010*
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.					
Low Performing	3.88	2.85	3.52	3.14	.066
Performing	3.63	2.37	3.03	2.89	.017*
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.					
Low Performing	3.63	3.15	3.52	3.54	.549
Performing	3.50	2.74	2.94	3.00	.429

Table 23 (continued)

Results Compared by Percentage of Title I Schools Considered Low Performing

Questions	Percentage				
	<26	26-50	51-75	76-100	Sig.*
IMPROVEMENT PLANS					
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.					
Low Performing	4.00	3.81	4.09	3.95	.860
Performing	3.88	3.07	3.30	3.40	.459
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	4.13	3.59	4.03	3.81	.496
Performing	4.00	2.96	3.27	3.34	.197
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.					
Low Performing	4.00	3.37	3.79	3.78	.402
Performing	3.88	2.89	3.12	3.29	.197
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.					
Low Performing	3.88	3.70	3.97	3.95	.805
Performing	3.75	3.33	3.52	3.54	.818

*p<.05

Table 23 listed three statistically significant areas of difference for superintendents' responses as compared to the percentage of Title I schools considered low performing for each superintendents' school system. Superintendents in systems that have 76-100 % of their Title I schools considered low performing, significantly (p < .006) responded that their supervision of principal's implementation of the curriculum had changed for Title I schools that were once performing and were still performing. Mr. Somerset expressed that his desire was for principals to be instructional leaders. He stated:

> They should be instructional leaders more than managers. Being managers will not cut it anymore. I want them to exhibit their leadership in lots of ways. I want them in the

> classrooms. I want them out of the office. I do not want to call the school and always be able to find them in the office. I want them to be able to conduct staff meetings and be able to talk about good instruction. I want them to be able to conduct staff meetings and be able to talk about good instruction. I want them to be able to look at lesson plans and know if good instruction is happening in those classrooms.

Mr. Meriwether found that curriculum changes were in order once schools were considered not to be performing. He explained, "We changed largely what we were doing in the area of curriculum and had some almost immediate responses to what was going on as far as our test scores." Likewise, Ms. Rivers noted that the principals in her system were expected to be involved with curriculum in several ways. She reported:

> We're focusing more on what is related to instructional improvement and then having some expectations about principals being in the classroom—understanding and monitoring the instructional program.

She continued:

> I am looking at the ways the principals are involved in curriculum development, how they are being more involved in the implementation or programming. I am seeing that they're at the table when curriculum issues are discussed. Their involvement in curriculum is making sure that they are learning instructional strategies and techniques and that they are given the expectation to monitor.

Superintendents in systems that had less than 26% of their Title I schools considered as low performing significantly ($p < .010$) responded that their practice of evaluating principal's budget allocation relative to school needs had changed. Ms. Rivers said, "One of the things my board had interest in is dollars. How are principals managing money? School budgets are being looked over routinely. Are they keeping up with the way the money has been budgeted?"

Additionally, the same superintendents' responded significantly ($p < .017$) that their practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources had changed. Mr. Bannister said that he checks for school cleanliness regularly. Mr. Somerset monitors the condition of the facility and how it is being maintained.

Table 24 compared the means of the superintendents' survey responses with the MSA status of the superintendents' school systems. ANOVA was used to calculate for statistically significant differences among the means.

Table 24

Results Compared by Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) Status

Questions	MSA	Non-MSA	Sig.*
CURRICULUM			
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.			
Low Performing	3.50	3.51	.982
Performing	3.14	2.84	.279
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.			
Low Performing	3.64	3.77	.661
Performing	3.14	2.84	.711
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.			
Low Performing	3.75	3.61	.610
Performing	3.32	2.93	.149
STUDENT PERFORMANCE			
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.			
Low Performing	3.71	3.73	.963
Performing	3.36	3.09	.362
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.			
Low Performing	4.00	3.94	.810
Performing	3.64	3.23	.152
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.			
Low Performing	4.07	3.84	.389
Performing	3.61	3.15	.100

Table 24 (continued)

Results Compared by Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) Status

Questions	MSA	Non-MSA	Sig.*
STAFF PERFORMANCE			
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.			
Low Performing	3.68	3.64	.879
Performing	3.39	3.00	.141
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.			
Low Performing	3.21	3.55	.245
Performing	2.79	2.80	.952
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.			
Low Performing	3.11	3.30	.507
Performing	2.71	2.81	.698
ACADEMIC FOCUS			
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.			
Low Performing	3.61	3.82	.453
Performing	3.29	3.15	.602
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.			
Low Performing	3.61	3.74	.652
Performing	3.25	3.08	.556
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.			
Low Performing	3.86	3.86	1.000
Performing	3.39	3.28	.702
COMMUNICATION			
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.			
Low Performing	3.18	3.36	.489
Performing	2.71	2.88	.490

Table 24 (continued)

Results Compared by Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) Status

Questions	MSA	Non-MSA	Sig.*
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.			
Low Performing	3.07	3.26	.496
Performing	2.68	2.91	.381
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.			
Low Performing	3.25	3.36	.679
Performing	2.75	3.00	.332
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING			
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.			
Low Performing	3.71	3.42	.265
Performing	3.18	2.93	.340
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.			
Low Performing	3.25	3.23	.951
Performing	2.86	2.85	.988
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.			
Low Performing	3.54	3.40	.620
Performing	3.07	2.91	.520
IMPROVEMENT PLANS			
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.			
Low Performing	4.00	3.95	.849
Performing	3.54	3.24	.301
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.			
Low Performing	3.93	3.82	.681
Performing	3.50	3.19	.249

Table 24 (continued)

Results Compared by Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) Status

Questions	MSA	Non-MSA	Sig.*
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.			
Low Performing	3.68	3.70	.931
Performing	3.21	3.16	.838
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.			
Low Performing	3.96	3.86	.667
Performing	3.79	3.39	.127

*$p<.05$

Table 24 did not reveal any statistically significant differences between the means for the superintendents' responses as compared to the MSA status of the superintendents' school systems for Title I low performing schools and Title I performing schools.

Table 25 uses the ANOVA test to determine statistically significant differences among the superintendents' responses as compared to the location of the respondents' school systems as located in six geographical regions of the state of Georgia. A standard topographical map of the state of Georgia was used to divide the state into the six regions. The regions were northeast, northwest, metro-Atlanta, middle Georgia, southeast, and southwest.

Table 25

Results Compared By Geographical Location Within the State of Georgia

Questions	Geographical Locations						
	NE	NW	Metro	Mid	SE	SW	Sig.*
CURRICULUM							
1. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.							
Low Performing	3.14	3.15	3.80	3.78	3.55	3.63	.537
Performing	2.62	3.00	3.60	2.64	2.91	3.25	.271

Table 25 (continued)

Results Compared By Geographical Location Within the State of Georgia

Questions	Geographical Locations						
	NE	NW	Metro	Mid	SE	SW	Sig.*
2. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.							
Low Performing	3.38	3.31	3.80	3.83	4.00	4.00	.430
Performing	2.81	3.08	3.60	2.77	3.23	3.25	.466
3. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.							
Low Performing	3.19	3.23	3.90	3.78	3.82	4.00	.236
Performing	2.71	3.00	3.70	2.77	3.23	3.19	.278
STUDENT PERFORMANCE							
4. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.							
Low Performing	3.62	3.31	4.00	4.00	3.82	3.50	.576
Performing	3.05	3.25	3.80	2.86	3.23	3.19	.580
5. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.							
Low Performing	3.57	3.85	4.40	4.09	4.09	3.88	.533
Performing	2.90	3.67	4.20	3.00	3.36	3.56	.093
6. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.							
Low Performing	3.67	3.38	4.40	4.13	4.00	3.88	.305
Performing	2.86	3.08	4.20	3.05	3.41	3.50	.089
STAFF PERFORMANCE							
7. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.							
Low Performing	3.29	3.08	4.10	3.83	3.64	4.06	.152
Performing	2.71	3.08	3.90	2.91	3.09	3.44	.133

Table 25 (continued)

Results Compared By Geographical Location Within the State of Georgia

Questions	Geographical Locations						
	NE	NW	Metro	Mid	SE	SW	Sig.*
8. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.							
Low Performing	3.05	3.08	3.10	3.87	3.64	3.69	.196
Performing	2.48	2.67	3.00	2.77	2.86	3.13	.554
9. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.							
Low Performing	3.19	3.00	3.40	3.26	3.14	3.56	.888
Performing	2.67	2.67	3.20	2.55	2.59	3.38	.182
ACADEMIC FOCUS							
10. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.							
Low Performing	3.38	3.31	3.90	3.96	4.09	3.81	.336
Performing	2.86	3.08	3.80	3.00	3.27	3.44	.342
11. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.							
Low Performing	3.43	3.23	3.70	4.00	3.86	3.81	.542
Performing	2.71	3.08	3.50	3.05	3.23	3.44	.542
12. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.							
Low Performing	3.43	3.15	4.30	4.04	4.14	4.06	.090
Performing	2.90	3.08	4.00	3.09	3.50	3.63	.219
COMMUNICATION							
13. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.							
Low Performing	3.10	2.85	3.20	3.52	3.36	3.69	.420
Performing	2.67	2.58	3.00	2.91	2.77	3.13	.748
14. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.							
Low Performing	3.05	2.92	3.20	3.35	3.23	3.44	.873
Performing	2.71	2.83	2.90	2.73	2.95	3.00	.966

Table 25 (continued)

Results Compared By Geographical Location Within the State of Georgia

Questions	Geographical Locations						
	NE	NW	Metro	Mid	SE	SW	Sig.*
15. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stake-holder input and provide feed-back has changed.							
Low Performing	3.05	3.08	3.50	3.39	3.45	3.56	.760
Performing	2.76	2.75	3.20	2.77	3.05	3.19	.755
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING							
16. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.							
Low Performing	3.14	3.08	4.00	3.83	3.41	3.63	.214
Performing	2.71	3.00	3.70	2.86	3.00	3.13	.368
17. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.							
Low Performing	2.81	3.08	3.20	3.61	3.27	3.38	.377
Performing	2.57	2.83	3.00	2.95	2.91	2.94	.872
18. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.							
Low Performing	3.00	3.08	3.70	3.61	3.73	3.50	.294
Performing	2.71	2.75	3.50	2.77	3.05	3.19	.435
IMPROVEMENT PLANS							
19. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.							
Low Performing	3.29	3.77	4.50	4.09	4.23	4.13	.065
Performing	2.90	3.58	4.40	2.91	3.32	3.56	.024*
20. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.							
Low Performing	3.24	3.77	4.30	3.96	4.00	4.06	.162
Performing	2.90	3.50	4.10	2.91	3.27	3.56	.078

Table 25 (continued)

Results Compared By Geographical Location Within the State of Georgia

Questions	Geographical Locations						
	NE	NW	Metro	Mid	SE	SW	Sig.*
21. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.							
Low Performing	3.24	3.46	4.10	3.74	3.91	3.88	.319
Performing	2.90	3.33	3.80	2.82	3.23	3.44	.234
22. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.							
Low Performing	3.76	3.92	4.20	3.78	3.82	4.06	.891
Performing	3.43	3.83	4.20	3.09	3.36	3.63	.173

*$p < .05$

Table 25 included only one area as identified as being statistically significant. Superintendents in the metro-Atlanta geographical region ($p < .024$) indicated that their practice of evaluating principals in Title I performing schools had changed relative to planning the school improvement process. Mr. Somerset explained:

> The GLEI is also used and then the school improvement plan becomes the important part of a principal's evaluation when it comes time to make judgments about a principal's performance.

Mr. Somerset continued by saying that he expected low performing schools to be more focused and that he expected the school improvement plan to reflect that. He said that the manner in which the principals construct, review, and carry out school improvement plans for low performing schools are expected to be different than for principals of performing schools. Mr. Darby pointed out that the individual school improvement plan is part of the principal evaluation process. The school improvement plan provides information for the student achievement component of the evaluation. Mr. Darby said, "I do my evaluations at the end of the year. It is an ongoing evaluation, by the way. It is not a one-step process. But, I use evaluation as a part of

school improvement, overall." However, Mr. Darby noted, "The process isn't really different for schools, the expectations are that working through the school improvement plan process of what needs to be done and what attention it gets can be different." Ms. Rivers also found that the school improvement planning process became part of the principal's evaluation. She stated:

> We've done a lot of work on school improvement planning. They are targeting their plan for the needs of the children in their school, not trying to do a one-size-fits-all approach. Each year the principals look at the people they have and the students that they have and develop and update the plan.

Ms. Rivers also noted that the principal was expected to plan professional development based on the school improvement plan.

Research Questions

To be able to test the null hypothesis for each of the two research questions, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Descriptive statistics provided the mean and standard deviation. Inferential statistics were used to determine if the differences in the means were statistically significant. Dependent paired sample t-tests were calculated between each pair using a .05 alpha level of significance.

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in principals' performance evaluation before and after the status of the school was announced?

$H_0$1: There is no significant difference in the relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in principals' performance evaluation before and after the status of the school was announced.

The descriptive statistics, the mean and standard deviation, are listed in Table 13 for the evaluation items from the SSSEPP. The superintendents' evaluative changes for Title I schools that were once performing but became low performing yielded a mean (M = 3.67) which was

greater than for Title I schools that were once performing and were still performing ($M = 3.14$). Additionally, inferential statistics were used to determine if the difference between the means of superintendents' responses for the Title I low performing and the Title I performing schools were statistically significant. Dependent paired sample t-tests were calculated resulting in $t = 6.978$ ($p < .000$). The t-value indicated that there was a significant difference in the means. Based on the findings and within the limitations of the study, the null hypothesis, $H_0 1$ was rejected.

Mr. Somerset shared in his interview that the scope of the evaluation for principals of low performing is different. He includes the school improvement plan as an essential addition to the GLEI. He stated:

> The process is the same. However, I would say again that the scope is the difference. For example, for a low performing Title I school the scope should be more narrow and for a performing school, the scope may be broader. It is okay for it to be broader. They must find things that they feel need to be improved. The scope is expected to be narrow for that Title I low performing school because their needs should be identified, and obviously, that is what the principal should focus all efforts toward improving.

Mr. Bannister had a different point-of-view. He said, "Actually, we obviously work more closely with those principals of schools that are in needs of improvement. But, in terms of the actual observation process, it is not any different." Mr. Meriwether noted that principal evaluation is still tied very closely to the GLEI process that is used for principals in Georgia. He said, "We've stuck with that, not because we felt like it's the very best thing, but we've actually added to it. It has become very qualitative."

Mr. Darby stated that he uses the GLEI instrument in his school system with some reservation. He explained:

> We do use the GLEI instrument. We are talking about making some changes. We have been talking about making some significant changes, the HR Director and myself, and it needs to be. As of this time, by adding these other pieces even though they are not part of the instrument. For example, I required each principal to bring a portfolio, a technology portfolio. Last year we had principals do a five part reflection log. What have you done

> well, what problems are you having, what are your future goals, and what kind of support do you need? The pattern of some of the things I had written as comments on their evaluation instrument were related to the reflection logs.

Ms. Rivers noted that her school system still uses the GLEI and expectations are the same for principals' evaluations regardless of their school status.

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced?

$H_0$2: There is no significant difference in the relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced.

To determine if there was significant changes in superintendents' supervisory practices, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. The mean and standard deviation were included in Table 11 for the supervision items from the SSSEPP. Table 11 listed the means and standard deviations for the superintendents' responses for Title I low performing schools and Title I performing schools. The Title I low performing schools mean (M = 3.58) was higher than the Title I performing schools (M = 3.06). In comparing the mean number between the SSSEPP supervision items for Title I low performing schools and Title I performing schools, a dependent paired sample t-test was used. This test resulted in a t-value of 7.102 ($p < .000$). Based on a .05 level of significance, there was a significant difference in the mean values of these groups; therefore, $H_0$2 was rejected.

Mr. Darby, when asked if his supervision of principals differed depending on school status, stated:

> I don't know that I supervise them any different in terms of what I do. My expectations of individual schools are basically the same in terms of performance. The only difference is

> to work closely with them and try to support them and help them. From the central office, we are not just about control, we are about support.

Ms. Rivers assigned principal coaches for some principals to help them and keep them disciplined with their Georgia Leadership Institute project. She added:

> We are also coaching first year principals. I think that we are putting younger, less experienced people in the principalship and expecting them to be able to do that high performance work. It is a greater expectation of people with less experience.

Mr. Bannister stated, "I don't know that I supervise them any differently in terms of what I do." Mr. Meriwether mentioned micromanaging as something that he avoids in supervision. He explained:

> We're not going to run down and try to micromanage and second guess every decision. But, because we do supervise principals on a regular basis, where we know what their plan is. We are very aware of what is going on there. We don't have to second guess the principal because they understand the operating framework that is established.

Finally, the descriptive statistics and inferential statistics have been reported for changes in superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals in Title I schools that were once performing and then became low performing and also for Title I schools that were performing and remained performing during the same period. The statistics were calculated for supervisory and evaluative survey items combined. Then the statistics were calculated and reported for survey's supervisory items independent of evaluation items and conversely the evaluation items independent of the supervisory items. Also, this chapter included statistics for each of the survey's dimensional constructs such as curriculum, academic focus, and staff performance. Being more specific, the chapter reported statistics by individual survey items. The findings will be summarized and discussed along with conclusions and recommendations made in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study are presented in this chapter. The chapter is organized into nine sections including (a) summary of purpose, (b) summary of procedures, (c) summary of descriptive data, (d) summary of findings, (e) summary of data based on demographics, (f) conclusions, (g) recommendations for further study, (h) implications, and (i) final thoughts.

Summary of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision and evaluation of principals by superintendents in light of accountability and low performing schools. The study was guided by the following two research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' evaluative practices before and after the status of the school was announced?
2. Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced?

Selected superintendents ($N = 146$) from school systems in Georgia were surveyed about their supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of Title I schools, both performing and low performing. Additionally, five school superintendents were interviewed to gain perspectives about supervision and evaluation practices among superintendents of systems that have

performing and low performing Title I schools. The knowledge discovered through such a study might assist superintendents and those who evaluate principals in understanding how supervision and evaluation impacts school improvement efforts in low performing schools. Moreover, the current study may assist policy makers in assessing the impact of the supervision and evaluation of principals in light of accountability and educational reform policies.

Summary of Procedures

The study used a mixed method approach to collect and analyze data. The approach, known as the sequential exploratory design (Creswell, 2002), allowed the researcher to conduct structured interviews with a small number of participants ($N = 5$) in a qualitative manner and then explore additional data in a quantitative manner by surveying a large number of participants ($N = 146$). The researcher used the mixed method to gain broader perspectives of superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices of principals of Title I low performing and Title I performing schools.

Structured interviews were conducted with superintendents ($N = 5$) that supervised and evaluated principals of Title I low performing and Title I performing schools. The researcher developed a survey instrument called the *Survey of Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* (SSSEP). The instrument consisted of questions that were developed from specific indicators identified in the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI), data collected from the qualitative interviews, and to the existing body of research on principal supervision and evaluation. The surveys were sent to all Georgia school superintendents ($N = 146$) that had both low performing and performing Title I schools. No surveys were sent to superintendents that were new to their system. The return rate was 77.40% ($N = 113$). Of the surveys returned, eight

were either returned after the deadline or were incomplete. There were 105 useable surveys for a response rate of 71.91%.

The survey (SSSEPP) consisted of 22 items that required the respondent to answer twice. Each superintendent answered 22 items under two conditions. First, the superintendents were asked to respond to the 22 items about changes in their supervisory and evaluative practices for Title I schools that were once performing but became low performing. T hen, the superintendents were asked to respond to the same 22 items for Title I schools that were once performing and remained performing during the same time frame other schools became low performing. The survey instrument was formatted so that responses were placed along the left margin for the low performing school condition and along the right margin for the performing school condition. The 22 items were placed along the center of the page to create ease of reading for the superintendents. The format was designed to be completed in about 13 minutes. The survey used a five-part Likert scale to determine the degree of change in superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices under the two conditions. Additionally, several demographic questions were included for the purpose of better defining the respondents.

The *Survey of Superintendents' Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* were mailed with a cover letter in the fall of 2003 to qualifying superintendents ($N = 146$). A friendly reminder was sent to all non-respondents at the end of the two-week deadline. The researcher received 105 useable surveys. The data were then analyzed using the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS). Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to determine statistically significant changes in the superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices. Statistical significant differences were determined using an alpha level of $p < .05$.

Summary of Descriptive Data

The demographic information collected for each superintendent with the survey included: (a) gender, (b) number of years respondent has served as superintendent in the current system, (c) the number of years the respondent served as superintendent, (d) the total number of years in education, and (e) the number of principals evaluated in the system. Additional demographic information was collected for each superintendent from public information sources. Those demographic information areas included: (f) the number of Title I schools in the system, (g) the percentage of Title I schools considered low performing, (h) the Metropolitan Statistical Area status, and (i) the geographical location of the superintendents' school system within the state of Georgia.

Most of the respondents were male (82.9%). A large number (42.9 %) of the respondents served as superintendent in their current system for three years or less. Only 11.5% had been in the same system as superintendent for 11 or more years. A small percentage of responding superintendents (4.8%) had more than 20 years of experience as a superintendent. About half (46.7%) of the superintendents evaluate five or less principals, indicating a large number of small school systems. About 71.5% of responding superintendents had 1-5 Title I schools. A large number (66.6%) of the superintendents had over 50% of their Title I schools considered as low performing.

A panel of expert judges reviewed the survey for content validity. A pilot study was completed to determine reliability. The pilot study yielded a Cronbach's coefficient *alpha* of .9744 for internal reliability. The Cronbach's *alpha* for the completed surveys yielded a coefficient of .9835.

Summary of Findings

The following summarizes the findings for each of studies' research questions and null hypotheses as a result of the statistical tests that were calculated by using the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS).

Research Question 1

Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' evaluative practices before and after the status of the school was announced?

$H_0$1(Null Hypothesis #1)

There is no significant difference in the relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in principals' performance evaluation before and after the status of the school was announced.

The superintendents reported a higher degree of change (see Table 11) in evaluative practices for Title I schools that were once performing and then became low performing (M = 3.67) than for Title I schools that were once performing and were still performing (M = 3.14). The differences in the mean scores (see Table 13) were found to be statistically significant with a t-value of 6.987 (p <.000). The correlation coefficient (r = .728) that describes the magnitude of the relationship (see Table 15) was statistically significant (p< .000). The null hypothesis, $H_0$1, was rejected.

Additional data were calculated for the overall survey (See Tables 11, 13, 15), each of the survey dimensions (See Table 11, 13, 15), and each of the survey's 22 items (See Tables 12, 14, 16). For each comparison, there were statistically significant differences favoring greater changes in superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices for Title I schools that were

once performing and then became low performing. For example, the following dimensional constructs within the survey all had higher mean scores for Title I low performing than for the Title I performing schools: Curriculum low performing (M =3.61) and performing (M =3.01); Student Performance low performing (M =3.85) and performing (M =3.26); Staff Performance low performing (M =3.44) and performing (M =2.90); Academic Focus low performing (M=3.76) and performing (M =3.21); Communication low performing (M =3.26) and performing (M =2.87); Organization Setting low performing (M =3.39) and performing (M =2.94); and Improvement Plans low performing (M =3.82) and performing (M = 3.26). All tests had significance for the mean difference between each pair (low performing school and performing school) at $p < .000$.

Research Question 2

Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced?

$H_0$2 (Null Hypothesis #2)

There is no significant difference in the relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced.

The superintendents reported a higher degree of change (see Table 11) in supervisory practices for Title I schools that were once performing and then became low performing (M = 3.58) than for Title I schools that were once performing and were still performing (M = 3.06). The differences in the mean scores (see Table 13) were found to be statistically significant with a t-value of 7.102 (p <.000). The correlation coefficient (r = .739) that describes

the magnitude of the relationship (see Table 15) was statistically significant ($p < .000$). The null hypothesis, $H_0 2$, was rejected.

Additional data were calculated for the overall survey (See Tables 11, 13, 15), each of the survey dimensions (See Table 11, 13, 15), and each of the survey's 22 items (See Tables 12, 14, 16). For each comparison, there were statistically significant differences favoring greater changes in superintendents' supervisory and evaluative practices for Title I schools that were once performing and then became low performing than changes in practices in Title I performing schools.

Summary of Data Based on Demographics

Using one-way ANOVA calculations, the data were compared by demographics to determine significance among means. Male superintendents had statistically significant higher changes on four items: evaluating principal's goals ($p < .029$) and evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results ($p < .036$) for Title I low performing schools, and evaluating principal's goals ($p < .047$) and supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources ($p < .037$) for Title I performing schools.

Superintendents with 20 or more years experience as superintendent in the same system had significantly more change on two items: evaluating the principal's goals ($p < .012$) and supervising the principals' use of instructional support staff and resources ($p < .033$) for Title I performing schools. When comparing superintendents by the number of principals they evaluate in their system, those that evaluate five or less principals had a significantly higher change in their supervisory practice relative to principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel

($p < .036$) for low performing schools. Superintendents that evaluate 11-20 principals had a significantly higher difference for their perception that their supervisory and evaluative practices assist school improvement ($p < .040$) in Title I performing schools.

Superintendents that had 76-100% of their Title I schools considered as low performing had a statistically significant higher degree of change in the area of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum ($p < .006$) and of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources ($p < .017$) for Title I performing schools.

The only result from comparing superintendents from the various geographical regions within the state of Georgia that was significant was for metro-Atlanta superintendents. Metro-Atlanta superintendents' responses were statistically significant for more change in evaluating principals in planning the school improvement process for Title I performing schools.

Conclusions and Discussion

After analyzing the qualitative and quantitative data collected using the mixed method process, the following conclusions were made:

Conclusion 1

Superintendents are changing their evaluation practices after a performing Title I school becomes low performing. The superintendents' survey responses translated to a score of "agree" on the five-part Likert scale for low performing Title I schools ($M = 3.67$). The responses for Title I performing schools translated to "sometimes" on the scale ($M = 3.14$). The difference in the means was calculated as being significant ($p < .000$). The pair of variables had a correlation coefficient ($r = .728$) that was significant ($p < .000$). The superintendents' evaluation practices of principals of Title I low performing schools are undergoing more change when compared to evaluating principals of Title I performing schools.

Just as the relative literature suggests that principal evaluation is problematic due to the situational nature of the principal's work (Davis, 1998; Seyfarth, 1999), the structured interviews revealed that superintendents are beginning to adjust their supervisory and evaluative practices because of challenges with accurately evaluating the myriad responsibilities of the school principal.

Thomas, et al. (2000) found that the primary purpose of principal evaluation was to fulfill requirements set by local or state school boards. In Georgia, state law requires all leadership personnel to be evaluated annually (Georgia Education Code 20-2-210). The state department developed a program for evaluation that included an instrument called the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI). The current instrument, revised in 1992, has been used by superintendents without much variation. However, with the advent of recent accountability policies such as *No Child Left Behind*, superintendents have started rethinking the usefulness of the GLEI and its intended purpose.

The superintendents found the current evaluation instrument to be too narrowly defined. Superintendents are expecting principals to carry out their duties as instructional leaders in a number of different ways—differentiated leadership. Through the interviews, the superintendents shared that they supported more developmental leadership skills rather than the management type leader that was evident prior to high-stakes testing and accountability. The superintendents viewed the GLEI as inadequate when attempting to capture and accurately portray the performance of principals working under the conditions of a school that is considered to be low performing. All superintendents stated that they expected low performing schools to improve.

Moore and Slade (1996) found that as education reform and accountability called for improved performance, the principal performance, too, must be evaluated based on school improvement and performance. The descriptive statistics in this study found that the highest mean in the dimensional constructs was in the area of "student performance." This quantitative data underscores the viewpoint that superintendents relate the performance of the principal to student performance data.

Additionally, superintendents indicated the need to evaluate accurately the performance of the school principal in light of accountability and low performing schools. One finding in the study was that the use of the GLEI has changed. Four of the five interviewed superintendents referred to abandoning the use of the GLEI in its pure and intended form. Each of the four have added components such as portfolios or improvement plans to the GLEI. These superintendents believed the additions increased the depth of evaluative information. The superintendents are retro-fitting the current GLEI into something that more closely measures the quality of the principal's work especially considering the status of the school, performing or low performing.

The differing conditions occurring from school to school must be taken into account when evaluation systems and processes are used to assess the leadership of the principal (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Marcoux, 2002). Ginsberg and Thompson (1992) concluded that the constructs in which principals are evaluated "don't easily lend themselves to observation and measurement for evaluation purposes" (p. 62). Closely related, one superintendent shared, "the school improvement plan becomes a very important part of the evaluation process." Another superintendent stated, "We have added a portfolio to the GLEI because it adds value to the process that is missing in the GLEI itself." Finally, another superintendent shared that a

reflection log activity was added to the GLEI because it better demonstrates the work of the principal."

The quantitative and qualitative data collected and analyzed in this study is consistent with the current literature relative to the difficult and problematic nature of evaluating the work of the principal. Schools where principals are moving away from traditional leadership techniques for the purposes of responding to accountability and school reform policy are especially difficult to supervise and evaluate in the traditional manner.

Conclusion 2

Superintendents are changing their supervisory practices after a Title I performing school becomes low performing. In light of accountability, superintendents shared that they have started monitoring the work that principals do more than they have done in the past. The superintendents also shared that they are working more closely with principals of Title I low performing schools.

The role of the superintendent in relation to the supervision of the principal has not been examined in depth (Moore, 2000; Szakacs, 2002). Consistent with that finding is what the interviewed superintendents described as supervisory changes. Data from interviews showed that superintendents supervised principals in very different ways. The superintendents described close contact with the principal, and arranging opportunities to talk and discuss current school challenges with the principals. Some of the supervisory approaches shared in the interviews were giving support to the principals by providing additional training, additional resources such as instructional coaches, technical support, and ensuring that the principals were involved in system-wide curriculum discussions. The superintendents noted that these changes in supervision were needed because of the urgency to respond to recent accountability policies such

as the *A-Plus Educational Reform Act of 2000* mandated by the Georgia state legislature and the federal educational reform called *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB).

Each of the superintendents interviewed recognized the need to supervise principals of low performing schools in a more direct manner than the principals of performing schools believing that the supervision would positively affect school improvement efforts and student achievement. This qualitative finding is consistent with current related literature. As schools respond to improvement and accountability efforts, supervision may be one of the tools to bring about improved student achievement (Murphy & Louis, 1994; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993).

The study found that there was quantitative evidence indicating that superintendents perceived their supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school achievement (See Table 12). The mean for survey item number 22 translated to "agree" for low performing schools (M = 3.87) and translated between "agree" and "sometimes" for performing schools (M =3.50). The differences between these two means are determined to be statistically significant (2-tailed) by completing dependent paired sample t-tests. The t-value was 5.086 with $p < .000$. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r = .786) described the magnitude of the relationship between the paired variables (low performing and performing schools for survey item 22). The r value was determined to be statistically significant ($p < .000$). Again, all of the superintendents expressed a strong desire to move low performing schools to a performing status. The statistical data from this study is consistent with the scant literature found relative to principal supervision (Duke & Stiggins, 1985; Kowalski, 1999; Murphy & Hallinger, 1986).

Conclusion 3

The superintendents recognized planning for school improvement and student performance as necessary for Title I schools to move from low performing to performing status.

The survey results indicated that the two dimensions scoring the highest means for changes in supervisory and evaluative practice were the Student Performance dimension ($M = 3.85$) and Improvement Plans ($M = 3.82$), both on the five-part Likert scale translating to "agree." Both dimensions yielded a significant difference between low performing and performing schools.

The t-tests results for the Student Performance dimension were 6.255 for t-value and a 2-tailed significance of $p < .000$. Likewise, the Improvement Plans yielded similar t-value results ($t = 6.593$) with a 2-tailed significance of $p < .000$. The Pearson correlation coefficients (r) for the Student Performance dimension is .688 and is significant ($p < .000$). The Improvement Plans had similar results ($r = .729$) and significance ($p < .000$).

Superintendents are giving principals of Title I low performing schools added attention in light of recent accountability standards and mandates because they believe the principal is the key person at the school level to bring about successful school improvement. Similarly, related literature suggests that it is the principal who implements educational programs, and it is the principal who has the ability to exert significant influence over student achievement (Hallinger, Bickman, & Davis, 1996).

Schools qualify for additional federal monies from Title I funding source if certain federal guidelines governing percentage of families in the school's community are met. Schools that receive the funding are then known as Title I schools. Bray and Challinor (2001) defined an effective school as one in which equal proportions of students master the curriculum regardless of the student's family income level. *NCLB* requires all schools, regardless of demographic makeup, to meet adequate yearly progress toward attaining achievement standards. The interviewed superintendents said that this requirement—adequate yearly progress, has been the

stimulus for the change in supervision of principals for both low performing and performing Title I schools.

Superintendents are reviewing the principals' use of resources, budget, facilities, and personnel in Title I low performing schools with a higher degree of change than before the school was deemed low performing. Aligning curriculum and monitoring its delivery has been one outcome of reviewing practices in low performing schools shared one principal during the structured interview. One superintendent said a careful review of the curriculum initiated some critical changes for his system. The result was immediately positive in terms of test scores. Another superintendent indicated that periodic reviews of the school budgets were being conducted to better manage limited resources. Resources are analyzed in terms of how they contribute to positive student outcomes.

Superintendents indicated that instructional leadership has become an expectation for principals in light of accountability. One superintendent stated that he wanted principals that could "effectively construct, review, and carry out school improvement plans." This notion is consistent with current school improvement literature such as the work of Harrington-Lueker (1998) and Hopkins and Reynolds (2001). Harrington-Lueker's research contends that the principal has emerged as an instructional leader in an effort to emphasize the importance of student achievement. Effective school improvement focuses on increased student outcomes and a knowledge base of the research and best practices that are supported with an infrastructure that allows for better use of curriculum and instruction (Hopkins & Reynolds, 2001).

Recommendations for Further Study

This research study addressed two important functions of the superintendent: evaluation and supervision of the school principal. The findings suggest that only recently have

superintendents begun to address evaluation and supervision in a manner that affects school improvement and student achievement. All five of the superintendents interviewed expressed strong statements about the call for school improvement. The survey's results were significant ($p < .000$) for the overall comparison of superintendents' supervision and evaluation practice for Title I low performing schools ($M = 3.61$) compared to Title I performing schools ($M = 3.08$). Similar results were found to be the case with the supervision items ($p < .000$, $M = 3.58$ for low performing and $M = 3.06$ for performing schools and the evaluation items ($p < .000$, $M = 3.67$ for low performing schools and $M = 3.14$ for performing schools). The results of the individual 22 survey items ($p < .000$) found that the mean was always higher for the Title I low performing schools when compared to the Title I performing schools. Although, recognizing the scarcity of literature related to supervision of the principal, the related instructional supervision literature points to the importance of on-going and purposeful supervisory practices and the resulting positive schoolwide outcomes (Glatthorn, 1998; Harris, 1998).

Recommendation 1

Additional study is needed in the area of principal supervision. The related literature is scant. Current researchers find it difficult to find footholds when there is so little known about how principals are supervised. The superintendents interviewed considered principal supervision differently from each other. What does principal supervision look like? For the superintendents interviewed, their view of principal supervision was fragmented and loosely-coupled to principal evaluation. They were unsure of the relationship, yet, believed one existed.

This study's quantitative and qualitative data supported the notion that supervision affected school improvement. One assumption may be made from studying the survey results. Superintendents perceived that their supervisory and evaluative practices had undergone a

greater change for Title I low performing schools than it had for Title I performing schools. The inference is that superintendents believe that supervision and evaluation of principals assists in achieving school improvement. Taking the assumption one-step further, schools that are low performing, obviously, are the ones needing assistance in school improvement. Further research of the superintendents' supervisory practices and the possible impact it has on school improvement would assist other superintendents as they carry out the practices that best assist schools needing to improve.

Recommendation 2

Additional study is warranted for principal supervision. This study asked if supervision practices changed in light of a school's performance status. How is principal supervision being carried out? This study did not explore how supervision takes place nor describe what supervision looks like. The research did not examine which practices were effective or ineffective. This research did not discover the intents of principal supervision. The answers to these questions would benefit the field of supervision research as well as assist current and future superintendents and how and why they supervise and evaluate principals, regardless of Title I performing or low performing status.

Recommendation 3

Additional study is needed in the area of principal evaluation. Current research exists to a greater degree than it does for principal supervision. However, most experts agree that evaluating principals is no easy task (Ediger, 2001, Thomas et al., 2000). The nature of the principal's job is one that finds the principal in brief, varied, and fragment work tasks throughout the day (Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998). A future research project should abandon traditional evaluation approaches and test alternative systems. Current literature states that evaluators and

those evaluated, alike, are not pleased with the principal evaluation process or product (Louden & Wildy, 1999; Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998). Exploring evaluative process that better capture the quality of the principal's work would be welcomed by both superintendents and principals.

Recommendation 4

Additional study is needed to determine the effectiveness of the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument (GLEI) as well as the variability in its use across the state of Georgia. In the state of Georgia, the Georgia Leadership Evaluation Instrument is provided as the evaluation instrument to be used for anyone requiring a leadership certificate. This study found that the use of the GLEI may be limited in its purest and intended form. In the initial stages of the current study, the researcher included a component of the study that required a documentary analysis of GLEI instruments from a number of school systems. This component had to be abandoned because of the vast number of superintendents that reported they no longer used the GLEI in its original manner, or they only used part of the GLEI, or they added components to the GLEI, or they did not use the GLEI at all. It was evident that the researcher would not be able to gather enough data to complete that portion of the study relating to superintendents' evaluative practices. However, future research would be helpful to superintendents and principals as decisions may need to be made about the future of the GLEI. Some possible outcomes of such a study may include revising the GLEI, adopting another evaluation system, creating a new system, among many others. In light of accountability, it is imperative to find the most effective process for evaluating principals of all schools.

Implications

This research study found that superintendents did recognize that their supervisory and evaluative practices were different for a principal of a low performing school. Superintendents

are struggling with current accountability mandates. Policies governing student performance and the practice of labeling schools with performance ratings is creating a sense of urgency for superintendents to do something from the superintendent's office to help in the school improvement process. This study found that superintendents did perceive that their supervisory and evaluative practices made a difference in school improvement. The mean score from the survey item (M =3.87) was interpreted from the Likert scale as "agree." The result was significant with a t-value of 5.086 ($p < .000$). However, it is not known how nor which supervisory practices influence school improvement.

The intent of instructional supervision is to provide on-going professional growth opportunities to those being supervised in a formative manner, whereas evaluation is summative and leads to a final judgment of performance (Zepeda, 2003). The intent of principal supervision may be considered in a parallel manner, yet, not all aspects of instructional supervision possess similarities. Because of the lack of qualitative or quantitative study relative to principal supervision, there may be an implication that supervisors will rely on what they know about instructional supervision without regard for the intended recipient of the supervision instead of using appropriate leadership supervisory practices. Superintendents will continue to struggle with effective and ineffective supervisory practices until more is known about principal supervision. Which practices are the best for which situations is still unknown.

The superintendents reported a high mean (M =3.85) for the survey's Student Performance dimensional construct. The superintendents indicated that for Title I low performing schools, they perceived that their supervisory practices of principals' ability to use test data for school improvement has changed more so than for Title I performing schools. The difference was statistically significant ($p < .000$). An implication of this finding is that test data

(or student test results) will be the impetus for many decisions made not only at the school level but most likely at the system level as well.

Accountability policies are creating tremendous changes in the way superintendents are carrying out the business of handling low performing schools. One implication of accountability is that some schools may receive adequate support for changing their school status. Others may not. Of the superintendents surveyed, about 20% reported that no supervisory practices had changed for supervising the principal's use of instructional support and resources regardless of the Title I school's performance status. Yet, some of the superintendents interviewed worried about declining funding sources and other limited resources in a time when accountability is expecting more from the school.

This study's results revealed that the principal is the focus of the school improvement movement at the school level. It was evident from the structured interviews, that superintendents viewed the principal as being critical to the success of the school. This was consistent with related literature. Ubben, et al. (2001) also recognized the importance of the principal to school improvement. This finding, along with the literature supports the following implication for school principals. In light of accountability, there may be growing pressures placed on only one individual at the school level—the principal, resulting in the possibility of decreasing the limited market of potential school leaders (Fullan, 1997; Meyer, 2000).

Final Thoughts

Superintendents have undergone a "seismic shift" in their thinking about the organizations that they lead (Schlecty, 2001). The larger society in which the school organization is embedded has undergone a great deal of structural changes resulting in slight

tremors causing superintendents to rethink effective school leadership and the resulting supervision and evaluation of those leaders.

As with any structural damage, repairs must be made. They are expensive, time-consuming, complicated, require the right tools to get the job done, along with providing the assistance of experts in the field. Not everyone can repair the damage; however, ignoring the problem typically brings additional damage until there is no choice but to address the issues. Structural damage has the capability of affecting many other elements of the structure beyond the foundation upon which everything rests. Many times these outlying problems are the first signals of deeper and more serious issues.

It is incumbent for all educators to start recognizing the "seismic shift's" impact on the prospect that the shifts may increase in intensity and frequency. To combat a full-blown "shake-up," all teachers, principals, administrators, superintendents, school board members, students, parents, community members, and state and federal policy makers should repair the current damage and start working to prevent additional damage from unforeseen tremors by insuring that school improvement is in place in every classroom in every school. By putting prevention measures in place, school leaders are minimizing the opportunity for damage when future tremors and shifts occur.

School leaders need the right tools to assure that appropriate measures are in place for a strong academic program and for school improvement. The superintendent's supervisory and evaluative practices serve as specialized tools that every school system leader needs to use with precision and thought in order to reap the benefits of using such tools. Supervision and evaluation from the leaders of school systems must be meaningful and purposeful—they must know how to repair and prevent future problems. Through those practices, all stakeholders are

assured that repair and prevention is being done in the name of school improvement and student achievement. The work of the superintendent in properly supervising and evaluating principals cannot be minimized as part of the equation for lasting school improvement.

REFERENCES

A Plus Reform Act (2000). Commonly asked questions about education reform. Author. Retrieved January 13, 2003, from http://ganet.org/governor/education/q_a_tf.html.

Acheson, K., & Gall, M. (1997). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Preservice and inservice applications* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Ackerman, R., Donaldson, G., & Van der Bogert, R. (1996). *Making sense as a school leader.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Albanese, L. (2003). Identifying and assessing current practices in principal evaluation (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*, 3427.

Alfonso, R., Firth, G., & Neville, R. (1975). *Instructional supervision: A behavior system.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Atkinson, T. (2002). We're not just whistling Dixie: Policymakers' perspectives on state education reform. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*(4), 289-308.

Barth, R. (2001). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bell, T. H. (1993). Reflections one decade after a nation at risk. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*(8), 593-597.

Bellon, J., & Bellon, E. (1982). *Classroom supervision and instructional improvement: A synergetic process* (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Black, K. (1995). A study of principal evaluation in Illinois high school districts: Current practices and procedures compared with best practices as articulated by the personnel evaluation standards (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana, 1995). *Dissertations Abstract International, 57*, 1403.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1998). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Blumberg, A. (1980). *Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brady, A. (1993). A comparison of the supervision of principals in two school districts (Doctoral dissertation, the University of Colorado at Denver, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*, 0040.

Bray, R., & Challinor, R. (2001). Texas-style school improvement. *Leadership*, *31*(2), 26-27.

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership.* NY: Harper and Row.

Calabrese, R., & Zepeda, S. J. (1997). *The reflective supervisor: A practical guide for educators.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Cammaert, R. (1987). A study of current practices for the evaluation and supervision of principals in Alberta (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 49,* 0666.

Cantu, M. (1994). *A study of principal instructional leadership behaviors manifested in successful and nonsuccessful urban elementary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

Carter, G., & Cunningham, W. (1997). *The American school superintendent*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cascadden, D. (1998). Principals as managers and leaders: A qualitative study of the perspectives of selected elementary school principals. *Journal of School Leadership, 8*(1), 137-169.

Castetter, W. (1996). *The human resource function in educational administration* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Catano, N. (2002). Content analysis of principal job descriptions and principal evaluation instruments of K-12 public education in Virginia (Doctoral dissertation, The College of William and Mary, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63,* 1636.

Chatterji, M. (2002). Models and methods for examining standards-based reforms and accountability initiatives: Have the tools of inquiry answered pressing questions on improving schools? *Review of Educational Research, 72*(3), 345-386.

Cheng, Y. (1994). Principals' leadership as a critical factor for school performance: Evidence from multi-levels of primary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5*(3), 299-317.

Christie, K., & Ziebarth, T. (2000). Reporting, rewarding and sanctioning schools and districts. *State Educational Leader, 18*(3). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1-3.

Clayton-Jones, L., McMahon, J., Rodwell, K., Skehan, J., Bourke, S., & Holbrook, A. (1993). Appraisal of school principals in an Australian Department of Education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(2), 110-131.

Cogan, M. (1973). *Clinical supervision.* Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Cole, C. (1992). The evaluation of school administrators on behaviors associated with the effective school research (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54,* 0037.

Cookson, P., Jr. (1995). Goals 2000: framework for the new educational federalism. *Teachers College Record, 96*(1), 405-417.

Cooley, V., & Shen, J. (2000). Factors influencing applying for urban the principalship. *Education and Urban Society, 32*(4), 443-454.

Cooper, B., & Fusarelli, L. (Eds.). (2002). *The promises and perils facing today's school superintendent.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (1994). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Creswell, J. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, & evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Danielson, C. (2002). *Enhancing student achievement: A framework for school improvement.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Daresh, J. (2001). *Beginning the principalship.*Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Daresh, J. (2002). *What it means to be a principal: Your guide to leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Datnow, A., & Castellano, M.E. (2001), Managing and guiding school reform: Leadership in success for all schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(2), 219-249.

Davis, S. (1998). Superintendent's perspectives on the involuntary departure of public school principals: The most frequent reasons why principals lose their jobs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*(1), 58-90.

Davis, S., & Hensley, P. (1999). The politics of principal evaluation. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 29*(1), 22-26.

Delaney, J. (1997). Principal leadership: A primary factor in school-based management and school improvement. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 81*(586), 107-111.

Desimone, L. (2002). How can comprehensive school reform models be successfully implemented? *Review of Educational Research, 72*(3), 433-479.

Doud, J. (1989). *The k-8 principal in 1988.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Duffy, F. (1997). *Supervising schooling, not teachers.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement.* Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Duke, D. (1992). Concepts of administrative effectiveness and the evaluation of school administrators. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 6*(1), 103-121.

Duke, L., & Stiggins, J. (1985). Evaluating the performance of principals: A descriptive study. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21*(4), 71-98.

Ediger, M. (2001). *Assessment of school principal achievement* (Report No. TMO 32521). MO: Tests, Measurement and Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED452235).

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 Reauthorization (2002). Author. Retrieved March 31, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/sec1116.html.

Erlandson, D., & Hoyle, J. (1991). Administrator performance evaluation: A comparison of two measures in the management profile. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 4*(1), 279-292.

Evers, W., & Walberg, H. (Eds.). (2002). *School accountability.* Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.

Fielder, D. (2003). *Achievement now! How to assure no child is left behind.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Fink, D. (1999). Deadwood didn't kill itself: A Pathology of failing schools. *Educational Management & Administration*, *27*(2), 131-141.

Franklin, J. (2002). *The necessary principal: The importance of instructional leadership*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Frerking, R. (1992). Principal performance evaluation: A nation-wide status report on the type and effectiveness of evaluation as perceived by principals and supervisors. (Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53,*4148.

Fullan, M. (1997). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership,59*(8), 16-20.

Gay, L. (1992). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Georgia Department of Education (1992), *Georgia leadership evaluation instrument.* Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education. Author.

Georgia Department of Education (1992). *Georgia leadership evaluation manual.* Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education. Author.

Georgia Department of Education (1992). *Georgia leadership evaluation program.* Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education. Author.

Georgia Education Code. (2001). *Education, 17*(Title 20). Charlottesville, VA: Lexis. Author.

Georgia's Quality Basic Education Act: A Summary. (1985). Georgia Department of Education: Author.

Ginsberg, R., & Thompson, T. (1992). Dilemmas and solutions regarding principal evaluation. *Peabody Journal of Education,* 68(1), 58-74.

Glanz, J., & Neville, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Glatthorn, A. (1984). *Differentiated supervision.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.

Glatthorn, A. (1990). *Supervisory leadership: Introduction to instructional supervision.* New York: Harper Collins.

Glatthorn, A. (1998). Roles, responsibilities, and relationships. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp.374-396). NY: Simon & Schuster.

Glickman, C. (1990). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordon, J. (1998). *Supervision and instructional leadership:A developmental approach* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers.* NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Griffith, J. (1999). The school leadership/school climate relation: Identification of school configurations associated with change in principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly 35*(2), 267-292.

Hallinger, P., Bickman, L., & Davis, K. (1996). School context, principal leadership, and student reading achievement. *The Elementary School Journal 96*(5), 527-548.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1996). The principal's role in school effectiveness: An assessment of methodological progress, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly 32*(1), 5-44.

Hart, W. (1992, April). *The socialization and organizational influence of principals: Evaluating principals on organization criteria.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Harrington-Leuken, D. (1998). States raise the bar: Now local school districts are accountable for results. *American School Board Journal 16*(1), 17-21.

Harris, A. (2001). Building the capacity for school improvement. *School Leadership and Management, 21*(3), 261-270.

Harris, A. (2002). *School improvement: What's in it for schools?* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Harris, A., & Bennett, N. (Eds.). (2001). *School effectiveness and school improvement: Alternative perspectives,* London: Cassell.

Harris, A. (2003). The changing context of leadership: Research, theory, and practice. In A. Harris, C. Day, D. Hopkins, M. Hadfield, A. Hargreaves, & C. Chapman (Eds.), *Effective leadership for school improvement* (pp. 9-25). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Harris, A., Day, C., Hopkins, D., Hadfield, M., Hargreave, A., & Chapman, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Effective leadership for school improvement*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Harris, B. (1975). *Supervisory behavior in education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Harris, B. (1998). Paradigms and parameters of supervision in education. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp.1-34). NY: Simon and Schuster.

Harris, B., & Valverde, L. (1976). Supervisors and educational change. *Theory Into Practice, 15*(4), 267-273.

Haydn, T. (2001). From a very peculiar department to a very successful school: Transference issues arising out of a study of an improving school. *School Leadership & Management, 21*(4), 415-439.

Heck, R. H., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1992). Principal assessment: Conceptual problem, methodological problem, or both? *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(1), 124-144.

Holdaway, E., & Genge, A. (1995). How effective superintendents understand their own work. In K. Leithwood (Ed.), *Effective school district leadership* (pp. 13-32). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hopkins, D., Reynolds, D., & Gray, J. (1999). Moving on and moving up: confronting the complexities of school improvement in the improving schools project. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 5*(1) 22-40.

Hopkins, D., & Reynolds, D. (2001). The past, present, and future of school improvement: Towards the third age. *British Educational Research Journal, 27*(4), 459-475.

Houston, P. (2001). Superintendents for the 21st Century. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(6), 429-433.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). *Standards for school Leaders.* Retrieved January 21, 2003, from http://www.ccsso.org/isllc.html Author.

Jackson, B. (1995). *Balancing act: The political role of the urban superintendent.* Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.

Johnson, J. (1996). A statewide analysis of secondary principal evaluation systems in Arizona (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57,* 950.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1988). *The personnel evaluation standards: How to access systems for evaluating educators.* Newbury, CA: Sage Publications.

Kirchoff, S. (1999). Can 'accountability' get struggling schools on track?. *CQ Weekly, 57*(10), 529-534.

Kowalski, T. (1999). *The school superintendent: Theory, practice, and cases.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Langlois, D., & McAdams, R. (1992). *Performance appraisal of school management.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Lee-Smith, M., & Fey, P. (2000). Validity and accountability in high-stakes testing. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(5), 334-344.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(4), 498-518.

Lewis, A. (2001). Continuity and change in federal policy. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(6) 423-424.

Lezotte, L. (1997). *Learning for all.* Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.

Lezotte, L., & Bancroft, B. (1985). School improvement based on effective school research: A promising approach for economically disadvantaged and minority students. *Journal of Negro Education, 54*(3), 301-312.

Louden, W., & Wildy, H. (1999). Circumstance and proper timing: Context and the construction of a standards framework for school principals' performance. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(3), 398-422.

Lyons, J. (1999). How school principals perceive their roles, rewards, and challenges. *Educational Research Service Spectrum, 17*(1), 18-24.

Marcoux, J. (2002). Applying the portfolio process in principal evaluation: A case study (Doctoral dissertation, Sam Houston State University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*, 2427.

Martens, P. (1991). A study of the nature and extent of use of the standards in the principal evaluation process in selected districts (Doctoral dissertation, University of California Santa Barbara, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 52*. (UMI No. 2774)

McCleary, L. (1979). Evaluation of principals. *Theory Into Practice, 18*(1), 45-49.

Meyer, L. (2000). Standards for school leaders. *The NTA Resource Bulletin.* (2002) Retrieved November 25, 2002 from http://ici.umn.edu/ncset/publications/nta/bulletins/april2000.html

Mintrop, H., MacLellan, A., & Quintero, M. (2001). A comparative content analysis across three accountability systems. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(2), 197-218.

Moore, G. (2000). The supervision and evaluation of high school principals as described by central office administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61,* 1698.

Moore, A., & Slade, F. (1996). A view from the schools: Two principals speak. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(1), 72-76.

Mosher, R., & Purpel, D. (1972). *Supervision: The reluctant profession.* Boston: MA, Houghton-Mifflin.

Muncey, D., & McQuillan, P. (1996). *Reform and resistance in schools and classrooms.* New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1986). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. *Journal of Educational Administration, 24*(2), 213-236.

Murphy, J., & Louis, K. (1994). *Reshaping the principal.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Author.

National Center for Educational Statistics (2003). Information on public schools and school districts in the United States. Author. Retrieved March 22, 2003, from http://www.nces.ed.gov.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Retrieved January 29, 2003, from http://www.nochildleftbehind.gov/next/overview/index.html

Norton, M., Webb, L., Dlugosh, L., & Sybouts, W. (1996). *The school superintendency: New responsibilities new leadership.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

O'Day, J. (2002). Complexity, accountability, and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 293-329.

Office of Education Accountability (2000). Message from the office of educational Accountability. Author. Retrieved January 14, 2003, from http://www.ga-oea.org/message.html.

Paige, R. R. (2001). Speech delivered at the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Washington, D.C. In *Presidents and Prime Ministers, 10*(1), 30-32.

Pajak, E. (1993). *Approaches to clinical supervision: Alternatives for improving instruction.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Pullo, F. (1993). The current state of principal evaluation in Pennsylvania: Perceptions of superintendents and principals (Doctoral dissertation, Leigh University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53,* 4159.

Rallis, S., & Goldring, E. (1993). Beyond individual assessment of principals: School-base accountability in dynamic schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 67*(2), 3-23.

Rosenblatt, Z., & Somech, A. (1998). The work behavior of Israeli elementary school principals: Expectations versus reality. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*(4), 505-532.

Sammons, P., Thomas, S., & Mortimore, P. (1997). *Forging link: Effective schools and effective departments.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Schlecty, P. (1997). *Inventing better schools: An action plan for educational reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schlecty, P. (2001). *Shaking up the schoolhouse: How to support and sustain educational innovation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schmoker, M. (1999). *Results: The key to continuous school improvement* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. (1995). *The principalship: 4 reflective practice perspectives* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *The principalship: Reflective practice perspective* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F., & Thurston, P. (1999). *Educational governance and administration* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T., & Starratt, R. (1998). S*upervision: A redefinition* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Settle, K. (1993). A study of superintendent and principal perceptions of selected criteria for evaluating high school principals (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54,* 3287.

Seyfarth, J. (1999). The principal: New leadership for new challenges. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Sirotnik, K.A., & Durden, P.C. (1996). The validity of administrator performance assessment systems: The ADI as a case-in-point. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32*(4), 539-551.

Smith, W., & Andrews, R. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Spillane, R., & Regnier, P. (Eds.). (1998). *The superintendent of the future: A strategy and action for achieving academic excellence.* Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.

Spillane, J. Reiser, B., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(3), 387-431.

Stine, D. (2001, April). *Developing an evaluation system to improve principal performance and accountability.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Stronge, J. (1993). Defining the principalship: Instructional leader or middle manager? *NASSP Bulletin, 77*(553), 1-7.

Stufflebeam, D., & Nevo, D. (1993). Principal evaluation: New directions for improvement. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(2), 22-46.

Sunderman, G. (2001). Accountability mandates and the implementation of Title I schoolwide programs: A comparison of three urban districts. *Education Administration Quarterly, 37*(4), 503-532.

Szakacs, B. (2002). Principal perceptions of their performance evaluation experience: A study of public school principals in the state of Wisconsin (Doctoral dissertation, Cardinal Stritch University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63,* 3079.

Thomas, D., Holdaway, E., & Ward, K. (2000). Policies and practices involved in the evaluation of school principals. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 14*(1), 215-240.

Ubben, G., Hughes, L., & Norris, C. (2001). *The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). Metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas. Author. Retrieved August 25, 2003, from http://www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/metroarea.html

U.S. Department of Education. (1995). Goals 2000: Educate America act archived Information. Author. Retrieved March 7, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Biennial/95-96/eval/105-97.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education. (1998). *Turning around low-performing schools: A guide for state and local leaders.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). Fact sheet on Title I, Part A. Author. Retrieved May 10, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/esed/title_i_fact_sheet.doc

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). Title I grants for schools serving at-risk children in 2001. Author. Retrieved April 13, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/pubs/annualreport2001/274.html

Waite, D. (1995). *Rethinking instructional supervision: Notes on its language and culture.* London: The Falmer Press.

Whitaker, T., Whitaker, B., & Lumpa, D. (2000). *Motivating and inspiring teachers: The educational leaders' guide for building staff morale.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (2000). *Supervision: A guide to practice* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Williams, H. (2000). Teacher's perceptions of principal effectiveness in selected secondary schools in Tennessee. *Education, 121*(2), 264-275.

Williams-Boyd, P. (2002). *Educational leadership: A reference handbook.* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Wilson, R. (1993). A study of current practice of evaluation of the building level principal in the state of Arkansas (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54,* 2425.

Zepeda, S. J. (2003). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S. J., & Mayers, S. (2000). *Supervision and staff development in the block.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

APPENDIX A

DIRECTIONS: The following statements relate to the supervisory and evaluative practices of principals by superintendents in two types of Title I schools in your system. READ the statements in the center column and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement. For each item, please CIRCLE the number that best describes your practices. Answer in **both** the left column for low performing Title I Schools and right column for performing Title I Schools. Your responses in the **left** column relate to Title I schools that were once performing but became low performing. Your responses in the **right** column relate to Title I schools that were performing well and are still performing well (not low performing).

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Sometimes 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

SD D S A SA		**SD D S A SA**
LOW PERFORMING TITLE 1 SCHOOLS	**SURVEY OF SUPERINTENDENTS' SUPERVISORY AND EVALUATIVE PRACTICES OF PRINCIPALS**	**PERFORMING TITLE 1 SCHOOLS**
	CURRICULUM	
1 2 3 4 5	**1**. My practice of evaluating the principal's goals has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**2**. My practice of supervising the principal's implementation of the curriculum has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**3**. My practice of supervising the principal's use of instructional support staff and resources has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
	STUDENT PERFORMANCE	
1 2 3 4 5	**4**. My practice of evaluating the principal's performance based on student assessment results has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**5**. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to use test data to improve the instructional program has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**6**. My practice of supervising the principal's use of test data has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
	STAFF PERFORMANCE	
1 2 3 4 5	**7**. My practice of evaluating the principal's implementation of professional learning for staff has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**8**. My practice of supervising the principal's selection, termination, and use of personnel has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**9**. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to create relationships with staff has changed.	1 2 3 4 5

ACADEMIC FOCUS		
1 2 3 4 5	**10**. My practice of evaluating the principal's use of instructional time has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**11**. My practice of supervising the principal's expectations for students has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**12**. My practice of supervising the principal's involvement in instruction has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
COMMUNICATION		
1 2 3 4 5	**13**. My practice of evaluating the principal's communication with school and system staff has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**14**. My practice of supervising the principal's relationship with the community has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**15**. My practice of supervising the principal's ability to use stakeholder input and provide feedback has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING		
1 2 3 4 5	**16**. My practice of evaluating the principal's budget allocations relative to school needs has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**17**. My practice of supervising the principal's use of facilities and resources has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**18**. My practice of evaluating the principal's ability to create organizational capacity has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
IMPROVEMENT PLANS		
1 2 3 4 5	**19**. My practice of evaluating the principal in planning the school improvement process has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**20.** My practice of evaluating the principal's use of a school improvement plan has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**21**. My practice of supervising the principal while implementing the school improvement plan has changed.	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	**22**. My supervisory and evaluative practices assisted school improvement.	1 2 3 4 5

Please answer the following demographic items and return with the survey in the stamped envelope.

1. Gender: _____Male ____Female

2. Years as superintendent of current system:

_____ 0-3 years
_____4-10 years
_____11-20 years
_____20+ years

3. Total years as superintendent:

_____0-3 years
_____4-10 years
_____11-20 years
_____20+ years

4. Years in education:

_____0-10 years
_____11-20 years
_____21-30 years
_____30+ years

5. Number of principals evaluated in the system:

_____0-5
_____6-10
_____11-20
_____20+

APPENDIX B
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I agree to participate in the research titled, A Study of Superintendents Implementing Policy Related to Principal Supervision, Evaluation, and Accountability: A contrast of Low Performing and Performing Schools, which is being conducted by Mike Mattingly from the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Georgia, and whose phone number is (478) 988-6181, under the direction of Dr. Sally J. Zepeda, Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy at the University of Georgia, whose phone number is (706) 542-0408. I understand that this participation is entirely voluntary; I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and have the results of the participation, to the extent that it can be identified as mine, returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The reason for the research is to answer the following questions: (a) Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in principals' performance evaluation before and after the status of the school was announced? (b) Is there a relationship between schools' accountability status (performing or low performing) and changes in superintendents' supervisory practices before and after the status of the school was announced?

I understand that there are no direct benefits associated with my participation in this study.

I understand that my part in this study will include participation in one interview lasting approximately 120 minutes. I will be interviewed by the researcher during a mutually agreeable appointment and place. Questions for the interview will relate to my experiences as a supervisor and evaluator of principals of performing and low performing schools. I understand that the interview will be audio taped. I will be asked to provide supporting documents such as memos and/or agendas. Additionally, I will be asked to provide principal evaluation documents (GLEI documents) for one performing school and one low performing school from my system as identified by Title I performance standards.

No discomforts or stresses are foreseen. No risks are foreseen.

Any information the researcher obtains about me as a participant in this study, including my identity, will be held confidential. My identity will be coded with a pseudonym. All data will be kept in a secured, limited access location. My identity will not be revealed in any publication of the results of this research. The audiotapes of my interviews will be destroyed six months following the interview. All transcripts will be shredded one year after the defense of the dissertation. The results of this participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior consent unless otherwise required by law.

The research will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at (478) 988-6181 or (478) xxx-xxxx or email, mmattingly@hcbe.net.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

Please sign both copies of this form. Keep one and return the other to the investigator (researcher).

Mike Mattingly mmattingly@hcbe.net, 478-xxx-xxxx _____ _____
Name of Researcher /email/ph Signature of Researcher Date

_____ _____ _____
Name of Participant (please print) Signature of Participant Date

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, PhD, Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone 706.542.3199; E-mail address IRB@uga.edu.

APPENDIX C
COVER LETTER FOR SURVEY

September 25, 2003

Dear Superintendent:

I am seeking your assistance in a doctoral study of the evaluative and supervisory practices of superintendents that evaluate and supervise principals in low performing Title I schools and performing Title I schools. For this study, the Survey of Superintendents Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals has been sent to every public school superintendent in the state of Georgia.

I would gratefully appreciate your taking a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey and demographics sheet. The time required to complete the survey should be no more than 10 minutes. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary. Because this study is seeking aggregate data, your responses will be anonymous and individuals will not be identifiable in the study's findings. There are no foreseeable risks or benefits from your participation because this is simply an assessment study and not a treatment study.

Please complete the survey and demographics form and return no later than **October 9, 2003**, in the enclosed envelope. Returning the survey implies consent to participate in the study. Thank you in advance for participating in this research project which is part of my doctoral dissertation at The University of Georgia under the direction of my major professor, **Dr. Sally J. Zepeda** and with the assistance of **Dr. Carvin Brown**, Professor Emeritus.

If you have questions about the research, please contact me by mail or email at the following address:
Mike Mattingly,
Executive Director of Elementary Operations
Houston County Board of Education
PO Box 1850
Perry GA 31069 Email: mmattingly@hcbe.net
Tel. 478-988-6181 office
478-XXX-XXXX home
You may also contact my major professor and Doctoral Committee Chair: Dr. Sally J. Zepeda, 706-542-0408.

Thank you,

Mike Mattingly

APPENDIX D
FOLLOW-UP REMINDER TO NON-RESPONDENTS

Dear Superintendent,

This is just a friendly reminder to please take a few minutes to complete the *Survey of Superintendents' Supervisory and Evaluative Practices of Principals* that I sent to you last week. I very much want the study of superintendents' practices to reflect the work of all of our public school superintendents in our great state of Georgia. If you have any questions or need another copy of the survey, please contact me (478-988-6181) or mmattingly@hcbe.net.

Thank you,

Mike Mattingly