

OE-23027
Bulletin 1963
Number 6

Staff Personnel Administration

SELECTED PRACTICES and ISSUES

by
James P. Steffensen
Specialist
Employed School Personnel
Administration

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE**

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE
Secretary

Office of Education
FRANCIS KEPPEL
Commissioner

Foreword

AMERICAN EDUCATION is facing many challenges, but none is more important than that concerned with the personnel who staff the schools of this Nation. This challenge is considerably more than the recruitment of sufficient teachers of high quality into the classroom. These teachers must also be provided with the appropriate conditions under which they can accept and assume the leadership necessary for the continued development of the educational opportunities available to American youth. The challenge is one of personal growth and development in the broadest and most professional sense.

The crucial importance of the human element to the success of the educational program has long been recognized. Education is vastly more dependent upon the daily performance of its personnel than many other activities. And, as great attention is being given today to the status of the schools, those schools are in turn giving prime attention to their staff personnel. With or without a special personnel division, they are closely examining their personnel administration program. They are doing this not only through an emphasis upon a personnel point of view which emphasizes the integrity of the individual, but also through administrative arrangements which formalize certain personnel functions and make them more susceptible to description.

This bulletin is a report of a study of three such major functions and the administrative arrangements being made for their satisfaction. The study was developed through the use of visits within selected school systems, through solicited statements from school personnel administrators, and through examination of literature in the personnel field. The analysis is made in terms of practices, problems, issues, and possible trends in school personnel administration. The Office of Education wishes to express its appreciation to the many school officials who contributed, through interviews or correspondence, to the material presented in this bulletin.

FRED F. BEACH,
*Director, Administration of
State and Local School Systems.*

ERIC R. BABER,
*Assistant Commissioner,
Division of Elementary
and Secondary Education.*

Contents

	Page
FOREWORD.....	III
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION FOR PERSONNEL.....	4
III. STAFF RECRUITMENT AND ORIENTA- TION.....	13
IV. STAFF EVALUATION.....	25
V. STAFF DEVELOPMENT.....	35
VI. SUMMARY.....	47

CHAPTER I

Introduction

THE PURPOSE of this publication is to focus attention upon a rapidly growing development in public school administration—the increasing interest in personnel administration as a process which can be identified through a description of certain formal functions which every school district must perform. While the more intangible goals—democracy, morale, freedom, and security—of a staff personnel program are vital, they cannot be satisfied in the absence of a considerable amount of administrative organization and planning. The existence of adequate personnel policies is of fundamental importance to the teacher just as the existence of an adequate instructional staff is to the students.

The need for sound personnel programs in any organization is a reflection of the importance of the human element in the success or failure of the organization's purpose. This is particularly true in education, which has no measurable competitive product. But the current interest in personnel programs is also a reaction to the need for the schools to be competitive. First, they must be competitive with each other. It can be assumed that those schools which can offer more attractive working conditions generally will attract the more highly qualified and competent staffs. And, when this is done, the educational program in those schools gains in stature adding another and perhaps most important factor in attractiveness to the professional career teacher.

The second area of competition is with a less tangible goal, frequently referred to in such terms as quality, growth, and national interest: It is evident in the local, State, and national concern about the elementary and secondary curriculums. It is seen in the discussions on the quality of American school teachers and in the preparation programs for those teachers. It is dramatically evident in the annual recruitment rivalry which schools face with other organizations for the most capable college graduates.

The nature of this competition of both types has been to give greater attention to the role of the teacher as part of the total education program and perhaps relatively less attention to him as a person-

ality. The fundamental importance of the teacher to the educational program has long been recognized. But now more concern is with the total conditions under which the most capable staff can be attracted, can teach in a situation which permits them to grow in their chosen profession, and can assume both the privileges and responsibilities concomitant with their status as teachers of our youth. This attention, it is suggested, is illustrated in the offering of more formal attention to the entire staff personnel program, and of recognizing that the personnel function is too complex, too sensitive, and too important to receive anything but the closest scrutiny.

Outline of Procedure

A variety of developments have indicated the formalization of the entire area of staff personnel administration. Examples of the developments are the delineation of personnel policies in detailed written form, the specification of procedures for selection and dismissal, and the use of numerical ratios for staffing, leave, and salary policies. But there are larger categorizations which can be made, including inservice training, recruitment, promotion, and placement.

Out of a myriad of such classifications, three have been selected for particular attention. These include staff procurement, staff development, and staff evaluation, each an area of major concern in education today. Each of these in turn includes certain integral parts such as selection and orientation of new staff. Effort is then made to consider these three functions in terms of issues surrounding them and possible alternative trends which may influence or be influenced by their administration as a school policy. In addition, attention is given to the administrative organization through which these three functions are discharged in several school systems. This is typically done through the description of an existing administrative practice which was observed and is made solely for the purposes of clarification.

Sources of Information

Three major sources of information were utilized. One was the result of personal visits of from 2 to 3 days in each of 7 school districts throughout the Nation.¹ They ranged in size from 400 teachers and more than 8,000 students to 3,000 teachers and more than 75,000 students. Each school district was in or adjacent to a community in which a university was located. Each was undergoing an annual

¹ Austin, Tex. ; Cincinnati, Ohio ; Parma, Ohio ; Pomona, Calif. ; San Juan Unified, Carmichael, Calif. ; University City, Mo. ; and Wilmington, Del.

increase in enrollment. Each school system had a personnel department with an individual designated as administrative head of that department, hereafter referred to as the personnel administrator.

When the visits to these districts were made, interviews were held with the staff of the personnel department. However, because of the fact that personnel administration is a highly nebulous term and that responsibility for such programs as staff selection, evaluation, development, and promotion is shared by many individuals within an organization, interviews were also held with selected persons outside the personnel department. These included one elementary and one secondary building principal, the public information official, the director or assistant superintendent for instruction, and, of course, the superintendent. No contact was made with classroom teachers or with board of education members, although these two groups are greatly involved in determining the nature and success of any part of the total school program.

A second source of information was that received through correspondence with personnel directors, coordinators, and assistant superintendents for personnel in several of the larger school systems in the Nation.² These individuals were asked to submit suggestions on possible directions which certain personnel practices might take in the next several years. As requested, their statements were in terms of the broad area of personnel administration rather than in terms of the particular school situation with which they might be associated. Many of the comments in this bulletin which refer to factors effecting possible trends are the result of the statements received. Their statements were submitted individually, and there is no suggestion that there was a uniformity of agreement among the practices or trends noted by them individually.

A third source was the examination of a number of personnel journals as they related to the questions of evaluation, supervision, and development. Generally, these were journals concerned with personnel practices in business, industry, and government rather than education.

These three sources made it possible to identify certain personnel practices now existent within our school systems, to relate these practices to particular issues which seem to receive considerable attention within the broad area of personnel administration, and also to suggest factors which influence given practices as well as possible trends in school personnel administration.

² George B. Redfern, Assistant Superintendent, Cincinnati, Ohio; Robert E. LeAnderson, Assistant Superintendent, Detroit, Mich.; C. S. Robinson, Assistant Superintendent, Kansas City, Mo.; Alfred B. Hebels, Director of Personnel, New Orleans, La.; Francis W. Sisson, Assistant Superintendent, Richmond, Va.; Ward M. Nichols, Coordinator of Personnel, San Francisco, Calif.; Erwin Dingman, Coordinator of Personnel, Buffalo, N.Y. (now Supervising Principal, Central School District No. 4, Bellport, N.Y.).

CHAPTER II

Administrative Organization for Personnel

IT IS WIDELY ACCEPTED that personnel administration within educational organizations is a major and integral but not a separate function of the total administrative program. However, specialized personnel departments within our schools do exist; are increasing in number; and are a focal point for this report. Within this chapter attention is focused upon the personnel department and its administrative head, referred to as the personnel administrator.

Discussion of positions or titles is generally considered to be of minimal value in an examination of an institutional organization. It is true that individuals must be recognized and that the rate of change in organizational structure may be accelerated by the vacating of certain positions. However, school systems and other institutions generally attempt to organize in terms of tasks, functions, or jobs which must be performed. This is a point which bears heavily upon frequently made efforts to develop norms in regard to pupil/staff ratios in isolation from the activities being undertaken. That the position or individual frequently does become the focus of examination, however, is dramatically observed when the schools face a shortage of finances. It can be argued, for example, that the larger the class size, the greater the need for supporting services for the classroom teacher. And, the smaller the class, the greater the opportunity for the classroom teacher to provide individualized services. Yet, when a curtailment of finances forces an increase in class size, there is typically a reduction also in the number of positions which offer supporting services.

Personnel Activities

There is a need to distinguish between personnel administration and the personnel department. This distinction is vital and reflects the fact that, within the schools visited, interviews were held with building principals as well as with other interested administrators.

A description of the total program of personnel administration would be limited to a large extent by the amount of detail with which one pursued the topic. Large categories would include staff procurement, inservice training, conditions of service, etc. Of greater specificity would be the provisions concerned with application forms, study leaves, or the frequency of staff meetings.

A recent effort has been made, however, to state the major activities associated with personnel administration in the school setting. This effort follows as a summary, in topical form, of an instrument for the evaluation of school personnel administration. Of potential value to schools with or without a special department, it is a comprehensive outline of the organization in terms of tasks and structure necessary to satisfy the requirements of the school organization today. The outline, as prepared by the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, includes:¹

- I. Organizational structure
 - A. Board of education
 - B. Superintendent
 - C. Policy development and execution
 - D. Personnel organization
 - E. Facilities
 - F. Records
 - G. Relations to total staff
 - H. Professional relationships
 - I. Communication and information
 - J. Public relations
- II. Staff procurement and utilization
 - A. Personnel accounting and research on staff needs
 - B. Recruitment
 1. Regular teachers
 2. Teachers other than regular teachers
 - C. Application
 - D. Selection of staff
 1. Investigation and screening
 2. Interview
 3. Appointment
 4. Probationary period
 - E. Placement, assignment, and transfer
- III. Staff development
 - A. Orientation
 - B. Inservice education
 - C. Evaluation
 - D. Promotion and recognition
 - E. Counseling and morale
 - F. Professional organizations

¹ *Standards for School Personnel Administration*. Kansas City, Mo.: American Association of School Personnel Administrators, 1960, p. 19-48.

- IV. Conditions of service
 - A. Salary administration
 - B. Job classification and description
 - C. Absences from duty
 - D. Insurance
 - E. Contractual status
 - F. Grievances
 - G. Suspensions
 - H. Dismissals
 - I. Resignations
 - J. Retirement

The extent to which many of these activities are centralized within a personnel department or decentralized at the building level will vary greatly between districts even of comparable size. However, with relatively few exceptions, every one of the items must be accounted for in a majority of the school systems of the Nation. The outline is presented because of its completeness and because the following chapters may be better viewed in context of the total program.

Need for a Specialized Department

For some time, a common pattern of organization has been an emphasis, administratively, upon two areas—instruction and business. There is some indication that a third organizational division is now becoming more frequent. This is the department or division of personnel usually headed by an assistant superintendent, a director, or a coordinator. The extent of this trend has been noted in a recent National Education Association publication.

The first recorded public-school personnel administrator was an assistant superintendent for personnel whose position was established by the public school of Dallas, Tex., in 1919.

At least eight school districts had instituted the position by 1939 and 35 by 1950. One hundred and thirty districts that had established the position by 1960 are reported in this study. It is probable that there are more than 200 school districts that have the position at present.²

This reorganization of our administrative structure to accommodate the growing interest in personnel management could be one of the significant changes in educational administration developing in this decade. It may parallel the apparent changing organization for instruction.

This is not, of course, to suggest that the existence of an identifiable personnel office is in itself an indication of the extent or nature of the personnel program. The number of individuals with direct one-to-

² National Education Association. *The Public-School Personnel Administrator*. (Based on a project report prepared by Eleanor Donald), Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1962. p. 60.

one relationships involving a guidance and supervisory responsibility attests to the fact that school personnel administration is a highly decentralized affair. However, the existence of and the responsibilities assigned to a personnel department may frequently indicate the degree of recognition of the importance of the problem of the development and coordination of systemwide personnel policy. It may well reflect the importance of location of administrative responsibility for personnel. Despite the relative importance of proper attitudes and climates for good personnel relationships, such an assignment of responsibility must be made. For this reason, much of the examination of the total program of personnel administration is made in terms of the personnel department.

Within education, the structuring of the personnel responsibility, as evidenced by the increasing number of separate personnel departments, has been influenced by several factors.

1. The growth in the school age population, the demand for additional and specialized educational services, and the general high mobility rate of American society have all added to the teacher recruitment problem. Thus, there has been and will continue to be an increase in the number of personnel departments separately organized within the central administrative staff purely as a result of the quantitative recruitment and selection programs needed to meet the annual staff needs.

2. The total responsibilities assigned to and accepted by the superintendent of schools have forced a continuous evaluation to consider the appropriate areas whose administration can be delegated. The personnel function is one of the most important phases of the chief administrator's total responsibility in education, and the personnel responsibility can never be wholly delegated. However, if the superintendent is to satisfy the ever-increasing number of demands placed upon his time, the delegation of a degree of responsibility for even such important tasks as personnel is necessary.

3. The number of operational units or schools within the total educational organization in any one district is increasing as a result of growth and reorganization as well as through the expansion of the educational program. Attendance centers within a district are becoming larger in number and size. Special programs for exceptional children, for adults, for recreation, and for pupil personnel services are operating across attendance boundaries within the school district. This increase in the number of units, as in their complexity, demands that a large number of individuals—e.g., principals, directors—maintain a large degree of personnel responsibility. But it has also demanded a recognition of a greater problem of centralized coordination of personnel policies throughout the total organization.

4. Lastly, there has been developed a broader definition of the term "personnel administration." This has been noted by Van Miller in the foreword to a text on school personnel administration:

During the past half century developments in the behavioral sciences have contributed to a new emphasis on the human element in industry, commerce, communication, education, and the many branches of government. In the various mass enterprises in these fields progress was for many years based first of all on understanding the nature of material things and engineering desirable arrangements of them. Great skill has been developed in a second area—that of relationships between men and machines, between consumers and goods. As the 20th Century has grown older, it has become evident that consolidation of gains and further progress depend upon a third set of relationships—relationships of men to men. This is the nature of the new emphasis.³

The emphasis upon personal relationships (and the subsequential recognition that their most fruitful growth can be realized only through a planned program) constitutes perhaps the most important reason for the trend toward an increasing number of personnel departments within our school systems.

Departmental Organization

The size of the personnel department has a direct relation to the type of activities assigned as well as the staff size. A high degree of centralized responsibility for the orientation, recruitment, selection, assignment, promotion, transfer, evaluation, and substitute teacher programs requires a larger staff than if the activities of the office are restricted to recruitment and the maintenance of personnel records. If the personnel office maintains some responsibility for the provision of guidance and counseling on either personal or professional problems, a large additional activity has been added.

Within the districts visited, the two common activities performed by the personnel administrator were the recruitment of staff and the maintenance of records on the existing staff. Responsibility was held in varying degrees for the selection, placement, promotion, evaluation, and inservice training as well as the general leadership in the development and administration of personnel policies. A further division of these activities would be between the certificated and noncertificated groups. The one extreme was to have a separate office for the noncertificated staff. The other was to make every effort to develop a unified staff personnel office with conditions of service policies for the two as comparable as possible, with a single head of the personnel unit and with a single set of personnel regulations. The responsibility for the

³ B. J. Chandler and Paul V. Petty. *Personnel Management in School Administration*, Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y.: World Book Co., 1955. Foreword, p. v.

development of training programs leading to promotion in instructional as well as custodial or clerical assignments was assigned to the same office.

The Evolutionary Process

As suggested above, there was observed a considerable range in the scope of the functions performed within the personnel department. This range is not only one which exists between cities on a geographical basis, but is also a temporal one within a school system which can be illustrated by the following brief summary of the growth of a department in one large system. Following a near total absorption in clerical responsibility, the personnel office accepted the administration but not the development of the salary schedule. The next step was to accept responsibility for recruitment, and then it became the final authority for appointments. Development of the salary schedule was then accepted. The personnel office next assumed greater responsibility for the development of staff personnel policy. Placement and transfer functions were next absorbed, and this was followed by the establishment of a districtwide system of appraisal to be administered by the chief personnel administrator. Meanwhile, the departmental head's title changed from director of personnel to assistant superintendent. This process covered a period of about four decades. As to the future, the advisability of assigning ultimate responsibility for staff development to the personnel organization has received some consideration.

Although there was apparently, in this instance, a centralization of certain personnel functions, the emphasis was upon the districtwide planning and coordination of policy as well as the identification of one authority for execution of personnel policy at a high level within the administrative organization.

The Role of the Personnel Administrator

"So, in a sense, the people who man our personnel departments are pioneering the way into one of the most important areas in school administration."⁴

A large number of specialized skills are associated with personnel administration. An understanding of legal requirements affecting personnel, the maintenance of a comprehensive system of personnel records, the development of personnel policies into a set of regula-

⁴ Lawrence T. Magee. *Person to Person Management. Overview, 2: 40, December 1961.*

tions—these are among the various responsibilities assigned. Specialization within the total administrative area, such as for personnel, instruction, or business, presents an opportunity for maximum satisfaction in the treatment of specialized problems. It also provides for a strong need to coordinate and integrate the specialized activities. In this way, the school personnel administrator is both a specialist and a general administrator. Such functions as recruitment, selection, and appraisal can be considered as specialized skills; however, the coordination of the total program is a responsibility shared by many individuals. A highly conceptual ability to assess the problems facing the organization is required.

It is perhaps for this reason that there was in several of the districts visited a desire of the superintendent to locate the personnel administrator within the administrative organization so that he could know and reflect the goals and beliefs of the superintendent. In these instances, the personnel administrator was in a position to provide the leadership through which employees could be made aware of existing policies, contemplated changes, and the reasons and procedures for making changes. Thus, we find a recent text on school administration stating that "in all cases the personnel function should be handled by the superintendent or by an assistant directly responsible to him. Never should personnel management be delegated to a third level position responsible to one of the assistant superintendents."⁴

The essence of the role of the personnel administrator was cited, by one of the superintendents interviewed, in terms of the basic requirements of a sound personnel program. The personnel administrator must believe in the importance of good human relations, possess the unique skills associated with their development, and then, as a generalist, be able to describe his beliefs and plan the necessary steps to attain the appropriate districtwide goals.

A Problem—the Responsibility for Training Programs

One of several features which contrast typical school personnel divisions with those in noneducational organizations is the responsibility for training programs. Within each of the school districts visited, the question was asked as to the appropriate relationship between the personnel department and the inservice training or professional growth program.

Personnel departments do now, of course, have considerable responsibility for the orientation program for teachers new to the district. The formal orientation period must be viewed as part of the

⁴ Emory Stoops and M. L. Rafferty, Jr. *Practices and Trends in School Administration*, Boston: Ginn and Co., 1961. p. 366.

total inservice program. In our largest school systems, there may exist a division of personnel responsible for appointment and assignment as well as the organization of the inservice training program. But to many school people, the close relationship between curriculum development and inservice training is strong. Hence, the separation of inservice training from the instructional division might pose an operational procedure which would be uncomfortable to many teachers and administrators. One alternative is to provide greater organizational unity to the personnel and instructional divisions. Perhaps, only within the largest or the relatively small school districts would such a unity be feasible, assuming it to be desirable. Presently, it would appear that the degree of participation by the personnel department in the inservice training program would depend greatly upon the degree of responsibility which it holds for selection, placement, and evaluation of staff.

The responsibility for selection and placement is somewhat dependent upon local factors. If, for example, the district is located near its principal supplier of new staff members, then the opportunity to rely heavily upon the building principals for assistance is facilitated. The use of an examination procedure as part of the establishment of eligibility lists also centralizes the selection process. But overriding these considerations is that of the concept of the personnel administrator. If this position is considered, by definition, one which maintains certain special skills in the assessment of the needs of individual schools as well as the total district and in the evaluation of candidates to meet those needs, then the selection and placement process becomes centralized. It is, then, more than the processing of application forms which the building principals use to select candidates for interview.

The third element which enters is evaluation. Presently, the personnel administrators interviewed were involved heavily in evaluation at several points. The selection process is based on evaluation. This includes both selection for employment and, equally important, selection for tenure status. And, either directly or indirectly, they were involved in the decision for transfer or for dismissal. The appropriate sphere of concern for the central personnel office in evaluation is dependent upon the concept of evaluation operating in the district. This was quite apparent during the observations made. If evaluation of staff was considered to be primarily one of appraisal of the individual, then there was little centralization of the program. However, where there was an effort to develop evaluation in terms of the program, including the classroom, the school, and the district, then there tended to be a greater degree of centralized development, coordination, and administration of the evaluation program. The importance of associating the development program with the evaluation program is assumed.

But it was apparent that, within those districts which had a relatively "strong" personnel department in terms of responsibility for evaluation, there was an acute realization of the need to maintain the immediate responsibility at the building level. There was emphasis on the belief that the teacher's primary source of authority should be that person closest to him, the building principal. In this sense, a goal of centralization becomes one of selecting or developing individuals as heads of the various operational units who are skilled at program evaluation as well as evaluation of the individual. If so, then a criterion of the success of the personnel administrator's selection and training program for building principals can only be a reduction in the number of specialists within the personnel department.

Thus, if selection and placement are centralized in the personnel office, if that department also has some responsibility for the development and coordination of a broad program of evaluation, then the need to consider the appropriate responsibility of the personnel office for the staff development program becomes significant. The close unity of evaluation and training is accepted.

CHAPTER III

Staff Recruitment and Orientation

STAFF RECRUITMENT, in its narrowest sense, refers only to the process of obtaining additional staff members necessary to meet the requirement imposed by loss and growth of staff. In its broadest sense, it includes the future teacher program, the research necessary to ascertain immediate and future needs both locally and nationally, the development of satisfactory relationships with the teacher education institutions, the establishment of qualifications for employment, interviews, observations, examinations, and the maintenance of voluminous records and correspondence. Finally, there is the matter of appointment to the district, placement to a building or division, and assignment within the building to a specific group of pupils or duties.

Orientation, in its narrowest sense, refers to the process by which the new employee is given the information necessary for him to initiate the acceptance of his assigned responsibilities with an optimum amount of efficiency. Frequently, this narrow definition is marked by a tour of the community, a planning session in the district, and an opportunity to exchange amenities with various members of the school and community.

Personnel administrators who were contacted voiced a particular concern over the temporal limitations too frequently imposed upon the orientation program. It was felt that emphasis must be given to the need for a continual process of involvement of the entire staff rather than just those members new to the district in any one year. For those staff members with service in the district over a period of years, the need to provide an opportunity for communication on matters of other than instructional program development was recognized. This responsibility frequently has been assigned to and accepted by the local professional association operating in close cooperation with the school administration. However, the question of maintaining close support and knowledge within the staff of progress, changes, and problems facing the district as a unit and teachers as individuals was recognized as one which could not be solved within what constitutes the typical orientation program for new teachers.

Recruitment

One of the most common elements existing among the various school personnel departments visited was the responsibility for the recruitment of the necessary new teaching staff. The procedures used for recruitment, including the maintenance of adequate relationships with the various university placement bureaus and the composition of the interviewing team, may vary somewhat in detail but not in the acceptance of the general responsibility, by the personnel department, for the coordination of the recruitment program. Beyond these procedural practices, there are, however, at least four administrative policies here noted which reflected upon the personnel department organization.

Geographical Limitations

The first was the geographical limitation imposed upon the recruiting teams, quite apart from the existence of an adequate numerical supply of candidates. It is apparent that one rather simple procedure for reducing an excessive annual turnover rate is the employment of rather mature individuals. If an additional factor of consideration is a history of long residence within the community, a great step has been taken toward the development of a stable, turnover-proneless, faculty. Thus, a reduction in the radius of the recruitment area can be justified in terms of its value as an instrument for occupational stability within the staff. Recruitment outside this area is then restricted to those individuals who initiate the action concerning potential employment. The existence of this policy has important implications for the value of comparative staff turnover rates between districts.

The argument against a restricted recruitment policy is apparent, ignoring the practical difficulties of costs, noncompetitive salaries, and so forth. Education is currently undergoing a stimulating period of new developments in varied instructional practices and organization. At least one of several procedures for communicating and adopting these new programs within a school system is the procurement of staff members who have had previous experiences with them. A generally recognized reason for a wider recruitment area is the need to avoid parochialism within the staff.

Not unassociated with the geographical limitation is the degree of active versus passive recruiting. The active aspects would include not only the support of future teacher programs and extensive cooperation with the practice teacher group as potential candidates for

selection. Of at least equal significance is the effect which a large number of applicants may have upon the recruiting effort. The number of applications for teaching positions which any school district receives is influenced by various factors. Hopefully, the quality of the educational program being offered would be a major one. Others would include the salary level, the geographical location and its climate, the proximity to teacher-training institutions, cost of living, and the cultural and recreational opportunities.

Some districts, with a large number of such factors operating favorably to it, enjoy the advantageous position of receiving a large number of applications. Others, for various reasons less attractive, receive relatively few. For the latter group, an active program of recruitment is imperative. For the former, it can be a matter of choice. One choice is a near total reliance upon the initiative of potential candidates to make application and to restrict selection to such applications. This assumes that the general overall attractiveness of the school system will insure a group limited only, in the final decision, to candidates of high quality. The alternative is for the district to assume that, regardless of the quality and number of applications received, only an active vigorous recruiting campaign will meet the competition for the most capable teaching staff which the district can attract.

Position Descriptions

A second aspect of recruiting, which is somewhat questionable, is the desirable extent to which position descriptions should be developed. The present general practice is to emphasize the use of formal position specifications within the instructional staff for those assignments involving "other than classroom duties." Principals, directors, consultants, librarians, and psychologists are examples of positions which are frequently covered by specifications for employment. In the nonteaching fields, particular concern about the need for comprehensive position descriptions was apparent.

The degree to which it will become necessary to extend the development of position classifications to the classroom teacher may depend upon two trends, one of which is the availability of staff. If the current teacher shortage should be alleviated to a major degree, it would be possible for districts to think more realistically than now possible about the recruitment of individuals for specific positions. The importance of a particular type of preemployment experience for particular classrooms, the proper ratio of building staff according to age, sex, experience—these factors could then be recognized within the selection program.

A second trend which will influence the emphasis upon position descriptions is that of more specialized positions within the instructional program. Team teaching and the departmentalized elementary classroom are two common examples of such a specialized position. The need for adequate preparation in certain curriculum programs—e.g., physics, mathematics, or economics—may also be cited. It is also noted that discussions about “extra pay for extra services” are not unassociated with the existence of adequate descriptions of the duties of staff members.

It is true that descriptions do now exist for teachers, at least in an implicit sense. Certification requirements, examinations, a minimum number of graduate hours in the teaching area—these are in a sense position specifications. With an increase in the teacher supply pool, however, it should be not only possible but also necessary for personnel administrators to recruit in terms of particular individuals for particular positions in a degree far greater than is now possible. This will mean a preparation of position descriptions in terms of the requirements and responsibilities of the position rather than a mere description of the individual sought for or occupying the position.

Examination for Selection

A third aspect of recruiting is the advisability of the use of teacher examinations. Tests, both locally and externally prepared, are a common element in the screening of candidates for administrative selection and training programs within many cities. Examinations are currently being administered as one part of the teacher selection program in some of our larger school systems. Although an examination procedure was used in several of the districts visited for screening of administrative candidates, its use for selection of teachers was at a minimum.

The use of examinations, both for the specialized teaching areas as well as the professional area of teaching itself, is always only one part of the total selection procedure. Although a given score may be sufficient reason for nonemployment, in few if any instances would it, in itself, be sufficient cause for employment.

The arguments as to examinations probably have been heavier in connection with their use as part of the State certification program than within the local school district selection program, with parallels frequently being made with other occupational groups. At the employment level, local practices have tended to influence the degree of reliance on examinations. This was evident in the districts visited. A sound interview procedure plus a heavy reliance upon the recom-

mentation of the teacher-training institution have been used as arguments negating their importance for new teachers. For the experienced teacher, the thorough investigation of past performance has been of inestimable value.

Procedures for advising an unsuccessful applicant of the reasons for failure varied considerably. Typically, those who did not meet the necessary standards were informed of this fact promptly but in no detail. One district which was contacted found it advisable to notify the applicant in specific terms, either personally or in correspondence, of the reasons for rejection. This was considered a counseling feature. A review committee, whose members included classroom teachers, was available for reconsideration if requested by the applicant.

At least two considerations are favorable to the increased utilization of examinations in the selection process. One is that they add one more piece of evidence not previously available upon which a decision can be reached. Two, as recruitment extends geographically, the familiarity with the teacher-training institution becomes less. Hence, the reliance upon the institutional recommendation, which may be satisfactory in the majority of cases, becomes unsatisfactory if the school is unfamiliar with the university. (This is pertinent only if one assumes a wide range in the quality of the teacher-training programs between various universities and colleges in the Nation.)

Personality testing, unlike examinations of professional competency, is not a common procedure for either teacher selection or for screening candidates for promotion. It is apparently more frequently utilized, particularly for promotion, within industrial organizations. Whether such testing should be done more frequently in education is a question which has received relatively little attention. The controversial aspects have been noted in various journals and generally apply to noneducational organizations. There are various reasons for the apparent lack of interest by school administrators in the use of personality tests. Limitations of the test is one, as is the cost. The position can well be adopted that the current selection procedure, with a heavy reliance upon a well-planned interview and recommendations, is quite satisfactory. Another is the belief that evaluation should be based solely upon the effectiveness of the individual in a given position. And, of course, there is the moral issue of the individual's privacy.

The question of personality testing, at least in business and industrial organizations concerned with the matter as a multi-million dollar endeavor, has been noted by Lipsett. After negating the value of paper-and-pencil personality tests, and emphasizing the costs of projective tests, he states: "The most sophisticated body of thinking in the profession [of testing] today probably would hold that

testing for personality factors certainly cannot be done effectively *without* projective tests, and there is insufficient evidence that it can be done *with* projective tests."¹

Qualifications

Lastly, there is apparently some difference of opinion over the factors which should be included in consideration of the qualifications for employment. Examination of the forms used for employment application reveals this difference. Some of the forms are limited in scope to those which are related only to a prediction of probable success in terms of pupil-teacher interaction within the classroom. Others include items which would be extraneous to this narrow definition of classroom performance but which would apparently attempt to assess the teacher's probable acceptance within and contribution to the community life in which the position being considered is located. Membership in noneducational organizations, for example, would illustrate this latter factor. This divergence of opinion on the limits of the role of the teacher as it relates to the evaluation of the application is not unlike the similar argument over factors to be considered for evaluation for additional salary based upon meritorious performance.

Selection and Placement and Transfer

Although a centralized recruitment policy as indicated above may have only secondary implications for administrative organization, the impact of the policy on selection and placement is direct. It should be emphasized that the placement process as referred to is in terms of a particular building or division and not in terms of assignment to duties within that organizational unit.

The issue in this case is the degree of autonomy for selection and placement which should rest with the building principal. The more prevalent practice, at least in the smaller systems visited, was to involve the building principal deeply in the selection of individuals who are potential members of his faculty. The reasons for doing so are rather apparent. The building principal knows best the needs of his particular administrative unit, he knows the composition of his faculty in terms of individual personalities, and he is the best judge of the individual who will fit into that faculty. And, of course, the

¹ Lawrence Lipsett. *Guidposts for Personnel Testing*. *Personnel Journal*, 40: 264, November 1961.

principal is the administrator who has general responsibility for the total educational program within that building, and that program is a function of the competencies of the staff within the building.

The contrasting point of view stresses the unitary nature of a school system as well as the highly specialized skills required for the selection procedure. It is argued that not only are personnel administrators more proficient because of training and experience in assessing candidates, but that they also have a broader perspective of the needs of the entire school system as opposed to the need of any one unit within that system. This does not negate the importance of recognizing placement preference of either the teacher or the principal where possible. Such consultation is assumed. As a basic operational principle it does, however, stress the fact that the personnel needs of the school system must supersede those of any part of it. Final authority would then rest with the personnel department.

A somewhat similar situation exists in regard to the responsibility for effecting transfers between buildings. Although it was common practice in the districts visited to provide for consultation between the transferring and the receiving principals prior to the actual transfer, there has also been concern for the need to provide, as a matter of policy, for the "uncommon practice" when such prior consultation need not take place. In this instance, there must be access to a third party. The extent to which the personnel administrator is assigned, and can accept, this type of problem is determined partly by the extent to which he is proficient in the entire human relations area. This type of a transfer, as in administrative placement, goes far beyond the typical personnel actions involving the recruitment aspects which are frequently the major responsibility of the school personnel administrator.

Not unrelated to the question of centralized responsibility is the assignment of day-to-day substitute teachers. There is little question but what the centralization of the responsibility for contacting and assigning the substitutes will result in some saving of time and effort. It is a responsibility, however, which for some time was lodged with the building principal. The reasons for placing the responsibility at the building level are similar to those for locating the placement responsibility there. It is questionable if centralizing this responsibility can be justified for the same reasons. Instead, the justification can be made more readily in terms of the saving of time and effort not only in locating and placing substitutes but also because the various records, including evaluations, must also be centralized.

Orientation

The orientation period for new employees, new to the system and new to the profession, is frequently regarded as the initial phase of the inservice training program. The typical session has as its principal goal the introduction of the new staff member to the school, the district, and the community. It is a matter of courtesy to conduct such a program. The major criticism, when the orientation period emphasizes this welcoming aspect, is that insufficient plans are made for a follow-through during the year. It is, in essence, more of an induction period.

There would appear to be some effort to expand the scope of the concept of orientation. This expansion attempts to view orientation in terms of the entire staff rather than just the new members and, as a result, to increase the magnitude of the entire program. This type of an orientation program has as its goals the development of both attitudes and information about the entire school system. The numerous horizontal and vertical stratifications which take place as school systems develop in size have made it difficult to achieve an understanding of the problems and the policies of the system as a whole. This is essentially a question of communication. Schools have made strong efforts to establish and maintain such communication with the patrons of their community—they are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of maintaining effective communications—both written and oral—within their own staff organization.

Written Communication

Within the school systems visited, it was apparent that communication, both vertically and horizontally, both to and from the classroom, was not something which could just be left to chance. There had to be an attitude that communication was important, and then there had to be a planned program to make the opportunity for communication possible. The development of communication through the written word offers the immediate problem of the achievement of a two-way flow of ideas. The house organ often consists primarily of a calendar of events or changes in particular regulations. In terms of orientation and the development of a unity of effort, there would seem to be greater interest in the tendency of the house organ to concentrate upon instruction. This is a reflection of the common element and purpose

which bind all staff members together—the provision of an educational program for a group of young people.

The other typical methods of communicating through the written word include the various personnel guides and administrative bulletins. The personnel manuals are generally of two types—district-wide and those unique to a building. The scope of the latter type depends, of course, upon the thoroughness with which the district guide is prepared. The importance of maintaining uniform statements on policy among various building statements was apparently a matter of some minor concern.

Although most of the districts visited employed an individual with a title in the communications area, these people were more typically concerned with external communications with the exception of the responsibility for preparation of the house organ. Whether or not they were considered as part of the personnel office varied from district to district.

Oral Communication

A two-way flow of communication finds greater opportunity for expression through oral rather than written procedures. The problem in educational organizations, just as in other endeavors, is the means of providing for a flow from downward upward rather than just horizontally or from top downward. But education is somewhat unique from other large activities in that such a relatively large proportion of the staff has a comparable background in terms of education, experience, and salary. This should have some advantageous influence on the conversational difficulties frequently cited in interchanges between individuals on different occupational strata in business and industry.

The most common format utilized in oral communication between the classroom and the central administration is that which places heavy reliance upon the building principal for maintenance of the communication flow. There was at least one other effort, observed during the visits, which was receiving attention as a procedure not in lieu of, but in addition to, the responsibility accepted by the principal. This was the planned, regular, participation by the chief administrative officer, or an associate extremely close to him, in occasional staff meetings held in the various operational units such as the school buildings. As time consuming as this practice obviously is in the larger systems, there was apparently a strong belief in its value. In one instance, this participation involved the submission prior to the

appearance at the faculty meeting by the superintendent, or a close associate, of questions of concern to various individuals. These questions did not restrict the discussion—they made it possible to structure the meeting as well as to give certain critical matters the prior consideration which they deserved. The extent to which the immediate office of the superintendent may find it possible or desirable to attempt to establish periodically this type of one-to-one relationship is undoubtedly greatly influenced by the size of the staff of that office. This procedure is cited merely as an indication of the extent of the concern or rather the existence of an attitude about communications. But, in each of the districts visited, there was evidence of a genuine concern and, more importantly, an attitude about the importance of the effort. The question of the increasing distance between the patron of the school district and the administration of the district parallels this concern of internal communication barriers.

Communication within an organization has been defined as "the interchange of information and ideas among all individuals within an enterprise."² The discussion following this definition went on to point out three major barriers to communication.

1. Individuals are involved in communication, and individuals differ. As individuals, or as subgroups within the organization, each may put a different interpretation upon what is said or heard.

2. The atmosphere, or climate, within the organization which may tend to deter the communication process. This may be the result of the absence of an affirmative policy upon its importance; the degree of importance attached to communication by the chief executive; fears held by individuals within the staff that their views if expressed would be misinterpreted, distorted, or used for reprisal; insecurity in seeking employee opinions; and poor supervisory practices.

3. Mechanical barriers, may exist within the technical and organizational procedures established to provide for communication. This would include not only the organizational channels through which communication is to flow, but also the existence of an assigned functional responsibility to assist the staff members in their communication. This is noted as a mechanical deterrence and a barrier of considerably lesser magnitude than the first two cited.

The author then raised three questions which should precede consideration and establishment of a policy on communication.

² Harold Stieglitz. *Barriers to Communications*. *Management Record*, vol. XX, January 1958, p. 3-5.

First, what and how much should employees be told? Second, on what matters should employees have an opportunity to be heard? Third, how can day-to-day acceptance and conformity with the communication policy be insured?

The three questions raised above are probably most concerned with changes in the instructional program and in personnel matters. This is treated in more detail in the following section on policy development. At this point, it is again emphasized that there was a concern about the need to extend the concept of the orientation period as a never-ending process which is basically one of maintenance of a flow of information both horizontally and vertically.

Policy Development

With the exception of curriculum program planning, the involvement of the staff in the development of policy is the most common procedure for the stimulation of a systemwide unity. There are other objectives, of course, to the utilization of staff representation in this legislative function. But its importance as a cohesive force, and in this sense an element of the total orientation program, is considerable.

In this area, a significant factor in the potential of the personnel administrator was discernible. Not only are districts growing in size and complexity, but they are also increasingly recognizing the importance of the formulation of policy as a legislative function under which the organization operates. And, in an organization in which the magnitude of the human element can be dramatically illustrated by the proportion of the total budget utilized for salaries, the formulation of personnel policy is particularly sensitive and demanding.

One of the unique characteristics of American education has been the involvement of the instructional staff—supervisors, teachers, and principals—in the development of the educational program. This procedure has been supplemented by the involvement of lay citizens in the formulation of general goals of the community for its schools. The importance of involving the staff in the formulation of policies which affect the conditions under which they operate is well established.

Properly handled, participation of the staff in policy development can wield a beneficial influence upon the acceptance of present and future programs. Formulation of policy, however, should not be confused with execution of policy. Democracy in administration or policy development is not synonymous with representation. Involvement of staff members, purely as a policy in itself, regardless of the importance of the task, is of obvious questionable value.

Among the personnel administrators whose views were obtained in this matter, the importance of developing within the staff an understanding of the rationale under which they work was held highly. But it was noted that the development of this understanding was a mutual obligation for (1) the individual staff member to become familiar with the personnel policies of this organization, and (2) for that organization to provide the necessary structure and opportunity for such familiarization.

As opposed to such functions as recruitment and promotion, leadership in policy development is a much more difficult task to describe and identify. But its importance and the necessity of maintaining the responsibility for such development and execution, at a high level in the administrative organization, were apparent in the districts where visits were made. Because of the great share of policy development affecting staff personnel, it was imperative that the personnel administrator be in a position in which he could be alert and contributory to such development.

CHAPTER IV

Staff Evaluation

IF THERE WERE any single element which could be identified as being of greatest concern to each of the districts visited, it would be in the area of staff evaluation and performance appraisal.¹ This concern was not negative in the sense that some remedial action in regard to the evaluation program was needed. Rather, it was a concern over the critical importance which staff evaluation has for a school system.

Performance appraisal, in its broadest sense, exists to some degree in all organizations. Individuals working within some close physical proximity of each other form judgments about the other's as well as their own effectiveness. And, within every school system, some degree of evaluation will exist. Selection for employment, assignment to certain buildings or grades, placement on tenure, transfer, promotion—these are all based upon evaluation of the individual concerned. The issues in evaluation arise not in connection with the general concept but rather in terms of performance within a given position and, perhaps, in the determination of relative effectiveness of two or more individuals assigned to similar positions.

The Basis for Evaluation

Acceptance of evaluation programs is not based solely upon the fact that school districts are expected to, and should, be alert to the performance standards of staff members within the system. This acceptance is recognized as a part of the professional responsibility of all educators. Within their professional organizations and individually, they have cooperated and encouraged efforts to improve procedures for evaluating teaching performance.

That placement of the greatest stress upon staff evaluation should be within the initial years of service in a position is basic to most evaluation programs. The probationary period is the major perform-

¹ The terms evaluation and appraisal are used interchangeably.

ance test which a school staff member undergoes since it has not been generally possible, even if it were desirable, to develop in education a position comparable to the internship or apprenticeship found in other fields. Nationally, the extent to which the probationary period does receive greater formalization as a training or internship period could be influenced by two factors. First, an increase in the supply of competent and qualified candidates for teaching positions would permit a greater degree of selectivity in both the recruitment and the retention procedures. Second, significant changes in the instructional organization would permit greater opportunities for a differentiation of assignments. Particularly, this would apply to efforts to distinguish between those individuals with a potential or interest in teaching as a long-term career and those whose employment history in education could be safely predicted to be one marked by sporadic entrances and exits.

Measurement vs. Evaluation

Practices and proposals in staff evaluation in education have taken various forms both in procedures for implementation and in particular points of view. In the absence of a product upon which some type of measurement might be conducted, evaluation procedures in education have emphasized the performance of the individual teacher, assuming that certain teacher behavior will result in certain effect upon the student(s). Thus, descriptions of a variety of desirable acts or attributes in terms of teacher behavior may be developed which would be acceptable to teachers and nonteachers. The difficulty has arisen when the next step—identification or measurement of these descriptions in a classroom situation—is undertaken.

A major issue in staff evaluation is the feasibility as well as the desirability of attempts to develop objective procedures for determining teaching effectiveness. It is presumed that objective "ratings" should have as their base the establishment of certain teacher actions—*x*—which when completed, could be predicted to bring forth result—*y*—in terms of some change in pupil behavior. And, that as frequently as action *x* is repeated, then change *y* will result. Whether this concept or goal of personnel rating is one of evaluation or of measurement is more than a question of semantics. For, as Paul Woodring has pointed out in regard to evaluation of teacher education programs, "A compilation of factual data, however accurate and comprehensive the statistics may be, is not evaluation but only a step toward evaluation. The word evaluation implies a system of values, and decisions about values involve human judgment. The actual

evaluation must always require decisions about human beings as to what is most worthwhile."²

Some Assumptions

Although the national concern of educators about personnel appraisal techniques receives considerable attention, this concern is also evident in other types of organizations. It stems considerably from the discomfort with which many individuals in a democratic society have when required to judge the worth of and relate that judgment to another individual. McGregor has pointed out the inconsistency of a procedure which emphasizes the leadership responsibilities of an individual and yet forces him to treat his subordinates as physical object.³ Although McGregor's statement is primarily in terms of the development of individuals for supervisory and managerial positions in industry, the alternative approach to personnel appraisal which he proposes is not unlike, in philosophy, that found in several of the school systems visited.

McGregor would shift a good deal of the responsibility for the establishment of performance goals to the subordinate. The goals should be specific, short-term, and intimately related to the position which the individual occupies within the organization. The role of the superior is to assist in relating these goals to that of the larger organization as well as to the periodic examination of the extent to which the short-term goals have been satisfied.

The result is a shift from appraisal to analysis—it emphasizes strengths as well as weaknesses, and it strives to unite the appraisal and development responsibilities, both of the individual and of his superior(s). Personality defers to performance, the past defers to the future, generalizations defer to specifics, and judgment defers to assistance.

An Industrial Conference Board roundtable included one presentation which examined several assumptions upon which traditional appraisal programs frequently operate. They are not unrelated to teacher evaluation programs and include:

1. The appraiser perceives the particular job concerned in the same way that the appraisee perceives it.
2. The appraisee is directly responsible for his own performance and has control over all of the factors which determine the effectiveness of performance.

² Paul Woodring. *New Directions in Teacher Education*. New York: The Fund for Advancement of Education, 1957. p. 62.

³ Douglas McGregor. An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal. *Harvard Business Review*, 35: 89-95, May-June 1957.

3. It is just as important to concentrate on weaknesses as on strengths.
4. The appraiser has little direct influence upon the appraisee's performance.
5. Communication can be legislated.
6. Certain criticisms can be communicated without serious disruption of personal relationships.
7. The appraisee really wants to know where he stands, rather than being reassured.
8. If standard criteria are used by multiple appraisers, each appraisal is given equal weight in terms of action on results.
9. All performances can be evaluated.
10. The effectiveness of staff accomplishments are directly proportional to the visibility of the act.⁴

The degree of acceptance of any or all of these assumptions in an educational organization will influence the nature of its evaluation program. Traditionally, teacher evaluation programs accepted many of these assumptions. Their validity is an important consideration to current ones.

Some Practices

Within the last two references cited above as well as within several of the districts visited, there was a commonality of belief in (1) the importance of the responsibility of the individual for self-appraisal; (2) the direct relationship between appraisal and professional growth for formal as well as for informal programs; (3) the acceptance of a degree of responsibility by the individual's supervisors or administrators for his performance as well as his growth within a position; and (4) the limits upon the degree of individual determination in setting the direction of developmental goals when related to systemwide or community goals.

Assumption of a degree of responsibility by the "manager" for the growth of an individual in a particular position was of special interest in at least two of the systems visited. This interest was expressed in two ways. First, within the formal organization, there was evidence of the importance of the development of specific, short-term goals by the teacher which would form the base for the periodic appraisal conference. This, on occasion, would take the form of a statement of annual goals in terms of a particular group of students for which a teacher would have responsibility. The result is an appraisal by the teacher of that group of students at a given point in

⁴ The Industrial Conference Board. *An Appraisal of Managers and Management Development. Management Record*, 23: 14-17 March 1961. See Phillip R. Kelly. *Reappraisal of Appraisals*.

time, their assets and liabilities, and the various problems which the teacher saw ahead if the potential of this group of students was to be approached.

Secondly, there was a reflection of the belief that the individual does not have complete control over the various factors that determine his performance as related to these specific goals. Although responsibility was given to the individual to make a self-appraisal, a subsequent responsibility was placed upon the individual's immediate supervisor to be able to assume a position in which sound judgment and assistance can be provided. This is as much a matter of attitude as of organization and as such includes the need for regular two-way communication as well as the typical annual or semiannual appraisal procedure.

Considerable evidence of a shift from a negative to a positive concept of staff evaluation was observed. The importance of a solid, time-consuming program for a formal evaluation of probationary staff members was, of course, evident. The negative aspect of this initial evaluation process tended to stress the recognition of two groups of "unsatisfactory" teachers. The two groups consisted of those whose professional competence could be improved if they were exposed to an appropriate program of development and of those individuals whose probable demonstration of acceptable performance in the future could safely be predicted to be very low.

One of the school districts visited emphasized the point of view that (1) each employee is not only required but also entitled to receive an appraisal, and (2) his immediate supervisor is obligated to be in a position in which a sound judgment can be made. This implies the necessity for a close working relationship between the employee and his immediate supervisor, over an extended time period and, in this instance, culminating in a formal appraisal conference to determine the results of job performance as determined by previously established goals.

It also implies that an effort is being made to identify more specifically the elements in job performance which should be appraised. When the formal evaluation forms of the school systems visited were examined, the similarity in approach to evaluation of the beginning or probationary teacher was considerable. Classroom management, knowledge of subject matter, personal appearance—these exemplify such similarity. A second similarity was the intense effort to make as thorough an evaluation of the probationary staff member as possible.

The evaluation of the teacher with a number of years of service within a district poses somewhat of a different question. The study on teacher competence of the New England School Development Coun-

eil⁵ has described the difference in the problems in evaluation of the probationary and the tenure teacher. Assuming that a strong appraisal is carried on for the probationary teacher and that those whose probability of attaining a high degree of successful performance is low have not been retained, then evaluation in terms of classroom performance is difficult. For, the statement argues, little differentiation in performance within the classroom can be identified for those experienced teachers who have survived a vigorous selection program prior to attaining tenure. Hence, factors associated with other than pupil-teacher interaction in the classroom must enter into the evaluation. As noted, these would include some responsibility to the school and to the profession, responsibilities which should not be accepted by the beginning teacher but which must be satisfied if the school and the district are to develop a growing instructional program.

This question of determination of the appropriate limits of the teaching role which is to be evaluated is a major one, not only for retention purposes but also for those salary programs which differentiate the reward on the basis of performance. As indicated above, any evaluation implies that the evaluator is in a position to make a sound judgment. When the teaching or professional role is expanded to include responsibilities outside the classroom or school, the need for a tenable point of observation still remains. Whether the total role should include community and/or professional responsibilities is an issue which was of concern within the districts visited as well as in many other school districts in the Nation.

Responsibility for Evaluation

Magee, in a concise statement, suggests that the general status of evaluation in our education system is at a low level and that a real need, at least in the larger districts, is to centralize the responsibility for evaluation in the office of the personnel administrator.⁶ The necessity of involving the principals and appropriate supervisors or directors in the evaluation process is not lessened. He would, however, overcome the divergence in standards and values held by the various operational heads within the district through the definition of evaluation in its final form as a personnel problem.

Within the school districts visited, the policy on evaluation ranged from a near-total absorption of responsibility by the building principal to a procedure which relied upon the principal primarily for the

⁵ David V. Tiedeman. *Teacher Competency and Its Relation to Salary*. Cambridge, Mass.: New England School Development Council, 1956. p. 85-106.

⁶ Lawrence T. Magee. *Person to Person Management*. *Overview*, 2: 40-41, December 1961.

accumulation of material as part of the total evaluation procedure. For critical decisions, reliance and responsibility were placed with the personnel administrator and the appropriate division heads.

At least two key points were stressed in those situations observed in which the personnel department has a large share of responsibility for evaluation, particularly as it involved the retention of staff. A prior responsibility for selection and assignment was a prerequisite. With such responsibility the need for centralization and coordination of the evaluation process is more acceptable.

Secondly, it may be argued, a centralization of the evaluation system permits a broad appraisal of the total staff development program, a program which rightfully should be related closely to the evaluation procedure. Such a position assumes that the responsibility for professional growth cannot be assigned in its entirety to the teacher, but that the principal, the supervisors, directors, and central office administrators all have a responsibility for the provision of logistic as well as leadership and guidance support which must exist between the superintendent and the teacher. If so, then the evaluation would include not only the elements of teacher performance but also the assistance which he has received to improve or remedy that performance. There is a strong unity of the evaluation and development concepts.

The Reward System

Within only one of the districts visited was there a salary program which was directly related to the evaluation program. The need for a program of evaluation is well established. The issue in this instance is the relationship between the two—evaluation and salary. Generally referred to as “merit pay,” this question of relationship has been with school administrators for decades and apparently will remain for future decades. However, it is of some national concern, and the following comments on merit pay are included in this section on evaluation.

Despite or perhaps because of the profusion of articles and discussions on the topic of merit pay, there still remains considerable difference of opinion on a suitable definition of the elements which constitute a merit salary policy. There has developed a rather common practice of viewing merit pay as the sole positive alternative to the present experience-education type of salary structure. Such a view uses the following arguments:

1. A higher maximum salary potential is needed for both the recruitment and the retention of superior classroom teachers.

2. A sufficiently high maximum cannot be attained through the elevation of the salaries of all teachers.

Some of the reasons for viewing merit pay as the only alternative to the present salary structure is the tendency to regard merit pay and merit rating as one and the same procedure. Although merit pay would imply the prior existence of a merit rating program, it does not necessarily follow that merit rating must be accompanied by merit pay. When the two do exist within a salary structure, then a merit program in total is the result.

Beyond this distinction between merit pay and merit rating, a more fundamental point of issue is the equation of merit pay with reward for exceptional performance. That is, is merit pay the only procedure through which outstanding teachers can receive higher salaries and still remain in a classroom situation? The answer is dependent upon one's definition of merit pay.

Perhaps the term most closely associated with merit is competence. And if competence is to determine salary, some form of evaluation or measurement must take place. A salary policy which attempts to differentiate the amount of the reward on the basis of competence must be attempting to differentiate degrees of competence in comparable positions, with comparable duties, assignments, and responsibilities. For example, third grade teachers have comparable positions, as do teachers of the second semester of high school physics. However, once a salary policy deviates from the competence factor and recognizes additional duties or responsibilities, then it ceases to be a merit salary award simply because a factor extraneous to competence has received consideration.

It is the additional factor of differentiated assignment, rank, or position classification, and based upon some rating, which has been somewhat neglected as a possible alternative to merit pay. It was noted in the statement in *Goals for Americans*, which urged the adoption of merit salary programs as a means of providing rewards commensurate with performance but also recognized the potential value of differentiated assignments.⁷ Example of its future applicability are evident in those situations which are seeing rather severe changes in the instructional organization of a school, such as team teaching and master teachers. Present applications are evident through such staff utilization practices as curriculum work, cyclical summer programs, and assignment as department chairmen, all of which offer potential salary increases for the teachers selected. In short, approaches are now currently being used and more are planned which

⁷The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. *Goals for Americans*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960. p. 82-83.

attempt to reward superior classroom performance without utilizing merit pay.

If such a procedure is to be adopted for the monetary recognition of superior service, the problem of identification and selection still remains within the staff evaluation or rating process. (The issue as to whether the "best teacher" is necessarily the "best" team teacher or department chairman is ignored here.) Studies conducted on the description and identification of teacher competence have searched for valid criteria of teacher effectiveness for several decades. These efforts have received in the past the cooperation and support of the teachers within our schools who have generally opposed merit pay programs because of the lack of objective data upon which a teacher might be rated.

This search for procedures to develop valid, acceptable, reliable criteria for use in rating teachers, criteria which may operate independent of subjective ratings, is one not only of feasibility but also of desirability. The goal in the search has been described as follows:

For every criteria item or role definition, there would be a specific objective means of collecting data related to it. Second, it would have been validated. In other words, it would have been tested to the point where you could say that if we describe a teacher performing this way, this is the way the teacher is performing. This has some bearing on kinds of pupil results. It will have some demonstrable connection with desirable changes in pupils. It would be reliable in that you could repeat this procedure many times with the same teacher and you would get the same picture. The values would be explicit and nobody would be in doubt about where the values were. It obviously would be recorded; it would be based upon data; it would be multi-dimensional; and the criteria would be vigorously selected and tested.*

Whether such a set of criteria, if it could be developed, would result in a measurement or in an evaluation is a significant question. If the former, then surely a rather tight position description of the teacher would be necessary; and, certainly, the determination of value decisions solely through an accumulation of statistical data does not rest comfortably with many people. It is for this reason that the desirability rather than the feasibility of efforts to develop objective criteria for the measurement of effective teaching is of some real concern.

It is suggested, then, that future salary developments which include a differential may take one of two courses, either of which will be based upon a thorough description of the position which is being evaluated. One direction would be toward merit pay, with the salary differential

* Gale Rose. "State Assistance to Local School Systems in Developing an Evaluation and Merit Program." p. 35. T. G. Tulin (ed), *Latest Thinking on Appraisal and Improvement of Teacher Performance (Merit Pay)*. New York: Barrington and Co., Inc., 1961.

determined by the relative competency identified in comparable positions. The other makes the salary differential a function of a differentiated assignment. This would include the proposition which would relate salary to the existing supply and demand figures for the various areas of study. This position argues that our society assigns different monetary values to different fields of specialization, and that this fact should be recognized within teacher salary policies.⁹ Either procedure will demand a thorough performance appraisal, an appraisal which may approach the nature of a measurement or it may be one of evaluation.

⁹ J. A. Kershaw and R. N. McKean. *Teacher Shortages and Salary Schedules*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962. 224 p.

CHAPTER V

Staff Development

TWO MAJOR OBJECTIVES are important to staff development. The professional teacher must develop his knowledge and skill to the maximum. In addition, he should be working in the position where he is able to make his greatest contribution to the educational program.

It should be recognized that some of the functions classified under staff "Staff Development" are not performed exclusively by the personnel department. However, even though the personnel department may not have primary responsibility for the function, it is concerned that the function be carried out in a manner that will be in the best interest of the school system. In many instances the responsibility of the personnel department is a cooperative one with other departments or agencies of the school system.¹

In the professional area, staff development programs appear to be of three general types, excluding those concerned with administrative training.

First is the program which has as its aim the familiarization of the staff with a new activity within the school district or building. This would include such changes as those which may be embodied in testing, in grouping, or in reporting to parents. It consists, in essence, of an *ad hoc* committee.

Second is the development program which is individualized to fit the particular staff member involved as based upon an appraisal of his performance, experience, and training within that position. The problem is basically one of a remedial nature, perhaps stemming from an incomplete preservice program, from a change in assignment, or from a uniquely local situation involving only one grade level or one building.

Third is the concern which has arisen as a result of certain new changes and knowledge in instructional methods and content, in learning theory, in materials and equipment, and other developments the importance of which is of such significance as to have implications for the entire staff or a particular segment of it. This would include inservice programs for culturally deprived children and the necessary cooperative arrangements with other agencies. The significant point is that the concern has arisen as a result of "new developments" and is

¹ American Association of School Personnel Administrators. *Standards for School Personnel Administration*. Kansas City, Mo.: The Association, 1960. p. 38.

generally quite unrelated to the present quality of staff performance or of previous training.

It is this third area which is of particular significance, because it has meant a relatively greater emphasis upon development programs directed at the performance of the teacher within his particular area of professional study. Programs arising out of problems created by a changing neighborhood were in operation as a major effort within one of the districts visited. This is, of course, a large issue affecting the staff and curriculum as well as the parents and the entire community. As such, it is not described here.

Mechanically, the provision of a program for the satisfaction of the goals implied in each of the above generally rests with either the local school district or with the university. This may be done through the use of internal staff, through cooperative arrangements with a university, or through the regular or extramural weekend, evening, and summer programs.

University Programs

Each of the school systems visited in conjunction with this report are in, or adjacent to, university communities. As a result, generous opportunity exists for weekend and evening course work as well as summer sessions. Formal course work taken at a university is considered as part of the inservice training program in varying degrees. Perhaps a defensible criterion would be the relevancy of the course work to a planned program of development as related to the individual's current assignment. Such a criterion does not suggest that a mathematics teacher must, or should, restrict his graduate study wholly to mathematics, but it does suggest that, if college courses are to be considered part of the inservice program, then some direction is implied which recognizes the needs of the school and the individual as determined on the basis of existing resources.

Such a direction need not be considered as a restriction upon the freedom of the individual toward self-improvement. The question here is only in terms of the utilization of college work as being supplementary to, or in lieu of, a formal inservice training program.

One alternative to the procedure on which the staff member goes to the university is to have the university come to the staff member. It would appear that, among the districts visited, this was a highly fruitful practice if the local school system prepared the necessary groundwork. This groundwork consisted of identifying the most critical needs which, because of limited resources, could not be satisfied through the utilization of district personnel. One of the most common areas for this type of endeavor is concerned with new de-

velopments in education for which the university concerned has been conducting some research and/or pilot programs.

Locally Conducted Inservice Programs

Development or training programs for school staff pose somewhat of a different problem than those for governmental and private business organizations. Perhaps most important is the fact that the great mass of individuals within education are, in practice, operating with very similar position descriptions and with little differentiation in assignment in terms of additional responsibilities. Additional certification qualifications, e.g., a graduate degree and experience, may be and frequently are recognized only within the salary level and not in terms of the qualifications permitting the holder to be assigned to a different position. Nor does the factor of supply and demand generally operate between areas of specialization which have similar responsibilities. The result is the general absence of the managerial or supervisory type of development program more closely associated with business and industrial organizations. Instead, there is an emphasis upon the development of the individual in what is to all purposes a terminal position within his career. One result, of course, has been considerable horizontal or geographical mobility directed toward salary advancement.

Locally conducted inservice training programs take a variety of forms, both in operational procedures and in principles. Curriculum development committees, practicums for new teachers, visitation days, summer university sessions, supervision, research projects, conventions, extended contracts for summer employment, extended leaves of absence for study or travel, and classes for teachers conducted by the local staff or a nearby university—these all represent practices observed which were directed at teaching improvement. The extent to which any one district may care to designate one or more of the above examples as being an inservice activity ranged within the districts visited. If, however, one accepts that the key to student growth within the classrooms is the amount of growth which takes place in the professional staff, then it is apparent that some type of an organized program of professional growth is most important.

Responsibility

Some concern was evident over the responsibility of the local district in providing professional growth programs. Perhaps some of this arises from the feeling that the nature of the conditions of service

for teachers imposes a restriction on inservice programs which results in a certain amount of sporadicity. It is difficult to achieve continuity over a large bloc of time. But perhaps more important, in a negative sense, again, is the concern over the need to differentiate between those inservice programs of a remedial nature necessary for a teacher as an individual and those which are properly the concern of the total district and are developmental or professional in nature.

In the positive sense, there is the question of placement of an even greater responsibility with the school district for the professional development of its staff. This implies an investment of staff time, resources, and funds, and assumes that the return in terms of improved quantity of education for the district will offset the costs incurred by it. The opportunity for teachers to participate in extended periods of study, including short-term institutes as well as academic year programs, is being provided to some extent through the activities of such national programs as the National Science Foundation and the National Defense Education Act. Locally, many districts offer extended study leaves with partial salary, tuition grants, and extended contracts to cover the summer months. Whether the impact of new developments in curriculum programs, technological devices, new materials, and alternative procedures of organization for instruction requires a greater extension of support at either the national or local level remains to be seen. In any event, it would appear that recent advances in educational organization and programs will have some significant implications for the inservice training practices, including the degree of responsibility of the local district to increase its financial support of such practices, as well as the degree of responsibility of the individual staff member.

A Possible Direction

A rather recent salary study presented a direction which staff development or professional growth programs might possibly take.²

The report noted the lack of purpose which exists in many growth programs, and questioned the appropriateness of making such a matter so heavily reliant upon the goals and desires of the individual. Instead, a coordinated program is recommended, "carried on as a continuing fundamental professional activity involving all employees" and related to the specific goals of the community. The program is considered an integral part of the teaching position and not an in-

² Engelhardt, Engelhardt, and Leggett. *Study of Teacher Salaries and Recommendations, Greenwich, Connecticut*. New York: The authors, 1961.

service training program carried on during the available hours after the students have left the building. Administratively, it would include the establishment of specific positions concerned with growth and development of the professional staff. It would also mean a new definition of the teaching role in terms of a professional position, with a full day and year of employment, during which the traditional activities of teaching as well as the proposed growth activities would take place.

This type of a proposal does give direction and organization to the staff development program. In an era in which the schools are faced with a multiplicity of challenges in regard to the adaptability of their staffs to meet changing curriculum and community needs, the "in-service training" program is of major concern.

Counseling and Consultation

The extent to which schools are providing counseling services for young people is considerable and there are many demands to increase such services. Much less consideration has been given to the need or even the desirability of providing some counseling services for members of the school staff. This would include the areas of personal and family counseling as well as mental health. Several of the personnel administrators contacted in connection with the preparation of this bulletin voiced the need for further attention to be given to the question nationally.

Several years ago, Symonds noted the importance of counseling as a most important factor in supervision. He went on to state that, "The essence of teaching is to be found in the interpersonal relationships in the classroom. The role of the teacher depends more on his personality than on specific methods and materials that he may use. A teacher's approach to teaching and his attitudes toward relationships with his pupils are a function of his attitudes and relationships to life in general."³

In addition to the inclusion of more counseling in the supervisory function as well as the provision of some group counseling opportunities, Symonds then went on to propose that counseling and psychotherapeutic services be made available to teachers. The attitude toward such a program might initially be negative. He then added: "But if the administrators could let it be known that the teacher who

³ Percival M. Symonds. The Improvement of Teaching Through Counseling of the Teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 6: 122-27, June 1955.

accepts counseling is in the forward of moving teachers, the teacher who is taking steps to improve his competence as a teacher, attitudes toward the acceptance of counseling or psychotherapy would change very quickly."

Ignoring the cost factor, the argument against the provision by the school district of staff counseling services would appear to center around the school's primary responsibility, which is to the student. Such a position would hold that an individual in present or potential need of counseling or psychotherapy is incapable of maintaining the level of competence necessary for the proper performance of his assigned responsibilities and, hence, his services should be terminated. The emphasis is upon the prior responsibility to the welfare of the children.

For those who would accept the view that the district should provide some service of this type, two positions may be stated. First is that of a saving in funds. The cost of recruiting and training a teacher is of sufficient amount that every effort should be made to retain and salvage the services of those individuals on the staff who have a history of satisfactory performance. This means that not only preventative but also remedial action should be taken.

But a secondary aspect of the problem is that which has been characterized by Mones as involving a unique and distinguishing concern of personnel administration in education as opposed to other types of organizations. This distinction is noted by Mones as being primarily in the nature of emphasis, and this emphasis is upon the human relations aspect of education. Noting that in education performance cannot be measured in terms of tangible products, Mones goes on to say, "The climate, responsibilities, tensions, and the general emotional impacts of teaching are such as to catalyze and stimulate incipient emotional insecurities of people who teach. Particularly in the profession of teaching, it is important to detect the incidence of such insecurities and disturbances and to afford to the teacher relief, therapy, and reeducation by means of all resources available to the department of personnel."⁴

There is little evidence to indicate that a significant number of local school districts are now providing the type of assistance urged by Mones and Symonds. The extent to which the matter receives further attention will probably depend upon, to some degree, the frequency with which other noneducational organizations provide such programs.

⁴ Leon Mones. Administration of Educational Personnel—The New Emphasis. *Education*, 75: 203-207. December 1954.

Promotion

Procedures for the identification and training of potential administrators are of national concern. The interest of many teachers, particularly male, in obtaining administrative or supervisory positions in education is well known. Receiving lesser attention has been the interest of school administrators, particularly superintendents, in identifying potential leaders within the classroom. It would appear that school districts are quite aware of the future need for well-qualified leaders not only on their own staffs but also within the entire profession.

Perhaps the most common pattern utilized for locally administered training programs is to focus the initial assignment upon the assistant principalship. The following materials describe such a program in one of the cities visited.

The identification procedure is both active and passive. The passive aspect is principally one of publicizing the mechanical details of the examinations which are held for the initial screening process. Actively, both the building principals and the personnel department are in a position to offer advice and counsel on opportunities in administrative positions available in this system. The personnel administrator particularly is able to extend this guidance for the general picture within the State. The initiation of action is not left to the potential candidate. The administrative staff may also begin by urging the teacher to consider the possibility of a career in a leadership position within the school system.

Typical qualifications for admittance into the selection program include the necessary degree, experience, and certification requirements. The second phase is the examination procedure consisting of two parts. The first is a national examination on administration and supervision; the second is a university-prepared essay test. Both are scored externally.

The third step is the field rating. The major responsibility for the field rating falls with those individuals who have had the most extensive and most recent opportunities to view the work of the candidate. This field rating is used as one basis for establishing a list of individuals eligible to take the oral section.

The next, and fourth step, is the oral interview. The interview committee is composed principally of individuals operating at the particular level at which the teacher is presently assigned. (This is a fairly recent departure from a position in which the central administrative staff had major responsibility for the interview.) The shift away from a heavy reliance upon the top administrators for conduct

of the interview has necessitated a training program for those individuals selected to evaluate candidates.

The personnel office takes the lead in developing the necessary orientation program for evaluators including the use of the materials to be used in the interviews. A 1-day work shop is held for them a month prior to the interview period. The actual interview usually includes a panel of five administrators and supervisors. The candidate is evaluated on a rather brief but thorough form and a numerical score is produced. It should be emphasized that the form of the interview period is based upon the candidate's response to certain situations posed to him. These situations are presented in writing and vary in nature between the elementary and secondary candidates.

The final procedure is to develop a rank order list of eligible candidates which is submitted to the superintendent for his use in nominating assistant principals. There is considerable weighting given to the four parts of the selection process—the objective test, the essay test, the field rating, and the oral interview.

Several comments should be made on this procedure. First, it is obviously a tremendous consumer of time and effort on the part of the administrative staff. Second, there is great emphasis within the personnel department that the success of the program depends directly upon the extent to which valid evaluations from the oral interview and the field rating can be made. Improvement in these evaluations was not left to chance. There was a planned program to develop the skills in personnel appraisal held by those who are doing the evaluations. This meant additional effort. Thirdly, the entire program was highly coordinated and was a responsibility assigned to and accepted by the personnel department.

The individuals nominated by the superintendent for an assistant principalship have an obligation to the building principal in terms of the general administration of the school. However, there is another aspect of this position in that it is regarded as an opportunity for development as a student of school administration. There may or may not be a change in assignment during the period spent as an assistant principal. This is advantageous in terms of training—it may impose a handicap in terms of the administration of a school. Certainly, the school district is aware of the advantages of a rotation of assignments between buildings as well as into the central office, if possible.

Within the school systems visited, there was only one other administrative training program operating to the degree of organization described above. In this second situation, although the coordination of the program rested with the personnel department, including the selection and assignment of the trainees, a good deal of the training aspect was absorbed by a nearby university. Certain comments made by ad-

ministrative personnel in both systems are pertinent to the general problem of leadership training programs.

In both systems a strong effort was made to provide the type of experiences as an assistant principal which demanded some opportunity for the acceptance of responsibility and yet maintained the integrity of the objectives of the training function assigned to the position. The internship program conducted by university staffs, in cooperation with local schools, has received some criticism because the assignment of responsibility to reach a decision of some importance was difficult for an individual operating in several positions at short intervals. Yet, the provision for a broader and more unified program of exposure to a variety of experiences as well as an organized critique of those experiences may be more highly developed in the intern programs than in those programs operating independently.

The feasibility of attempting to give the necessary balance between the training aspect of the assistant principalship and the provision of actual administrative responsibility is not clearly established and was of concern in both districts. There was some feeling that too frequently when an individual was assigned to the position with the title of "assistant principal," he tended to seek and be assigned responsibilities to such an extent that the training or growth goals of the assignment were almost completely neglected. The significance of this action is of lesser importance if the principalship is viewed as a terminal career position for the trainee. However, this restriction upon what should be potentially a most fruitful period of development for leadership careers demanding a wider variety of skills and experience was considered a handicap. On the basis of the two systems visited, the cooperating university as well as the local school system administrators shared this concern.

Administrative Growth

Beyond the need for teacher development programs, the districts observed indicated an interest in expanding the program to include all professional staff members other than just the classroom personnel. This interest was particularly acute in the case of the elementary school principal, so frequently the initial step in advancement. Although the need for a program of development for the administrative and/or supervisory staff may depend somewhat upon the thoroughness of the selection program for that staff, there was some concern voiced that this is an overlooked area of organized programs for staff development.

The observations made would indicate that the future development of inservice programs for school administrators and particularly principals would be effected by both changes in the educational program and by changes within the community. This was evidenced by three specific efforts to offer an organized program of development for the principals.³ One was directly geared to the need for principals to develop a better understanding of the changing community in which the school served as an attendance center. The importance of human relations and the high positive relationship between parental cooperation and school success of the child was recognized. It was also an assessment of the problem of the determination and accommodation of the mutual interests of the school and its community.

A second program was directed toward the rapidly developing changes in the curriculum program, particularly at the elementary level. In the district concerned, each elementary principal was responsible for developing an awareness and appraisal of certain designated areas of the elementary curriculum. This was, it appeared, an administrative development program directed at the subject-matter competence of the principal.

Thirdly, there was the program directed at the development of a particular administrative skill of the principal. In this instance, it was toward the districtwide policy on evaluation of the teaching staff. Concerned not only with the particular practices and instruments used in the evaluation program, it was also an effort to develop a much larger program of evaluation than the teacher—an evaluation of the entire school program with the teacher being the base unit.

Each of these three examples illustrates a problem which has been identified locally and has been approached with predominately local resources utilized through an organized training program. Other types of programs supported internally would include workshops and sabbatical leaves. Programs for potential, new, and experienced administrators may need to be considered rather discrete and individualized for each of these categories. The question of the direction which university-sponsored development programs should take is another question and was not considered in any detail within the districts visited. There have, however, been some statements on the subject.

It would seem that it is only in recent years that preparation institutions have awakened to the fact that there are from four to ten times as many administrators already on the job as there are administrators appointed to new positions in any one year. Instead of concentrating so much upon those aspiring to mount, from among whom only some will get the nod in any one year, more should be done for those already in the saddle. More is being done.⁴

³Walter A. Anderson and Richard C. Bondale. *Learning Administrative Behavior*. Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, eds. *Administrative Behavior in Education*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957. p. 453.

The essence of this need—for the building principals, for example—lies in the nature of their previous training and experience which have been heavy in the area of teaching. As a principal, however, there is the need for accommodation of two responsibilities—teaching and administration. Yet, his success in his teaching function probably depends more upon his success as an administrator than his success as an administrator depends upon his success as a teacher. Perhaps the major deterrent to the broader provision of development programs for administrators who have several years of service in their position has been the uncertainty about the most appropriate type of program which might be followed. Howe, for example, would argue for “. . . a further effort to connect the training of those who will manage public education with the major sources of wisdom we have in our universities—the liberal arts and sciences. There is evidence, for example, through the John Hays Fellows Program for encouraging the study of the humanities, that high school administrators exposed for a summer to literature, drama, and the fine arts, and particularly in a lively discussion of these, gain an exciting interest in connecting their administrative efforts to the significant themes of the human heritage.”⁶

A statement of an earlier date noted that in regard to the development of inservice programs for school administrators, “Certainly it will need to be more practical and realistic than are some of the graduate courses offered for certification.”⁷

Perhaps the choice is not as well-defined as the two quotations, out of context, immediately above would indicate. But the question of the appropriate development programs for practicing administrators has received considerable attention. The professional educational associations are interested in it as are the universities and the colleges.

Centralization

The need for greater activity by the personnel department in the inservice program was more of an academic question than of one having application within the particular school districts visited. The rationale for such greater involvement, as indicated elsewhere, is related to the degree of unity of the selection, assignment, evaluation, and development functions. An apparent argument against such unification as it applies to development is that a good deal of inservice training is presently carried on under “curriculum development” ac-

⁶ Harold Howe, II. *The Care and Feeding of Superintendents. Saturday Review*, Feb. 17, 1962. p. 84.

⁷ Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Reavis, and James D. Logdson. *The Effective School Principal*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955. p. 579.

tivities. Within the districts visited, the personnel departments tended to limit their participation in development programs to promotion and to those uniquely applicable to new members of the staff. These activities would include the induction and orientation programs, both of the preschool and yearlong nature.

CHAPTER VI

Summary

THE ISSUES and problems which have been discussed are selective. Certain critical personnel questions which are facing our schools have not been considered. These would include, for example, the growing concern over the appropriate teacher-board of education relationship in terms of negotiation procedures as well as the proper areas of such negotiation. The difficulties in staffing, as well as working within, the slum schools of the metropolitan areas have not been treated. The importance of locally conducted research on personnel practices, as well as future needs, is omitted. The scope of the fringe benefit program available to the staff is an annual matter of discussion as is the salary schedule. These, and other vital areas of concern, are not discussed.

The personnel activities which have been included for examination are, however, of great importance. Recruitment, development, and evaluation are broad classifications of responsibility in which there is considerable current interest on a nationwide level, as well as within individual school systems. This concern arises from a commonality of problems which transcend such quantitative factors as the staff size or average salaries. School systems with a staff of 150 are faced with the development of evaluation or inservice programs as are those with a staff of 1,500 or 15,000.

The annual recruitment activity is, of course, a pressing problem. Although it has frequently been described in highly quantitative phrases showing the supply and demand imbalance, there is great concern over the qualitative aspects. The importance of a thorough interview, as well as an evaluation of past performance, have been noted within this bulletin. The use of a formal examination procedure for applicants is an effort to provide one additional source of information as an aid in the selection process. The opportunity to obtain observations of performance prior to selection is somewhat limited. The transition of the probationary period into an internship would increase such opportunities. With the current teacher shortage, such a transition does not appear to lie within the immediate future.

The inservice training or staff development program is closely related to the recruitment and selection programs. New developments in instructional methods, curriculum, and organization should result in, among other trends, an increase in the number of specialized teaching positions as well as teaching positions with highly specialized qualifications required. Thus, it may become necessary to recruit and train individuals for particular instructional assignments to a degree greater than is now being done. For recruitment, this could influence the extent and nature of the development of position descriptions. For inservice programs, a reappraisal of their structure may be necessary. This would involve consideration of the relative responsibility of the individual staff member and of the school district to support such programs. In addition, it may give additional impetus to the consideration of the appropriate extent to which "staff training" in itself becomes more highly organized within the administrative structure. One example of such an organization was noted.

Evaluation is a term which permeates the entire educational system. Evaluation is made of students, their teachers, the school, the program, and the total staff and district. It is made of and by teachers, as well as their administrators, both as individuals and as groups. It is made externally by the school patrons, as well as internally by the school staff. It may be carried on informally or it may be highly structured as a program through which certain criteria, activities, and responsibilities can be identified.

Within this bulletin, evaluation has been considered as a formal procedure. Particular concern has been with administrative evaluation of the classroom teacher. The fact that certain districts attach a high degree of unity to the evaluation and development programs has been stressed. This unity places evaluation in a positive concept rather than a negative one. As a result the responsibility lies with the teacher for the preparation of specific goals upon which evaluation should take place. It assumes that successful performance frequently requires administrative supervisory assistance in removing obstacles preventing such success. It also assumes that as highly important as individual determination in professional growth patterns may be, such determination need not be disassociated from the goals of the school and district.

The need to view personnel administration within two frames of reference has been stressed. In its broadest context, personnel administration is basic to all administrative and supervisory functions which involve the provision of leadership and guidance to the staff. But there is also the aspect of personnel administration as an organization for meeting the personnel problems and needs of the school system. The problems within recruitment, evaluation, and development

have been examined as activities within this separate organization as well as within the broader scope of personnel administration.

There has been no attempt to suggest what the most appropriate form of organization to discharge the various personnel responsibilities might be. In the instance of evaluation, for example, the critical importance of the one-to-one relationship between the principal and the teacher was stressed. At the same time, the importance of coordination of the evaluation program and its growth was noted. The school districts visited exhibited a variety of organizational forms in regard to the degree of centralization of these activities. The concept of the appropriate duties and responsibilities of the personnel administrator is not as closely established as that of the principal or superintendent. In addition, local conditions frequently determine the particular form which an administrative organization might take as well as the rate at which evolutionary changes occur.

As a profession, the major problem for personnel administration is not solely that of determining the most suitable type of organization. Instead, the concern is also with the broader acceptance of the belief that personnel management is dependent upon a personnel attitude as well as upon a personnel organization. Both must exist.

Finding and employing teachers is only the beginning of a sound personnel program. School systems, like industrial organizations, have learned that staff welfare and morale may no longer be left to chance or taken for granted. It is one thing to manage "the personnel" and quite another to work respectfully with persons as individuals.¹

¹ John H. Fisher. A Welcome to the 1958 AASPA Annual Conference. *Baltimore Public Schools Newsletter*, 12: 1 October 1958.