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ABSTRACT

EVALUATING THE CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER
A STUDY OF CURRENT PRACTICES

Marianne S. Long

The Chief State School Officer, along with his staff, had the principal duties and responsibilities of the state government in the administration of education. In an era of increased educational accountability, little information was available on the evaluation procedures for Chief State School Officers. The purpose of this study was to conduct an assessment of the policy, scope, and methods used by State Boards of Education in the evaluation of the Chief State School Officers.

Questionnaires were mailed to each State Board of Education President and each Chief State School Officer in order to elicit specific information concerning the evaluation procedures used in forty-nine states and six U.S. Territories.

Results indicated that:

(1) Of the 48 states and 4 territories responding to this survey (95%), only 17 states (32%) conducted evaluations. In states where the Chief State School Officer was elected by the people or appointed by the governor, no evaluation occurred. In 10 states where the Chief was appointed by the State Board of Education, no evaluation occurred.
(2) Less than 20% of the states and territories responding to these questionnaires had a formal plan for this evaluation. When evaluations were conducted, they were usually done so at yearly intervals using a number of different processes.

(3) State Board of Education Chairpersons who had an evaluation process in place, used predominantly two methods in evaluating the Chief State School Officer, essay questions and checklist ratings. The instrument was usually designed by the State Board of Education, was relatively new and had not been validated.

(4) Most of the State Boards of Education that evaluated the Chief State School Officer did discuss the evaluation with the Chief. Fifty-three percent of the responding states completed a written evaluation. Most of the states utilized the results to set goals and standards for future performance.

(5) State Board of Education presidents saw the process as being more effective in improving performance standards than did the Chief State School Officers.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

With the adoption of the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, education became the responsibility of the individual states. In the early days of American history, the local governmental authority, usually the town board, accepted responsibility for educating the town's children. They approved the funds necessary to hire the staff, build and equip the physical plant, and maintain the school. This responsibility was later delegated to a committee of citizens, eventually evolving into a "board of education". The office of superintendent followed naturally, as it became apparent that members of the board of education had neither the time nor the special professional qualifications necessary to direct and supervise a growing educational system.

As states assumed a more active role in the educational process, public-spirited citizens saw the need for strong educational leadership in the development of their common school system. A State Superintendent or Chief State School Officer filled an important role in consolidating the educational forces within the state. By necessity, the Chief State School Officer had to have a state-wide viewpoint. It became the legal responsibility of the "Chief" to study the educational system and keep the legislature informed and conscious of education. The role required the Chief State School Officer to be
the champion for the teachers and the spokesman in all educational matters. The job required vision, intelligence, and courage.

The duties of the State School Officer expanded and intensified as states grew and legislators demanded increased accountability. Such problems as financial appropriations, teacher training and licensure, building safety, courses of study, and educational law forced the establishment of a professional staff to assist the Chief State School Officer. State Departments of Education became increasingly important to the efficient operation of schools and education.

State Boards of Education were first viewed as the state counterpart to the local board of school trustees, and played an integral role in unifying educational forces within the state. In 1990, forty-nine states plus American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands had active State Boards of Education. They reflected lay governance of education as well as the belief that education policymaking should be separated from partisan politics.

In each of the fifty states and six territories, provision was made, usually in the state constitution, for a Chief State School Officer. Although nomenclature varied, and the Chief assumed the responsibility in different ways, this educator, along with a professional staff, had the principal duties and responsibilities of the state government in the administration of education. Such problems as student unrest, school finance reform, changing demographics, competency testing, accountability issues, and
educational reform mandates all required careful study and timely decisions. Not only did Chief State School Officers deal with issues, they also worked with others in establishing policy. They actively communicated with the State Board of Education, with governors, legislators, educational interest groups, school administrators, federal officials, and the community.

Despite all the responsibility, the activity, and the turbulence, little had been written about how Chief State School Officers actually operated. In this era of increased educational accountability, even less had been done to examine evaluation techniques and procedures utilized in the formal evaluation of Chief State School Officers.

**Statement of the Problem**

The purpose of this study was to conduct an assessment of the policy, scope, and methods used by State Boards of Education to evaluate the Chief State School Officer.

**Subproblems**

1) To determine how State Boards of Education were involved in the evaluation of the Chief State School Officer.

2) To determine if there was a formal plan for this evaluation that was both timely and systematic.

3) To determine what methods were used to evaluate the Chief State School Officer.

4) To determine how the results of this evaluation were utilized in future job performance expectations.
5) To determine the Chief State School Officer's perception of the effectiveness of this evaluation.

**Significance of the Study**

Chief State School Officers played a dynamic, integral role in the education of America's youth. A sound evaluation program served the best interests of both the Chief State School Officer and the nation's interest in the education of its youth.

A comprehensive study of Chief State School Officers' evaluation policy, its scope, methods used, and changed performance expectations, had not been undertaken. This study was designed to provide baseline data concerning this important procedure.

**Research Questions**

1) Did each State Board of Education conduct a performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer regardless of the governance model used in the state?

2) Did each State Board of Education have a formal plan for this evaluation that was both timely and systematic?

3) Had each State Board of Education used a variety of methods to evaluate the Chief State School Officer? Had the instrument employed in the evaluation been well written, validated, and pertinent to the job description?

4) Did each State Board of Education discuss the evaluation with the Chief State School Officer, complete a written document, and utilize the results of the evaluation in future job performance
5. Did each State Board President and each Chief State School Officer perceive the evaluation to be effective in helping improve performance standards?

Assumptions

The following basic assumptions applied to this study:

1) State Boards of Education were functioning in forty-nine states and six territories. Wisconsin did not have a State Board of Education.

2) They shared a common desire to upgrade education in their respective states.

3) Evaluations were a good management tool and should be employed by all State Boards of Education.

4) State Board Presidents or their designees had knowledge about and access to evaluation measures used in their respective states.

5) The data collected from both the State Board President and the Chief State School Officer were accurate data.

Delimitations

1) This study surveyed evaluation practices of the 1988-89 fiscal year.

2) This study focused on specific questions asked in the survey instrument.

3) The study was limited to the information provided by the State Board of Education President and the Chief State School Officer.
Limitations

1) This study was limited by the willingness of the State Board of Education President and the Chief State School Officer to respond to the instrument.

2) The responses were limited to the options offered to specific questions.

Definition of Terms

Chief State School Officer: A public official who was the chief education administrator in a particular state. In this capacity, the Chief State School Officer headed departments of elementary and secondary education, acted as the Chief Executive Officer of the State Department of Education, and engaged in a wide variety of core activities. One of his chief responsibilities was to oversee and to influence the distribution of large sums of money to the schools. He also administered a growing number of categorical programs, which involved compliance monitoring, technical assistance, auditing, and evaluation. His agency also provided a variety of services to local school districts and regulated the basic conditions of education.

The State Board of Education: This term referred to a lay governing board consisting of between 6 and 24 members. All State Boards of Education were responsible for public elementary and secondary education. Additional authority varied according to the intra-state relationship among board, governor, legislature, and Chief State School Officer.

Governance Structure: This term referred to how State Boards of
Education and Chief State School Officers were selected. There were eleven different governance models demonstrated in the United States. These models represented a combination of ways in which the Chief State School Officer obtained his position and different methods by which State Boards of Education members received their authority. The particular selection methods influenced the relationships among education officials.

Evaluation: Used in the context of this report, an evaluation was an examination and a judgment of the work performance of a specific individual, namely the Chief State School Officer, as undertaken by the State Board of Education.

PROCEDURES

This study was descriptive in nature. The following procedures were followed in order that data could be collected and evaluated:

1) A survey questionnaire for State Board Presidents was developed that would measure the specific questions asked in the research project. The questions were written in a variety of ways and required both closed and open-ended responses.

2) A draft of the instrument was reviewed by the Nevada State Board of Education and the Nevada State Department of Education. Appropriate suggested changes were made in the document.

3) A smaller but similar instrument was designed for the Chief State School Officer in each of the participating states. This instrument was not validated.

4) The questionnaires were mailed to the State Board of
Education Chairman/President and to each Chief State School Officer in all 49 states and 6 territories that had State Boards of Education.

5) Follow-up procedures were undertaken as necessary.

6) The questionnaires were initially stratified according to the governance model employed by the state.

7) Results were tabulated and analyzed using conventional descriptive techniques.

8) The final report was made with appropriate suggestions for continued research.

Organization of the Study

This study followed the usual organizational pattern:

1) Chapter I introduced the subject and provided a general statement of the problem. Also included were the research questions, assumptions, delimitations, limitations and definition of terms.

2) Chapter II provided a review of the literature including a review of previous research, pertinent opinions and a summary of the findings relevant to this topic.

3) Chapter III was concerned with the methods used in completing the study. It included the research design and a description of the survey instrument.

4) Chapter IV included all research findings as they pertained to each research question. Other appropriate findings were also discussed.

5) Chapter V included the summary and conclusions.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Nothing matters more -- nothing. Education is the public enterprise in our country that is closest to people's hearts and most important to their lives. And education is the enterprise that is crucial to the success of everything we attempt as a nation.

James B. Hunt, Governor of North Carolina

In 1990 there was unprecedented public interest in all facets of American education. This interest had its genesis in a small publication of the National Commission on Excellence in Education entitled A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Briefly, the Commission found "our nation at risk" because "the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people." (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 5)

After seven years, the interest in educational reform remained high. Virtually every state, according to The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, Time for Results, had taken steps to raise educational standards and make other improvements in the educational delivery system. (National Governors' Association, 1987, pp. 44-61) This interest led states to boost aid for public schools by 41 percent between the 1982-83 and 1986-87 school years, more than double the 19
percent inflation rate of that period, according to a study done by the National Council of State Legislatures. ("Education Vital Signs," 1988-89, p. A19)

Yet, despite these efforts, the need for education reform continued and the work of the recent past was extended into the future. The National Governors' Association outlined three specific reasons why such reform was critical to the social and economic environment of the country:

First, the economic well-being of the states and their citizens is increasingly dependent upon a well-educated and highly skilled workforce. Second, the health of our economy as well as the stability of our democracy requires schools and colleges to effectively educate all students . . . . Third, public education is a big public business. . . . With a commitment of resources on this scale, and in light of competing demands for scarce state resources, improving both the efficiency and the productivity of the educational system must be a continuing concern for Governors and other state policymakers. (Cohen, 1988, p. 1)

Obviously, the implementation of broad-ranged, in-depth changes in the educational system required the united efforts of many players. Individual teachers and administrators, small businesses and large corporations, local school districts and superintendents, as well as parents, students, and lay members of the community, played a critical role in the educational goals that met the expanding needs of the entire system.

The scope of this paper, however, dealt with the responsibilities of the state in the education of its citizens. It, too, had an important role in setting educational goals, stimulating local innovation and providing its citizens with accountability systems. (Cohen, 1988, p. 19-27)
Education as a State Function -- An Historical Perspective

In the United States, education was the responsibility of individual states. Although the Constitution, as originally adopted in 1788 and amended with the Bill of Rights in 1791, made no direct reference to educational policy, the tenth amendment to the U.S. Constitution clearly stated that, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively or to the people." (10th Amendment, U.S. Constitution) Since education was not mentioned as a power delegated to the federal government, and not forbidden by that same document, education was clearly a function of the state. As such, the state was free to provide educational services to its citizens in any way it wished.

An examination of the history of American education clearly showed an involved process of evolution. The colonists, with their common love of freedom and their experiences with European governments, established a "common school." Compulsory schools were established throughout colonial America, not only to preserve the religious faith of the early citizens, but to maintain the existing social and economic climate of the times. (Thurston and Roe, 1957, p. 22)

After the Revolutionary War, Americans became even more convinced that the education of their youth was essential to the well-being of the country. Thomas Jefferson, among others, was particularly interested in the education of every individual. His statement, "I
have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form
of tyranny over the mind of man," exemplified his deeply-held belief
in the importance of a sound educational system. (Arrowood, 1930,
p. 65) In 1786 he wrote a letter to George Wythe, supporting a strong
educational platform in the constitution of Virginia:

I think by far the most important bill in our whole
code, is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the
people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the
preservation of freedom and happiness . . . . Preach,
my dear Sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and
improve the law for educating the common people. (Thurston
and Roe, 1957, p. 7-8)

Post-revolutionary events continued to focus on the importance
of education in the United States. The War of 1812, the Western
migration, European immigrants, growing social, secular, economic,
scientific and political independence were powerful forces in shaping
the destiny of American education.

Although the education movement started in local communities,
supported by interested citizens who accepted responsibility for
educating the town's children,

"... it was not until the state took action by making
provisions for a state school officer that the forces
of and for education were consolidated into a movement
that did not stop until free common school education
became a reality. (Thurston and Roe, 1957, p. 48)

The state, rather than the local or federal government, became
the provider of educational services. (Thurston and Roe, 1957,
pp. 27-28) The states assumed this responsibility and made provisions
for a system of public schools in their constitutions. "The purposes
of the state could not ignore the instrument of the school if its ends
were to be achieved." (Kirst, 1972, p vii)
Table 1, page 14, illustrates the statutory and constitutional provisions for public education in the states prior to 1820.

The judicial system, too, played a critical role in establishing education as a state function. There was a large body of case law, for example, that forbade the federal government from encroaching on the perogatives of the state. In Cummings v. Richmond County Board of Education, (175 U.S.528 (1900), the Supreme Court maintained that education was a function of the state and the federal government could only intervene when there was a clear, unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land. Other cases have repeatedly stated that the "exclusive right of the state to administer, organize, and conduct an education system cannot be questioned." (Missouri ex. rel. Gaines v. Canada, 305 U.S.377)

Although each state constitution differed, they all charged the state legislature with the responsibility for developing a program of public education. (Dykes, 1965, p. 36)

"Throughout the nation there is a great difference in the structural organizations used to discharge the responsibilities for educating the children of the state. No two designs are exactly the same -- all vary in many ways, yet all, strangely enough, show a hard core of similarity." (Thurston and Roe, 1957, p. 73).

In an effort to fulfill their responsibilities for a strong educational system, legislators created a system through which services could be provided. All states have embodied in their constitutions a chief state school officer. This office-holder was given the responsibility of managing a state department of education.
TABLE 1

STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS
FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Date Admitted to Union</th>
<th>Statutory Provisions</th>
<th>Constitutional Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (1)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Original State</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**(1) Constitution provides for "direct establishment"
(2) Constitution provides for "protect and encourage"
(3) Constitution provides for "encourage schools"
Provisions were also made for some type of educational state board, "although the responsibilities of these vary from complete supervisory control of all educational activity to a very limited control over a very limited division of educational effort." (Thurston and Roe, 1957, p. 74)

Although this review of the literature focused primarily on the Chief State School Officer and the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education is vital to state efforts and will be discussed briefly.

The State Department of Education

State departments of education played a vital service and leadership role in state-wide education. Although, historically, their role was essentially one of "compiling general information on education, making annual or biennial reports, publishing school laws, and apportioning state aid moneys," (Thurston and Roe, 1957, p. 115) the demands on the agency have changed that role significantly. In a 1952 publication entitled "State Department of Education," the National Council of Chief State School Officers listed the six functions of the state department as "planning, research, advisory, coordination, public relations and in-service education."

Major responsibilities of State Departments of Education included these functions:

1) Regulatory -- assuring that a basic program is offered and that minimum standards are observed in such areas as school buildings, transportation, teacher certification, accounting for funds, etc.
2) Leadership -- supplying vigorous energizing force throughout the state and to the state government itself for the improvement of education.

3) Research -- providing stimulation for, conducting, and supporting research in all areas of public education and an effort to place educational progress on a sound, research-proven foundation.

4) Planning -- developing a long-term program of education with the assistance of appropriate agencies and groups, and coordinating the efforts necessary to implement the program.

5) Advisory -- providing consultative services needed by local school districts to improve education at the local level.

6) Service -- providing educational services which local school districts cannot provide themselves. (Dykes, 1955, p. 57)

State Departments of Education accomplished these functions through a wide variety of ways. Under the supervision of the Chief State School Officer and the direction of the State Board of Education, State Departments:

1) Collected, organized, and interpreted educational data from throughout the state;

2) Applied current data to specific policy contexts and provided policy-makers with accurate and reliable information; (Cohen, 1985, p.5)

3) Provided technical assistance and training to local school districts; (National Governors' Association, 1988, p. 29)

4) Administered, coordinated, and monitored federal and state categorical programs; (Robinson, 1987, p. 83) and

5) Assisted policy-makers in determining purposes and set long-range and short-range goals.

In essence, state departments of education provided regulatory
control, administered specific programs and services, and led the educational efforts in the state. Any effective organization depended upon the leadership of a chief executive officer. Although the State Board of Education was legally responsible for the state's educational system, it was the Chief State School Officer who filled the role of chief officer.

The Chief State School Officer

The constitution of every state provided for a Chief State School Officer. New York was the first state to establish such a position in 1812. Maryland followed in 1826 with Michigan in 1829. By 1850, another 21 states had recognized the need for such a position and by the beginning of 1900, all states had established a Chief State School Officer. (Dykes, 1965, p. 53.) Thurston and Roe point out, however, that this officer was usually regarded more as a political figure than as an educational one.

Usually elected to office by the direct suffrage of the people, indebted to a political party for his nomination and his subsequent election to office, frequently eligible to the title deeds of office without substantial educational talent, experience, or training . . . the earlier chief state school officer was caught in a web of circumstances that prevented him . . . from making any substantial contribution to the advancement of education within his state. (Thurston and Roe, 1957, p. 113)

Nevertheless, as the demands on the educational system grew, the Chief's responsibility grew, as well.

As one looks at the developing pattern of education today, however, it is obvious that no position has greater potential for the unification and leadership of education in each of the states than that of the chief state school officer. (Dykes, 1965, p. 54)
Although job descriptions varied from state to state, Chief State School Officers undoubtedly shared many common functions. Jerome T. Murphy interviewed four chief state school officers in writing his book *State Leadership in Education -- On Being a Chief State School Officer.* (1980) Collectively, these ex-chiefs provided a variety of insights into what it was like to be a Chief State School Officer. Job descriptions for them, and other chiefs, usually included:

1) Managing the State Department of Education; These bureaucracies varied considerably in resources, responsibilities and influence. They engaged in a wide variety of core activities and provided a variety of services to local school districts.

2) Actively participating in the formulation, approval and appropriation of financial resources;

> From a strictly financial perspective, the current annual investment of more than $160 billion in the public schools and future increases in this annual investment demand nothing less than educationally sound and cost-effective decisions. (Robinson, 1987, p. 3)

3) Interpreting, explaining and facilitating the operation of educational legislation;

4) Exercising leadership both through local school districts and the state government in the development of the state's educational system;

5) Acting as executive officers of State Boards of Education.

**State Boards of Education**

The State Board of Education was a reflection of the desire of the people to keep control of education close to themselves. The
The first state board was established in New York in 1784. (Dykes, 1965, p. 52) It was not until the state of Massachusetts, however, established a State Board of Education in 1837, that such a board became generally accepted.

Today, in every U.S. state and territory except one (Wisconsin), primary responsibility for the schools is vested in a state board of education. State boards are responsible for the education of nearly forty million students in public school and more than three million students in post-secondary institutions. State board members devote an average of ten to fifteen hours a week in the performance of their official duties and serve the public trust with little or no compensation. Men and women of varying ages and diverse personal and professional backgrounds join to work for the common goal of a well-educated citizenry. (Wiley, 1983, p. 13)

State Boards of Education varied in size from Oklahoma with 6 members to Texas with 24 members. As of 1983, 66.4% of board members were men and only about 16% belonged to minority ethnic groups. Eighty-eight percent were older than 40, and most were well-educated. Most board members described their occupation as "managerial" or "administrative." Together, board members shared "an abiding interest in public education and brought to state board service a sound understanding of critical issues for reform of the schools." (Wiley, 1983, p. 17)

The National Association of State Boards of Education appointed a task force in 1986 to study state board leadership. They identified a number of key roles that a state board played. These included that of being an education advocate, a liaison between educators and others involved in policy-making, a consensus builder and a policymaker. In order to effectively carry out these roles, members of a state board
had to be "proactive, highly visible, responsive to education constituency groups and well-informed about the condition and needs of education and the system in which it operates." (NASBE Task Force on State Board Leadership, 1986, p. 2-3)

The responsibilities of boards varied depending upon the constitution of the various states. All boards developed statewide policies and regulations in areas such as standards for education quality, equal access to education, organization of local school districts, and finance. Some boards also had the additional responsibility for vocational education and rehabilitation, colleges and universities, private schools, adult education, textbooks and educational television.

Although state responsibilities varied, the primary functions of many State Boards of Education included:

1) Appointing a Chief State School Officer, evaluating his performance, and renewing his contract;

2) Adopting a budget for those educational activities directly under its jurisdiction;

3) Establishing policies and regulations that govern the operation of public and private schools;

4) Cooperating with other agencies, including federal, state and local, to further the cause of public education;

5) Developing appropriate recommendations to be submitted to the governor and legislature regarding the improvement of education. (Dykes, 1965, p. 52-53)
Governance Structure Among States

There were eleven distinct governance models that described the different structures of educational governance in the 50 states and six U.S. territories. These models described how State Boards of Education and Chief State School Officers were selected. Naturally, the selection methods influenced the relationships among education officials. These models included:

Model I: (See Figure 1, page 22) This model illustrated the governance structure in 13 states including: Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont and West Virginia. It was the most popular model. As can be seen from the graphic representation illustrated in Figure 1, the governor appointed the State Board of Education and the State Board of Education appointed the Chief State School Officer.

In most states, gubernatorial nominees to the state board were confirmed by the senate, full legislature, or an advisory group. Appointed board members often served a longer term than the governor who appointed them. Although State Board of Education members in Rhode Island served less than five years, those in Arkansas and West Virginia served nine year terms. Most of the other governors appointed their board members for terms of five or six years.

Supporters of this model viewed the gubernatorial appointment of state boards as enhancing coordination and efficiency in the policy-making process. Appointed board members felt they had a closer
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relationship with their governor than they would have had if they had been elected. (Wiley, 1983, p. 21)

Model II: (See Figure 2, page 24) Although both Model I and Model II indicate that State Board of Education members appointed their respective Chief State School Officer, both clearly established separate governance structures for education. As can be seen in Figure 2, the ten states and one U.S. territory incorporating this governance model provided for the electorate to vote on State Board of Education members. These ten states included Alabama, Colorado, Hawaii, Kansas, Mighigan, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Texas and Utah plus the District of Columbia. Alabama, Colorado, Kansas, Michigan and Texas all elected state board members through a partisan ballot while candidates in Hawaii, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Utah and the District of Columbia ran on non-partisan tickets.

In states where board members were elected, they usually served a four-year term although four states had six year terms and North Carolina elected board members for eight years.

State board members who were elected felt that such a process enhanced their relationship with the governor and the legislature. They also felt that "the election process promoted discussion of issues, personal points of view, and developed an interest in establishing and maintaining a public position in keeping with those views." (Wiley, 1983, p. 23)

In the 27 states where the State Board of Education had the authority to appoint the Chief State School Officer, (Models I, II,
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VII, VIII, and IX) board members advocated this authority. In these models, the board's relationship to the Chief was not dissimilar from a board of directors and the chief executive officer of a large organization. In such models, the administration of the school system flowed from the board down. Issues of accountability were easier to track and often resulted in a smoother functioning process of education policymaking and administration.

Appointed chiefs were often selected from a wider pool of candidates than those who ran in state elections. A national search for qualified candidates had the potential of producing a higher quality candidate and promoted the incumbency of stronger, more capable administrators to the post of Chief State School Officer.

In Model III (see Figure 3, page 26) there was a significantly different structure. In these 12 states, (Arizona, California, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon and Wyoming) the Chief State School Officer was elected, usually by partisan ballot, and usually for a four-year term. The state board members, on the other hand, were appointed by the governor, most often on staggered terms of five or more years.

This type of structure often resulted in a "dual" state system of education with the elected Chief State School Officer in conflict with a board appointed by the governor. In most of the states that incorporated Model III,

... it was not unusual for both the governor and the Chief to be elected at the same time for terms of equal length. Both have some legal and formal responsibility over education and both must work with a board to which the
Figure 3

Appointed State Board of Education
Elected Chief State School Officer
majority of members were appointed by the previous governor or governors. (Wiley, 1983, p. 25)

Those who favored such a system believed the chief was more responsive to the needs and priorities of the constituents.

In Model IV (See Figure 4, p. 28) the governor appointed both the members of the state board and the Chief State School Officer. Seven states (Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia) and five U.S. Territories (American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) used this model. In two states, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, the chief's term was longer than the governor's and in all of the states, board members served for a minimum of five years. These extended terms for board members and the chief state school officer limited the control of the governor over education. In three states, however, Maine, Tennessee, and Virginia, the chief served at the governor's pleasure, thus further enhancing more gubernatorial authority over the education system. (Wiley, 1983, pp. 26-27)

Models I, II, III, and IV accounted for the governance structure in forty-one states and all six U.S. territories. Models V through XI were utilized in the remaining 9 states.

Model V (See Figure 5, page 29) illustrated the governance structure employed in the state of Florida. As can be seen from the illustration, Florida's State Board of Education was composed of members of the governor's cabinet, including the elected Chief State School Officer. In such an arrangement, the State Board of Education was limited in size and had little accountability.
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Model VI (See Figure 6, page 31) was illustrative of the education governance in the state of Wisconsin. Although this state had a federally mandated board for vocational education, it was the only state with no board of elementary and secondary education. For purposes of this research, Wisconsin was not included in the population studied.

Model VII, (See Figure 7, page 32) illustrated a dual method by which State Board of Education members achieved their position. As can be seen in Figure 7, members of the State Board of Education could either be elected by the vote of the people or appointed by the Governor. This model was utilized in both Louisiana and New Mexico.

In Louisiana, eight members of the eleven member board were elected and 3 appointed by the governor. In New Mexico, 5 members of the board were appointed and 10 were elected. Both State Boards of Education appointed the Chief State School Officer. In such a model, the governor's authority to appoint a minority of board members allowed him to exercise some control over this educational entity while permitting the electorate to have an important voice in the election of State Board of Education members.

Although such an arrangement would accomplish a compromise in how State Board members gained their positions, it was important to notice that the State Board of Education maintained their authority in appointing the Chief State School Officer. In such an arrangement, the Chief was still responsible to the State Board of Education and was in a position to carry out their mandates.
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Model VIII (See Figure 8, page 34) represented still another way in which State Board of Education members obtained their positions. In Mississippi, the only state using this model, both the governor and the legislature appointed the nine-member State Board of Education. The Governor appointed five members of the board while the President of the Senate appointed two members and the Speaker of the House also appointed two members. While the Governor obviously enjoyed the advantage of the majority appointment, it was very possible that members of the opposing political party could appoint the remaining four members.

In Mississippi, the Chief State School Officer was appointed by the State Board of Education.

Model IX (See Figure 9, page 35) represented still another structure employed by states in the process of governing education. In New York, the legislature, elected by the people, had the authority to appoint the Board of Regents. Such an arrangement allowed both parties to nominate candidates and forced the legislature to be responsive to the demands of the State Board of Education.

This board, in turn, had the authority to appoint the Chief State School Officer and made the chief accountable to the State Board of Education.

Model X (See Figure 10, page 36) illustrated the governance structure in South Carolina. As can be seen from the graphic illustration, the governor, state legislature and Chief State School Officer were all elected by the popular vote of the people.
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The state legislature had the authority to appoint the members of the State Board of Education.

Such authority constituted a particularly direct tie between the legislature and the State Board of Education. Both had responsibilities for educational policy and both had opportunities to take a leadership role. Through the appointment process, members of the state board felt a particular closeness to legislators. This closeness allowed board members to work directly with key legislators to see that policy requiring legislation was enacted and that state funding was provided at adequate levels.

Model XI (See Figure 11, page 38) depicted another unique governance structure. In the state of Washington, the State Board of Education was elected by local school board members. The Chief State School Officer and the local school board members had been elected by popular vote.

Because local districts were responsible for operating the schools within the legal framework of the state constitution and statutes, and the policies and regulations of the state board, this governance structure assured a good level of cooperation. Such a structure encouraged the state and local boards to work closely together in promoting quality education throughout the state.

State governance structures served as a useful context for discussing key relationships of a State Board of Education. Certainly the structure of the board, the methods used in selecting the Chief State School Officer and the members of the State Board of Education
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all impacted the working relationships of state education.

Members interact routinely with professional and parent associations, teachers, labor unions, business organizations, and other special interest groups. Thus, in working to fulfill all its responsibilities, a state board rarely works alone. State governance patterns are rooted in tradition and political science theory; however, roles and relationships continually adjust to changes in personnel and in public priorities. (Wiley, 1983, p. 36)

Regardless of governance structure, educational management, especially at the top level, was demanding, complex and filled with risk. Planning and evaluation were keys to success.

Evaluating the Chief State School Officer

All those involved in public education, particularly during the last decade, stressed the importance of improving the quality of educational services at every level. "One often identified means to achieve this improvement in public education is evaluation." (Hamm, 1988, p. 404)

Although there was a growing body of literature on administrative evaluations, the professional literature on evaluating school superintendents was not extensive. Literature that focused on Chief State School Officer evaluation was virtually non-existent. However, public education was funded with public dollars and, as such, its employees were public employees. Because of the size and scope of the public sector, public employees constituted a significant proportion of all employees (Dresang, 1984, p. 3) and much was written concerning public personnel management that can be applied to educational personnel as well.
History of Personnel Management

The development of public personnel management in the United States has been fraught with conflict and compromise. Despite the rhetoric that accompanied the American Revolution, the initial governments of the United States were ruled by the upper classes. The revolution was led by the upper class of landowners and it was not surprising to see these same people assume roles in the new government. Washington looked for people who were both loyal and demonstrated "fitness of character" including family background, formal education and general honor and esteem. (Mosher, 1968, p. 57)

He also recognized that employees should be treated in accordance with the level of their responsibilities. Those who assumed high ranking positions, i.e., policy-makers and managers, usually served at the pleasure of the president while workers with low-level or specialized skills, served for indefinite periods and were dismissed only for cause. (Ibid., p. 58)

The Jacksonian Revolution of the 1830s was fundamentally related to a major change in public personnel policy. (Rosenbloom, 1985, p.5) Although the type of men chosen by his predecessors might have been both honest and efficient, President Jackson argued that they were out of touch with common citizens. In his words:

Office is considered a species of property, and government rather as a means of promoting individual interests than as an instrument created solely for the service of the people. Corruption in some and in others a perversion of the correct feelings and principles divert government from its legitimate end and make it an engine for the support of the few at the expense of the many. (Ibid., p. 6)
Jackson is credited with introducing the "spoils system" in the government of the United States that used patronage to build and maintain political machines. This system of appointees played an integral part in American history for many years. Even after the civil war, when both "the economy and society were on the threshold of technological breakthroughs, . . . . government was paralyzed by conflict, corruption and incompetence. The potential of the country seemed strangled by the selfish greed of political machines."

(Dresang, 1984, pp. 28-29)

In 1881, the National Civil Service Reform League was formed that examined civil service reform both in the United States and in England. The resultant Pendleton Act established criteria for civil service to include:

1) entry through open, competitive examinations designed to test the applicants' ability to perform tasks assigned to the position being filled;
2) prohibition against using political party identity as a criterion for appointment to or retention in a position;
3) existence of a bipartisan, independent commission to act as a watchdog, ensuring compliance with merit system principles. (Ibid., p. 30)

Although this act was not a panacea for all civil service problems, it did authorize the President to establish a Civil Service Commission and to designate which positions were to be covered by the act. The legislation has been credited with ushering in a new era in public personnel management that emphasized competence and attempted to build on the separation of politics and administration.

Additional legislation throughout the years, (Table 2, p. 42)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1789-1829</td>
<td>Government by gentlemen; the guardian period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inauguration of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829-1882</td>
<td>Government by the common man; the spoils period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inauguration of Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882-1906</td>
<td>Government by the good; the reform period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pendleton Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1937</td>
<td>Government by the efficient; the scientific period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York Bureau of Municipal Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-1955</td>
<td>Government by administration; the management period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the Brownlow Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Government by the professional; the scientific period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report of the Second Hoover Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Government by unions; the collective bargaining period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin Law mandating collective bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Government by minorities; the affirmative action period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension of 1964 Civil Rights Act provisions to government employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Government by political executives; the accountability period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carter Civil Service Reform Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

allowed the government to expand personnel management responsibilities as the country grew in both numbers and sophistication. In order to meet these demands of scientific management, additional trained personnel were needed to conduct job analyses, classify positions, develop examinations, conduct evaluations, design training programs and establish compensation systems.

In later job markets, public employees underwent a selection process that included a series of steps. Such a process, ideally, "included a position analysis, a recruitment effort designed to attract qualified candidates and to encourage minority group members to apply, validated examinations, veterans' preference points, certification rules, selection interviews, and evaluation during a probationary period." (Ibid., p. 40.) Salaries were no longer based on the good judgment of an agency head, but were the product of careful negotiations. Even disciplinary action, once administered with little thought or for little reason, required a sound and thorough understanding of statutes, rules, and case law.

Although there were many management tools that could assist educational planners in attracting, identifying, selecting, evaluating and retaining a competent and professional workforce, performance evaluation played a critical role in building and maintaining excellence at every level throughout the system.

Knezevich in his book Administration of Public Education, pointed out that administration is a critical function in complex institutions. (Knezevich, 1975, p. 598)
Neither schools or other institutions could remain effective or survive for long without some type of administrative structure and personnel. The practice of administration is as old as man's first attempts to organize and achieve his goals. Although the practice is old, the formal study, research, and literature about administration have appeared on the scene fairly recently. (Ibid., p. 23)

In the early 1970's states began looking at additional ways to increase performance among students. The flood of educational reports during the 1980's focused some attention on the fact that administrators should be held accountable for what happened in schools. Accountability became the key word in the vocabulary of writers and speakers on education.

There were so few school districts prior to 1960 with administrator appraisal systems that one could almost assume that school executives were immune from evaluation. This is not the case today; the pressures behind administrator appraisal are now intense for a variety of reasons. Since the 1960's more and more school districts have dedicated themselves to the design and implementation of ways and means of assessing administrator behavior and decisions. Accountability and appraisal go together.

The need for evaluating administrative personnel, the methods used in performance evaluations, successful evaluative processes, and possible results that can be expected from the utilization of this management tool were critical components to State Boards of Education as they appraised the performance of the Chief State School Officer.

Need for Evaluating Administrative Personnel

Though individual school board members have many opportunities to observe and evaluate a superintendent's performance, it is clear that such informal evaluations cannot provide the board with a complete picture of the superintendent's effectiveness in carrying out her (his) complex job. Regular, formal evaluations offer boards the
best means of assessing their chief administrator's total performance. (Redfern, 1980, p. 4)

Although there were perhaps innumerable reasons why evaluations of chief educational personnel were important, a joint statement by the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association (1980), focused on four primary reasons:

1) Evaluations enhanced the chief administrator's effectiveness. Moberly (1978) wrote that "the primary obligations of a school board are long-range planning, setting priorities, and evaluating the superintendent." Since the school board, whether at a local or state level, was in a primary position to influence the educational policies of the chief administrator, careful consideration should be given to the best means of accomplishing this goal.

... the board should realize it is the primary source of feedback for the superintendent and that the superintendent's self-respect and self-improvement are linked. (Braddom, 1988, p. 28)

2) Evaluations assured the board that its policies are being carried out. At times of mandated, increased accountability, chief educational administrators cannot be exempted from the process. Herman (1980) pointed out that "since competency evaluation is such a critical part of educational administration, a clear, unbiased system for evaluating administrators is needed." Administrators, at all levels in the education hierarchy, must be evaluated regularly "to make sure their job performance is of the highest possible quality." (Genck, 1982)

Casual, unspecified evaluations of a superintendent don't work. They won't head off misunderstandings that
develop between a board and its chief executive officer and they don't facilitate the efficient conversion of board policy into school system practice. What is needed is an evaluation process that's formal, specific, and structured -- and one that follows a set timetable. (Dickinson, 1980)

3) Evaluations clarified both the job description and the responsibilities of the superintendent. Effective evaluations elucidated and focused the attention of both the superintendent and the board on specific educational priorities. Educational writers familiar with administrative evaluation (Murphy, 1985; Appel, 1980; Fowler, 1977; Heller, 1984) were unanimous in their belief that effective administrative evaluations were based on the identification of priority goals and objectives in several areas, i.e., curriculum, management, community relations, fiscal expenditures, etc., and the superintendent's effectiveness in meeting those pre-determined goals.

4) Evaluations strengthened the working relationship between the school and the superintendent. Rapid turnover among chief educational administrative personnel were of real concern to educators and those involved in staffing the nations' schools. (Fowler, 1977, Bradley, 1990) Fultz (1976) identified the almost hackneyed 'inability to communicate' as the reason most superintendents are sacked -- they failed to communicate effectively with the board, the staff, the community or all of them. Although not a panacea for ineffective leadership, communication between all segments of the school community, but particularly between the superintendent and the board, was absolutely crucial.

An annual evaluation program where the school board formally measures the superintendent's performance,
and the superintendent has an opportunity to
evaluate the board . . . . should leave no doubt as to
where the respective parties stand. (Ibid., 1978)

The Educational Policies Service of the National School Boards
Association suggested that through evaluations of the superintendent,
the following goals could be accomplished:

1) Clarify for the superintendent his role in the school system
as seen by the board;

2) Clarify for all board members the role of the superintendent
in the light of his job description and the immediate priorities among
his responsibilities as agreed upon by the board and the
superintendent;

3) Develop harmonious working relationships between the board
and superintendent;

4) Provide administrative leadership for the school system.

Purposes of Administrative Evaluations

Before beginning any evaluation process, it was necessary to
clarify the purposes for which the evaluation was conducted and the
outcomes that such a process would produce. In his 1978 article,
Robert J. Roelle pointed out that

... the purpose sets the stage for development and
implementation of the formal evaluation system. Eval-
uations are conducted in entirely different ways,
depending upon the purpose behind the evaluation.
Clearly, the superintendent and the board must be in
accord on the purpose.

The purposes of administrator appraisal were not always explicit
and some could be in conflict. (Knezevich, 1975) Many writers have
addressed this issue and concluded that the following reasons might serve as effective purposes:

a) determining and defining educational goals; (Roelle, 1978)

b) describing the duties and responsibilities of the superintendent; (Redfern, 1980)

c) clarifying the board's expectations of the superintendent's performance; (Redfern, 1980)

d) identifying both the areas of strength and weaknesses in the superintendent's performance; (Redfern, 1980)

e) improving communication between the board and superintendent, (Redfern, 1980; Roelle, 1978; Knezevich, 1975)

f) providing documentation to determine regular and merit compensation; (Knezevich, 1975)

g) providing documentation for orderly dismissal; (Knezevich, 1975)

h) enabling the board to hold the superintendent accountable for carrying out its policies and responding to its priorities, (Redfern, 1980)

i) satisfying state legislature or local school board demands for appraisal; (Knezevich, 1975)

j) designing of professional development programs and other opportunities for professional growth; (Roelle, 1978, Knezevich, 1975)

Methods Used in Evaluating Educational Personnel:

Once the objectives of the evaluation were formulated, the appraisal system created should be capable of providing data needed to satisfy one or more of the stated objectives. The basis for any appraisal, however, assumed that the evaluator knew and understood exactly what was expected of the employee. This was not always the case:

The reluctance of . . . managers to use performance evaluations meaningfully might reasonably be based on their doubts about whether employee performance can be measured . . . . Generally, work that requires analysis and judgment defies easy measurement. (Dresang, 1984, p. 167)

According to Knezevich, appraisal, by implication or explicit statements, assumed that a model of an effective administrator was known. The task then became one of collecting information about a given individual, comparing it with the effectiveness model and making a judgment about how closely the real person matched the ideal of effectiveness. In reality,

. . . there is no explicit statement of what constitutes effectiveness. Research and the existing literature have little to offer and most conclude that we know next to nothing about managerial effectiveness. (Ibid., p. 606)

The data-gathering instrument, then, had to shift its focus from a measurement of "effectiveness" to how well the administrator was fulfilling the legal responsibilities of the position, completing the assigned tasks required by a job description, satisfying the leadership roles required of the position and meeting productivity demands.

To gather this kind of data required different methods. The
following alphabetical list contained the plans that were most widely used: (Redfern, 1980, p. 35-66)

1) Checklist Ratings -- this method required the board member to individually rate the superintendent's performance on a variety of options using a specific scale. An example of this type of question would be: "The Superintendent prepares carefully for board meetings." The rater would circle the numeral "5" if the statement were always true, the numeral "4" if the statement were true most of the time, the numeral "3" if it were true about half the time, "2" if it were seldom true or "1" if it were never true. The scoring of such an instrument resulted in a list of numbers that could be averaged and presented to the superintendent in an evaluation conference.

2) Essay Evaluations -- this method allowed board members to write a brief narrative statement indicating the member's assessments of the Superintendent's positive and negative accomplishments during the year. The board members might also be asked to make appropriate recommendations for the coming year. An example of this kind of question might request the board member to "Write a brief summary paragraph on the Superintendent's relations with the Board." After each individual responded to the instrument, the board reached consensus regarding a summary paragraph and presented the summary evaluations to the superintendent.

3) Evaluation by Objectives -- this method required the board to work with the superintendent in:

   a) identifying needs or specific areas to emphasize,
including aspects of the job that needed strengthening, district goals and objectives, and special problems or projects;

b) establishing specific objectives and action plans;

c) implementing the plans;

d) assessing the results with the superintendent completing a self-assessment and the board assessing the effectiveness of the superintendent in major areas of responsibility;

e) conferencing with the superintendent in order to discuss the superintendent's self-evaluation and formulate follow-up plans.

4) Forced Choice Ratings -- this method required the individual board member to choose from among a series of statements and select the one that best described or least typified the superintendent's performance. An example might include: "The superintendent's presentations and recommendations to the board are: a) extremely forthright and convincing; b) usually thoughtful and sound, c) occasionally less than carefully prepared and d) persistently shallow and unreliable. After individual board members had completed the evaluation, a consensus judgment was reached as the assessment that best described the superintendent's performance. A completed copy of the consensus assessment was discussed with the superintendent.

5) Graphic Profiles -- this evaluation method required the board member to list the traits and desirable qualities in management performance along one axis of a scale and numerical ratings along the other. The individual board member would then plot the point at which
the two coincided and connect the dots. Such an evaluation tool resulted in some scores falling above the midpoint and some indicating below average effectiveness. A composite evaluation was then prepared and was transmitted to the superintendent during an evaluative conference.

6) Performance Standards -- this method required the superintendent and the board members to:
   a) mutually list proposed performance standards,
   b) reach consensus on those on which the superintendent would work during the year,
   c) assess whether performance standards were fully achieved, partially achieved or not achieved.
   d) conference with each other and set new standards.

State Boards of Education, undoubtedly, used a combination of techniques to measure overall performance. "Good evaluation can be achieved in various ways provided the process is thoughtfully planned, cooperatively implemented, and completed in a professional manner."
(Redfern, 1980, p. 13)

**Process Used in Evaluating Chief State School Officers**

The development of a total evaluation system includes agreement on the theory undergirding evaluation, specification of objectives for the evaluation; development of an administrator effectiveness model; creation of a monitoring subsystem to design data gathering instruments, prepare evaluative data gathers, and outline evaluative procedures; collection of relevant evaluative data; determination of who shall interpret evaluative data; and finally specification of alternative courses of action based on appraisal information. (Knezevich, 1973, p. 37-49)
Since such a system, although ideal, was well beyond the scope of most State Boards of Education, more traditional methods for evaluating the superintendent and a process that facilitated full communication between all involved parties had to be used until such systems could be developed.

In developing a process for evaluating an educational leader, Manning pointed out that certain factors should be incorporated into the process. Although his research was primarily done with school principals, he supported administrative evaluations that were specific, simple, objective, and motivating. (Manning, 1983)

Current literature supported the following steps in developing an evaluation process for local school superintendents. Such a process also met the proposed needs of the Chief State School Officer.

1) It was imperative that all persons involved in the evaluative process identified and clarified significant objectives. This emphasis on objectives allowed all involved in the process to have a common ground on which to evaluate performance. Consensus must be reached on specific evaluation instrumentation. (Knezevich, 1975; Roelle, 1978; Murphy, 1985; Appel, 1980; Redfern, 1980; Heller, 1980; Herman, 1988; Hoben, 1986; Ingram, 1986)

2) When the board agreed on specific objectives by which to measure the superintendent's performance, a self-assessment by the superintendent was critical to the evaluative process. (Ganong and Ganong, 1984; Appel, 1980; Moberly and Stiles, 1978) Because school board members were usually not involved in the every day operation of
the school system, they were often not fully informed of the superintendent's full performance.

3) Using the evaluation instrument, each member of the board was given the opportunity to provide input into the process. This was done through individual written responses or in a personnel session with just board members present. (Dickinson, 1980; Redfern, 1980)

4) Prior to meeting with the superintendent, consensus among all board members had to be reached in order for the superintendent to clearly understand his directions from the board.

5) A scheduled meeting with the superintendent allowed both parties to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the Superintendent's performance. (Appel, 1980; Dickinson, 1980; Moberly and Stiles, 1978)

6) The superintendent was given access to a written report of his evaluation. (Murphy, 1985; Redfern, 1980)

7) Appropriate follow-up activities needed to be planned and implemented. (Ingram, 1986; Hoben, 1986; Manning, 1983)

8) The goals and priorities by which the superintendent's leadership should be judged must be reassessed periodically.

In order to maximize effectiveness, the educational board, must:

1) Have it clearly understood that evaluations should be constructive experiences to enhance performance;

2) The superintendent must be assured that he will know the standards against which he will be evaluated and his performance will be measured against those agreed upon standards.
3) All board members must be involved in the process at a scheduled time and place;

4) It is required that the evaluation include discussions of both strengths and weaknesses with as much rational and objective evidence as possible;

5) Results must be used in such a way that both the board and the superintendent can cooperatively set job targets by which future performance can be evaluated.

Since the educational reform movement began in the early 1980's, it was characterized by an orientation toward educational outcomes. State educational agencies must fashion systems that are focused on educational outcomes.

**Expected Results from Chief State School Officer Evaluations**

When State Boards of Education have evaluated the Chief State School Officer, it was reasonable to expect that their efforts would be rewarded with increased effectiveness on the part of the Chief. This has not always been the case.

The current state of performance appraisal for school administrators is not very different from that of evaluating teachers and support personnel. Often it is done in a fragmented, uncertain, and subjective manner. (Ingram, 1986, p. 9)

A study by Rand Corporation of teacher evaluation in American schools found evaluation to be "perfunctory, routine and bureaucratic, yielding almost no usable outcomes either in increased productivity or valid decisions about employment, pay, or status."

In a study of principal evaluations, Joseph Murphy, Kent Peterson
and Philip Hallinger found that principal evaluations were more "primitive" than teacher evaluation. They also discovered that many principals were neither supervised nor evaluated on a regular basis. Their research did indicate, however, that in 12 districts where student achievement was particularly notable, the superintendent personally supervised and evaluated principals. They also found that these schools demonstrated a high correlation with the goals of the school board and/or superintendent.

The problem of poor supervision of administrators was not, of course, unique to education as fewer than 10 percent of the nation's companies had performance appraisal systems that were "reasonably good." (Harris, 1985, pp. 31-36)

Evaluation literature on local school superintendents was hardly more positive. In the most complete study available to this author, Robert Anderson and Jean Lavid conducted a survey study of 42 new superintendents in Kansas. Since there are 304 unified school districts in the state, this represented a statewide turnover rate of 13.8 percent.

Results indicated that:

1) Superintendent evaluations were not included as a critical topic of school boards as they interviewed and hired the superintendent.

2) Less than 50 percent of the superintendents conducted a self-evaluation during this two year study.

3) Established evaluation instruments frequently were not being
4) Data collection, the methods employed, the format for collection, and the sources from which the data were obtained appeared to rely less on objective data and more on feelings and opinions.

5) Executive session discussions were held for only 76.8 percent of the superintendents. Fifty percent of the boards held an executive session discussion without the superintendent present.

6) Almost 72 percent of the superintendents, however, felt the evaluation process was meaningful to them. (Anderson and Lavid, 1988)

This research demonstrated a genuine need for improved evaluation practices. "Appraisal and accountability are complementary concepts. The development of a total evaluation system calls for more than a new rating scale. Its rationale should be based on more than the orderly discharge of incompetents." (Knezevich, 1975, p. 609)

If the evaluation of principals and district administrators is to improve in parallel fashion . . . . then the primary purpose of administrator evaluation should be to build stronger linkages and commitments to achieving the district's long range goals. (Ingram, 1986, p. 11)

Boards that have implemented this type of evaluation process for their chief executive officers have reported that it has "greatly improved the rationality, objectivity, and constructiveness of superintendent evaluations, and that it has improved the job performances of superintendents." (Dickinson, 1980, p. 38)

An effective evaluation of the Chief State School Officer was but one component in increasing accountability. A sound evaluation was motivation, it was an aid in planning, it was development, it aided in
communication, and, ultimately, effective evaluations helped to assure a good education for students in our nation's schools. That may well have been the most significant result. (Cohen, 1988, p. 22 and Redfern, 1980, p. 71)

Summary

Because education was not specifically mentioned in the tenth amendment to the U.S. Constitution, it was clearly a function of the individual states to both plan and administer. As such, it evolved from small community-based schools to state-wide systems through which a variety of educational services were provided. State Boards of Education and Chief State School Officers played a vital role in this development.

Continued effectiveness of state educational agencies depended upon the working relationships of many key players including the governor, the legislature, professional educators, and lay boards of education. As more financial resources were targeted for educational programs at all levels, accountability efforts were increased to meet public demands.

A review of current literature supported the concept that regular, well-planned and executed administrative appraisals enhanced the administrator's effectiveness, assured the board that its policies were being carried out, clarified both the job description and the responsibilities of the superintendent, and strengthened the working relationship between the board and the chief administrator.

Although satisfactory results could be obtained from using a
variety of methods and processes, an effective administrative evaluation was a key component in accomplishing the state's mission, that of providing its citizens with an educational system that prepared students for their roles in a changing world environment.
CHAPTER III

Research Design and Procedures

Introduction

This research project was descriptive in nature. As such, it was specifically designed to provide a description of the current status of Chief State School Officer's evaluation on a state-by-state basis. In order to determine this information and answer the research questions posed in Chapter I, it was necessary to develop appropriate questionnaires, query the desired populations and use descriptive statistics in the analysis of the data. It was beyond the scope of this research to develop an evaluation model for Chief State School Officers or to make any determination concerning which state governance model was most effective.

A description of the procedure used in this research, a summary of the research population, a detailed analysis of the two survey instruments, and the method used in treating the data are discussed in this chapter.

Populations

In order to obtain the information required in this study, the researcher surveyed two distinct population groups:

1) The first and most comprehensive questionnaire was sent to the President or Chairman of each State Board of Education in the 49 states that have State Boards of Education. Because Wisconsin does
not have a State Board of Education, no State Board of Education questionnaire was sent to this state. It was beyond the scope of this research to obtain information on how these people were selected for their leadership position; the mere fact that they held the position qualified them for inclusion in the population to be surveyed. The names and addresses of these state educational leaders were obtained from the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE). Because only forty-seven states and three territories were represented in the national association, the names and addresses of other board presidents or chairmen were obtained by direct contact with the appropriate State Department of Education. The complete mailing list of State Board personnel can be found in Appendix A.

2) A similar but smaller questionnaire was mailed to the Chief State School Officer (CSSO) in forty-nine states and six U.S. territories. Although Wisconsin did have an elected Chief State School Officer, the state was not included in the sample because it had no State Board of Education. The six territories included: American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The complete mailing list of Chief State School Officers was obtained from the Council of Chief State School Officers and can be found in Appendix B.

Survey Instruments

The survey instruments used in this research project were intended to collect specific information from the population of state educational leaders questioned. Because a review of the
literature revealed that no suitable instruments were available, it was obviously necessary that such instruments would have to be designed. In doing so, careful consideration was given to developing a logical progression of steps to be accomplished.

1) In designing the instrument to be mailed to all Presidents or Chairmen of State Boards of Education, specific research questions were formulated that correlated closely with the initial statement of the research problem.

2) Individual questions were then developed that attempted to measure specific aspects of each research question. Although open-form questions were implemented into the questionnaire, most of the questions were closed-form, requiring the subject to make specific choices among alternatives.

3) The questions were grouped into a logical sequence, and the first draft of the instrument was readied.

4) Two past presidents of the Nevada State Board of Education, the Nevada State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and educational personnel from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, critiqued the instrument and offered suggestions for its improvement.

5) A second draft of the research instrument designed for state board leaders was developed and piloted by seven members of the Nevada State Board of Education. All members of the board responded to the survey and their suggestions were incorporated into the final form of the research questionnaire.

6) The instrument mailed to Chief State School Officers was
much smaller in scope and was specifically designed to ascertain the CSSO's perceptions of the evaluation process. Six of the seven questions used in this survey were identical to those used in the survey sent to State Board of Education presidents.

The questionnaire sent to State Board Presidents consisted of biographical information, i.e., name, state, position held, 16 research questions, and additional space for comments. The questionnaire sent to Chief State School Officers consisted of biographical information, 6 research questions, and an opportunity for the CSSO to list evaluation procedures that would best meet his specific needs as a Chief State School Officer.

Each question on the State Board of Education Questionnaire was closely correlated to the research questions delineated in Chapter I. A copy of the complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix C.

A) Questions 1, 2, 3, and 6 of the survey instrument were designed to measure responses to the question: Did each State Board of Education conduct a formal evaluation of the Chief State School Officer, regardless of the governance model used in the state?

B) Questions 4, 7, and 12 required the respondent to state whether or not such an evaluation was required by state law, regulations, or policy. These questions also addressed the issue of the timeliness and structure of such a plan.

C) Questions 8, 9, 10, and 11 were written to ascertain what method or combination of methods, were used in the formal evaluation of the Chief State School Officer in each state.
D) The responses to items 13, 14, and 15 determined if the results of the evaluation were discussed with the Chief State School Officer and if they were used as a basis for future evaluations, and 

E) Questions 5 and 16 were written to answer the inquiry: Did the Chief State School Officer assess the evaluation experience to be both worthwhile and meaningful to him (her)? 

Because the Chief State School Officer would best know how effective the evaluation process was in helping him/her improve performance standards, the instrument mailed to each CSSO was designed around that specific question. Since the six questions used in the survey were duplicates of those used with State Board Presidents, there was little to be gained by piloting the questionnaire. A copy of the Chief State School Officer Research Questionnaire can be found in Appendix D.

Treatment of the Data

As the questionnaires were returned from participating states, they were initially separated into ten subgroups depending upon the governance model employed by the state. After this stratification, the results were tabulated using simple descriptive techniques. Since the number of responses in some of the subgroups was very small, the decision was made to combine subgroups. Although the populations could have been stratified using many different methods, it was determined that significant differences existed between governance models. Therefore, in this study, the models were stratified into three groups, depending solely on how the Chief State School Officer
received his position.

1) Those states where the State Board of Education, regardless of how the individual members of the board achieved that position, appointed the Chief State School Officer. The states involved in this category comprised 27 states and 1 territory, including: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia. The State Board of Education in the District of Columbia also appointed the Chief State School Officer and was part of this subgroup.

2) Those states where the Chief State School Officer was elected by popular vote of the people. Sixteen states elected the Chief State School Officer, usually by partisan ballot and almost always for a four-year term. These states included: Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming. The Chief State School Officer was elected in none of the six territories.

3) Those states where the Chief State School Officer was appointed by the Governor of the state. These states included: Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia, as well as American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Marianas Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Data Gathering Procedures

After the survey instruments were finalized, a personal letter of transmittal was written in October and November of 1989 to each State Board of Education President or Chairman and to each Chief State School Officer in 49 states and six territories. Samples of these letters can be found in Appendix E.

The educational leaders were asked to complete the survey and return it prior to the end of November. By December 15, 1989, replies had been received from either the State Board of Education President and/or the Chief State School Officer from 46 states (93.88%) and 4 territories (66.67%). State Board Presidents in 30 states (61.2%) and Chief State School Officers in 37 states (75.5%) had completed the questionnaires.

A second letter of transmittal and another copy of the questionnaire was sent to non-responding State Board Presidents and Chief State School Officers on December 20. By January 30, 1990, an additional two states had responded to the questionnaire.

As the questionnaires were returned, answers to each question were recorded by hand on a master roster. Answers were checked and verified on a second roster. After all responses were received, the returns were tabulated and percentages were computed. A complete analysis of the results of the survey can be found in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

Research Findings

Review of the Problem

The Chief State School Officer in each state and U.S. territory played an integral role in the education of this nation's school children. Despite their wide range of responsibilities, their varied tasks, and the importance of their work, very little had been written concerning how Chief State School Officers actually operated. At times of increased accountability at all levels of education, even less had been written on how Chief State School Officers were held accountable for their performance. The purpose of this study was to conduct an assessment of the policy, scope, and methods used by State Boards of Education to evaluate the Chief State School Officer.

Review of the Research Questions

In order to assess this information, five research questions were identified. These include:

a) Did each State Board of Education conduct a performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer regardless of the governance model employed by the state?

b) Did each State Board of Education have a formal plan for this evaluation that was both timely and systematic?

c) Did each State Board of Education use a variety of methods to evaluate the Chief State School Officer? Was the
instrument employed in the evaluation well-written, validated, and pertinent to the job description?

d) Did each State Board of Education discuss the evaluation with the CSSO, complete a written document, and utilize the results of the evaluation in future job performance expectations?

e) Did each State Board President and each Chief State School Officer perceive the evaluation to be very effective in helping improve performance standards?

**Review of the Population**

State Boards of Education and Chief State School Officers arrived at their position through a number of ways. Eleven distinct governance models have been incorporated among the states and territories. (See Table 3, pp. 69-71) These models include:

**Model I:** In this model, members of the State Board of Education were appointed by the governor. The State Board of Education appointed the Chief State School Officer. This model was incorporated in 13 states.

**Model II:** The members of the State Board of Education were elected, and in turn, appointed the Chief State School Officer in this model. Ten states and the District of Columbia were included in this model.

**Model III:** In 12 states, the members of the State Board of Education were appointed by the governor, and the Chief State School Officer was elected.
### TABLE 3

**State Board of Education -- Chief State School Officer Governance Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Chief State School Officer</th>
<th>State Board of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>Appointed by SBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER</td>
<td>STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>Appointed by SBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER</td>
<td>STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>Appointed by SBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model IV: In 7 states, the governor appointed both the State Board of Education and the Chief State School Officer. This model also existed in five U.S. territories.

Model V: In this model, the Chief State School Officer was elected and served, along with other state officials, as the State Board of Education. Florida was the only state who had adopted this model.

Model VI: In Wisconsin, the Chief State School Officer was elected and there was no State Board of Education.

Model VII: Under this model, the Chief State School Officer was appointed by the State Board of Education. Some members of the State Board of Education were appointed by the governor and others were elected by the voters. Only two states utilized this model.

Model VIII: In one state, the State Legislature and the governor appointed the State Board of Education, who, in turn, appointed the Chief State School Officer.

Model IX: In the state represented by this model, the Chief State School Officer was appointed by the State Board of Education who was appointed by the legislature.

Model X: In this model, the Chief State School Officer was elected and the State Board of Education was appointed by the legislature.

Model XI: In this model, the Chief State School Officer was elected and the State Board of Education was elected by the states' local school boards.
Analyzing Results

For the purposes of this study, Model I, Model II, Model VII, Model VIII, and Model IX have been combined into one subgroup. In each of these states, the Chief State School Officer was appointed by the State Board of Education. For purposes of comparison, however, separate statistics have been tallied for those State Boards of Education that were appointed (Models I, VII, VIII and IX) and the one that was elected (Model II.) This subgroup will be labeled "Board Appointed CSSO" in order to distinguish it from other subgroups.

The next subgroup consisted of all states where the Chief State School Officer was elected, including Models III, V, VI, X, and XI. For purposes of discussion, this subgroup will be labeled "Elected CSSO."

Those states and territories where Chief State School Officers were appointed by respective governors made up the last subgroup. This included Model IV and will be labeled "Gov. Appointed CSSO."

The findings for each research questions will be discussed.

Research Question One

Did each State Board of Education conduct a performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer regardless of the governance model employed by the state?

Board Appointed CSSO's

Of the 27 states and territories in this subgroup, performance evaluations of the Chief State School Officer were conducted in
seventeen (63%) of them. There was no performance evaluation conducted in nine (37%) states. No response was available from the District of Columbia, the only one of six territories where the State Board of Education appointed the Chief State School Officer.

Table 4 (page 75) illustrated the percentage of states that conducted a 1988-89 performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer and summarized the differences that existed between those states where the state board was appointed and where the state board was elected. Chief State School Officers were also asked to respond to the same question. Chief State School Officers who responded to this question represented a few different states than did the responses generated by the State Boards of Education.

In an effort to determine how consistent evaluations were, state board presidents were asked if a performance evaluation was conducted in 1987-88. The results of that question are summarized in Table 5 (Page 76) and were fairly consistent with data collected in 1988-89.

Elected CSSO's

Of the fifteen states included in this subgroup, every one of them responded to the questionnaire. Without exception, none of these states evaluated the Chief State School Officer. Comments from several elected Chiefs demonstrated repeatedly that they did not serve at the pleasure of the board and were not directly responsible to them.
TABLE 4

Percentage of States Conducting a 1988-89 Performance Evaluation of the Chief State School Officer*

**State Board of Education Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=21)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointed SBE (N=13)</strong></td>
<td>9 (69.2%)</td>
<td>4 (30.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elected SBE (N=8)</strong></td>
<td>6 (75.0%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15 (71.4%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Elected CSSO: (N=9) 0 0
- Gov. Appointed CSSO: (N=5) 0 0

**Chief State School Officer Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointed SBE (N=14)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 (64.3%)</td>
<td>5 (35.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected SBE (N=10)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (80.0%)</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 (70.8%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 2 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire in Appendix C and Question 1 of the Chief State School Officer's Questionnaire in Appendix D.
TABLE 5

Percentage of States Conducting a 1987-88 Performance Evaluation of the Chief State School Officer*

State Board of Education Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=18)</th>
<th>Yes (%age)</th>
<th>No (%age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=11)</td>
<td>8 (72.7%)</td>
<td>3 (27.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=7)</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO: (N=9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CCSO: (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 (72.2%)</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 3 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C.
Governor Appointed CSSO's

In seven states and five U.S. territories, the governor appointed the Chief State School Officer. Questionnaires were returned from all seven states and four territories. Again, no performance evaluation was conducted during the 1988-89 fiscal year in any of these states or in any of the four territories.

Summary of Question One

Of the 53 states and territories who responded to this questionnaire, performance evaluations of the Chief State School Officer were conducted in seventeen states (32%). The other thirty-six states (68%) did not conduct such evaluations. Data collected for the 1987-88 academic year are similar.

Research Question Two

Did each State Board of Education have a formal plan for this evaluation that was both timely and systematic?

Board Appointed CSSO's

In order to answer this question, state board presidents were asked to stipulate whether the 1988-89 performance evaluation was "formal" or "informal." A formal evaluation was defined as one "in which specific procedures and/or regulations are followed exactly." Table 6 (page 78) indicated that slightly less than 56 percent of the states did conduct a formal evaluation while about 45 percent made the evaluation "informal."

In Table 7 (page 79) State Board of Education Presidents were
TABLE 6

Number and Percentage of States Formalizing Chief State School Officers' Evaluations*

State Board of Education Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=16)</th>
<th>Formal (%age)</th>
<th>Informal (%age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=10)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=6)</td>
<td>4 (66.67%)</td>
<td>2 (33.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N=9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (56.25%)</td>
<td>7 (43.75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 6 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire in Appendix C.
### TABLE 7

Number and Percentage of States with Specific Mandates for Chief State School Officer Evaluations*

State Board of Education Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Statute</th>
<th>State Regulation</th>
<th>State Board Policy</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Not Mandated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=11)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (50.0)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N=9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appoint CSSO (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (36.8)</td>
<td>2 (10.5)</td>
<td>1 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 4 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C.
asked to stipulate under what authority they evaluated the Chief State School Officer. In 47.4% of the states where performance evaluations were conducted, such an evaluation was not mandated. An additional 37% have state board policies that required such an evaluation. In 10% of the states, evaluating the Chief State School Officer was traditional.

Table 8 (page 81) indicated that in 81% of the total states responding to the question, performance evaluations were conducted on a yearly basis. In three of the states (19%), evaluations were conducted "as needed."

As can be seen from Table 9 (page 82) there was wide variation in the process used to evaluate the Chief State School Officer. Almost twenty-seven percent of the 15 states responding to this question utilized the process stipulated on Table 9 (steps a, b, c, d, and e in succession) and recommended by the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association. The other seventy-three percent of the states used some deviation of that basic form.

Elected CSSO's and Governor Appointed CSSO's

Because none of the 23 states and five territories in these subgroups evaluated their Chief State School Officers, these questions were not answered and were not applicable.

Summary

Only 17 percent of the states responding to this questionnaire
TABLE 8

Frequency of Chief State School Officer Evaluations*  

State Board Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Board Responses</th>
<th>6 months</th>
<th>1 year</th>
<th>2 years</th>
<th>As needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (80.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N = 6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (83.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO: (N=9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (81.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 7 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire in Appendix C.
TABLE 9

Process Utilized by States in Evaluating
the Chief State School Officer**

State Board of Education Responses:

**For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 12 of
the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C.

SBE Appointed CSSO (N = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence*</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
<td>3 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a, b, d, c, e</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b, a, d</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b, c, d</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c, b, d, e</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d, e</td>
<td>1 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appointed SBE (N=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence*</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a, b, d, c, e</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b, a, c, d, e</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d, a, b, c, f, e</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a, b, d</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elected CSSO (N=9) No response

Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=5) No response

*a. Individual board members independently rate the
Chief State School Officer's Performance.

b. President of the board convenes members to discuss
assessment and to prepare composite evaluation.

c. Copy of composite evaluation transmitted to the Chief
State School Officer.

d. Conference scheduled with Chief State School Officer
and State Board of Education members to discuss
evaluation.

e. The C.S.S.O. retains a copy of the evaluation.

f. Other (Please describe)
formally evaluated the Chief State School Officer. State Board policies in only 13 percent of the states required such action. In 87 percent of the total states where State Boards of Education govern the educational policies of their respective states, no state statute, state regulation or state board policy mandated a performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer.

In those states where evaluations were conducted, they were usually done every year using a wide variety of processes to accomplish the task.

Research Question Three

Did each State Board of Education use a variety of methods to evaluate the Chief State School Officer? Was the instrument employed in the evaluation well-written, validated, and pertinent to the job description?

Board Appointed CSSO's

State Boards of Education who evaluated the job performance of the Chief State School Officer used a variety of different methods to complete the task. Table 10 (page 84) detailed the type of methods used by different state boards. As can be seen from the statistics, 62.5 percent of the responding state boards used essay form questions in the evaluation. Just over 37% used some type of checklist ratings while forced choice ratings and graphic profiles were not as popular. Other forms of questionning included: "general discussion," "a procedure for recording opinions," and a "self-evaluation by the Chief
TABLE 10

Methods Used in Evaluating Performance
of Chief State School Officer*

State Board of Education Responses:

SBE Appointed CSSO  (N = 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>NBE-appointed (N = 10)</th>
<th>Elected SBE (N = 6)</th>
<th>Total (N = 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checklist Ratings</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
<td>6 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay Evaluation</td>
<td>6 (60.0)</td>
<td>4 (66.6)</td>
<td>10 (62.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Choice Ratings</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Profiles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (6.2)</td>
<td>1 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (40.0)</td>
<td>1 (6.2)</td>
<td>5 (31.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elected CSSO  (N = 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>NBE-appointed (N = 10)</th>
<th>Elected SBE (N = 6)</th>
<th>Total (N = 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checklist Ratings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Choice Ratings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Profiles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gov. Appointed CSSO  (N = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>NBE-appointed (N = 10)</th>
<th>Elected SBE (N = 6)</th>
<th>Total (N = 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checklist Ratings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Choice Ratings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Profiles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 10 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C.
with an opportunity for board members to comment."

The instrument used in the evaluation (See Table 11, page 86) was usually composed by the State Board of Education (73%), the State Department of Education (13%), or derived from other educational personnel measures (13%). The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) had been active in assisting four states in the design and implementation of appropriate measures.

Sixty nine percent of the instruments used by State Boards of Education had been used only one or two times. Fourteen states (81%) have used the instrument for three years or less. (See Table 12, page 87)

Without exception, none of the State Board of Education Presidents who responded to the questionnaire had any process in place for validating, or confirming that the test measured what it claimed to measure, the instrument used in evaluating the Chief State School Officer. (See Table 13, page 88)

Elected CSSO's and Governor Appointed CSSO's

Because State Boards of Education in the twenty-three states and five territories represented in these subgroups did not evaluate the Chief State School Officer, these questions were not answered and were not applicable.

Summary

In those states where the Chief State School Officer was evaluated by the State Board of Education, the evaluation instrument
### TABLE 11

**Origin of Chief State School Officer Evaluation Instrument**

**State Board of Education Responses:**

**SBE Appointed CSSO: (N=15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument Used in Another State</th>
<th>Derived from Other Personnel Measures</th>
<th>Composed by State Board of Education</th>
<th>Composed by State Department of Education</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elected CSSO: (N=9)**

- 0
- 0
- 0
- 0
- 0

**Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=5)**

- 0
- 0
- 0
- 0
- 0

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument Used in Another State</th>
<th>Derived from Other Personnel Measures</th>
<th>Composed by State Board of Education</th>
<th>Composed by State Department of Education</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total %age**

- 0
- 13.3
- 73.3
- 13.3
- 0
- 26.7

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 8 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire in Appendix C.*

**The National Association for State Boards of Education (NASBE) has been instrumental in assisting various State Boards of Education in preparing C.S.S.O. evaluation instruments.**
TABLE 12

Age of the Chief State School Officer

Evaluation Instrument*

State Board of Education Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO (N = 16)</th>
<th>One Time</th>
<th>Two Times</th>
<th>Three Times</th>
<th>More than three times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE N = 10</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE N = 6</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
<td>2 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (16.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (37.5)</td>
<td>5 (31.2)</td>
<td>3 (18.7)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 11 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C.
TABLE 13

Validity of Chief State School Officer Evaluation Instrument*

State Board of Education Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Board of Education Responses</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBE Appointed CSSO (N = 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO (N = 5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 9 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire.
employed a limited number of methods to ascertain the desired
information. Because the instrument was usually composed by the State
Board of Education, with some states requesting assistance from the
National Association for State Boards of Education, it could have been
pertinent to the job description of the Chief State School Officer in
each respective state. In most states, the instrument was relatively
new and was not validated.

Research Question Four

Did each State Board of Education discuss the evaluation with
the Chief State School Officer, complete a written document, and
utilize the results of the evaluation in future job performance
expectations?

Board Appointed CSSO's

When State Board of Education presidents were asked if the
results of the evaluation were discussed with the Chief State School
Officer, 100% replied positively. Interestingly enough, however,
only 89% of the chiefs reported that results of the evaluation were
discussed with them. (See Table 14, page 90)

In responding to another question (See Table 15, page 91) state
board presidents reported evaluations were written up as a formal
document in only a little over half (53%) of the time. Chief State
School Officers reported about the same percentage.

When stipulating expected outcomes from the evaluation process,
(See Table 16, page 92) state board presidents viewed this as an
### TABLE 14

Results of Evaluation Discussed with
Chief State School Officer*

**State Board of Education Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=16)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N=9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chief State School Officer Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=18)</th>
<th>Elected SBE (N=10)</th>
<th>Appointed SBE (N=8)</th>
<th>Elected CSSO (N=14)</th>
<th>Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (90.0)</td>
<td>7 (87.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (10.0)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 13 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C and Question 3 of the Chief State School Officer Questionnaire found in Appendix D.
TABLE 15

Chief State School Officer Evaluation

Written as a Formal Document*

State Board of Education Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=17)</th>
<th>Yes (%age)</th>
<th>No (%age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=11)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=6)</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
<td>3 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (52.9)</td>
<td>8 (47.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N=9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chief State School Officer Responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=18)</th>
<th>Yes (%age)</th>
<th>No (%age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=10)</td>
<td>4 (40.0)</td>
<td>6 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=8)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (50.0)</td>
<td>9 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N=14)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO (N=6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 14 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C and Question 4 of the Chief State School Officer Questionnaire found in Appendix D.
TABLE 16

Expected Outcomes of the Chief State School Officer Evaluation Process*

State Board of Education Responses:

SBE Appointed CSSO (N=16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Assessment of Current Status</th>
<th>Continuing Record of CSSO Effectiveness</th>
<th>Evidence Upon Which to Base Contract and Salary Decisions</th>
<th>Documentation for Contract Termination</th>
<th>Opportunity for CSSO to Discuss Results with SBE</th>
<th>Opportunity to Set Goals for Future Performance</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE</td>
<td>(N=10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td>(90.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE</td>
<td>(N=6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.7)</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(83.3)</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31.2)</td>
<td>(56.2)</td>
<td>(56.2)</td>
<td>(43.7)</td>
<td>(68.7)</td>
<td>(81.2)</td>
<td>(6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N=9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appoint CSSO (N=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 15 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C.
opportunity to set goals and standards for future performance. (81%) They also felt this was the appropriate opportunity for the CSSO to discuss the results of her/her evaluation with the board. (68.7%) The evaluation also provided the board with a continuing record of the effectiveness of the Chief State School Officer (56%) and supplied tangible evidence upon which to base decisions to renew the contract and set salary levels (56%).

Elected CSSO's and Governor Appointed CSSO's

These questions were not appropriate to the states who did not evaluate the Chief State School Officer.

Summary

In most cases, the State Board of Education did discuss the completed performance evaluation with the Chief State School Officer. Only about half the states, however, actually completed a formal written document of this evaluation. Although most states did utilize the results of the evaluation in future job performance expectations, there were other reasons for the assessment as well.

Research Question Five

Did each State Board President and each Chief State School Officer perceive the evaluation to be very effective in helping improve performance standards?

Board Appointed CSSO's

In order to ascertain information directly related to this
question, two questions were asked of both state board presidents and state chiefs. The first question (See Table 17, page 95) required the State Board of Education Presidents to, using a checklist, indicate their reasons for evaluating the Chief State School Officer.

A total of 81% of the respondents felt that the most important reason for holding such an evaluation was to enable the board to hold the CSSO accountable for carrying out its policies and responding to its priorities. State Board Presidents also felt that the evaluation process enabled them to indicate whether the duties and responsibilities of the Chief State School Officer were performed and to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Chief.

Only 41.2% (See Table 18, page 96) of the Chief State School Officers, on the other hand, perceived the evaluation as a means of holding them accountable for carrying out the policies and responding to the priorities of the State Board of Education. Over 76% of them felt, however, that the primary purpose of the evaluation was to "indicate whether the duties and responsibilities of the CSSO are being performed."

When specifically questioned about their perception of the effectiveness of the Chief State School Officer evaluation, (See Table 19, p.97 ) 94% of the state board presidents felt they were very effective or somewhat effective in helping the CSSO improve performance standards. Only 6% felt that the process was not effective.

Approximately 82% of the responding Chief State School Officers
TABLE 17

Purpose of Chief State School Officer Evaluation
as seen by State Board of Education Presidents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO</th>
<th>Indicate Duties and Responsibilities Performed</th>
<th>Determine if Expectations are Realistic</th>
<th>Measure CSSO's Performance</th>
<th>Identify Strengths and Weaknesses</th>
<th>Improve Communication</th>
<th>Provide Suggestions for Improvement</th>
<th>Foster High Trust Level</th>
<th>Determine CSSO's Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First Choice)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Second Choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Third Choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fourth Choice)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First Choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Second Choice)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Third Choice)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fourth Choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total %age 68.7 25.0 62.5 68.7 25.0 50.0 12.5 81.3

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 5 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire in Appendix C.
TABLE 18

Purpose of Chief State School Officer Evaluation as seen by Chief State School Officers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBE Appointed CSSO</th>
<th>Indicate Duties and Responsibilities Performed</th>
<th>Determine if Expectations are Realistic</th>
<th>Measure CSSO's Performance</th>
<th>Identify Strengths and Weaknesses</th>
<th>Improve Communication</th>
<th>Provide Suggestion for Improvement</th>
<th>Foster High Trust Level</th>
<th>Determine CSSO's Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First Choice)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Second Choice)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Third Choice)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fourth Choice)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First Choice)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Second Choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Third Choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fourth Choice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appointed CSSO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total %age 76.5 35.3 64.7 70.6 52.9 47.1 17.6 41.2

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 2 of the Chief State School Officer Questionnaire, Appendix D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Board of Education Responses:</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=10)</td>
<td>5 (50.0)</td>
<td>4 (40.0)</td>
<td>1 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=6)</td>
<td>2 (33.3)</td>
<td>4 (66.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7 (43.7)</td>
<td>6 (50.0)</td>
<td>1 (6.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N=9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appoint CSSO (N=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chief State School Officer Responses:</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBE Appointed CSSO (N=17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected SBE (N=9)</td>
<td>4 (44.4)</td>
<td>3 (33.3)</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed SBE (N=8)</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>4 (50.0)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>3 (17.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected CSSO (N=14)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. Appoint CSSO (N=6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For exact wording of this question, please refer to Question 16 of the State Board of Education Questionnaire found in Appendix C and Question 6 found in the Chief State School Officer Questionnaire found in Appendix D.*
felt the evaluation was either very effective or somewhat effective. Just under 18% felt that the evaluation was not effective in improving performance standards.

Elected CSSO's and Governor Appointed CSSO's

Since neither of these subgroups evaluated the Chief State School Officer, all of the questions under this research question were not applicable.

Summary

Although State Board of Education Presidents and Chief State School Officers perceived the purpose of the evaluation somewhat differently, most of them did agree that the performance evaluation conducted in 1988-89 was effective in helping them improve performance standards.
Summary

In order to present a summary of the findings as it related to each research question, the question has been restated, a brief summary of the results have been presented and the original question has been answered either positively or negatively.

Research Question One

Did each State Board of Education conduct a performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer regardless of the governance model employed by the state?

There were eleven governance models utilized throughout the 50 states and six U.S. territories. Because Wisconsin did not have a State Board of Education and it therefore could not evaluate the Chief State School Officer, forty-nine states and all the territories were surveyed in this research. Only one state and two territories did not respond to the questionnaires.

State Boards of Education in seventeen of the 48 states and four U.S. Territories (32.07%) who responded to this research question evaluated their Chief State School Officer during the 1988-89 fiscal year. Approximately the same percentage evaluated the Chief the preceding year.

The answer to research question one was no.
Research Question Two

Did each State Board of Education have a formal plan for this evaluation that was both timely and systematic?

Of the states and territories who responded to this questionnaire, only 18% of the states and none of the responding territories evaluated the Chief State School Officer in a formal way. When evaluations were conducted, they were usually done so at yearly intervals. Although the process for evaluation used by a single state might be consistent from year to year, there was a wide variety of processes employed by different states.

The answer to research question two was no.

Research Question Three

Did each State Board of Education use a variety of methods to evaluate the Chief State School Officer? Was the instrument employed in the evaluation well-written, validated, and pertinent to the job description?

State Board of Education presidents who had an evaluation process in place (32%), used predominately two methods in evaluating the Chief State School Officer. These methods included essay questions and checklist ratings. The instrument was usually designed by the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education or by the National Association. In general, however, the instrument was relatively new and had not been validated.

The answers to research question three was no.
Research Question Four

Did each State Board of Education discuss the evaluation with the CSSO, compile a written document, and utilize the results of the evaluation in future job performance expectations?

Most of the State Boards of Education that evaluated the Chief State School Officer did discuss the evaluation with the Chief. A little more than half of these states completed a written evaluation. Although there was variety in the purpose of Chief State School Officer evaluations, most of the states utilized the results of the evaluation to set goals and standards for future performance.

The answer to research question four was no.

Research Question Five

Did each State Board President and each Chief State School Officer perceive the evaluation to be effective in helping improve performance standards?

As can be expected, state board presidents and Chief State School Officers perceived the reasons for evaluation and the effectiveness of the evaluation somewhat differently. State board presidents appeared to be more interested in the CSSO's performance as it related to their policies and their priorities, while the chief perceived a need to determine whether or not he was carrying out the specific duties and responsibilities assigned to him.

State Board of Education Presidents saw the process as being generally more effective towards improving performance standards than did the Chief State School Officers.
The answer to research question five was no.

Conclusions

The word "evaluation" was, in the minds of most people, quite threatening. Generally, the very term caused concern for school administrators and school board members alike. And yet, when it was incorporated into a planning process in which all members played an integral role, it didn't need to be threatening and could be most productive.

A review of the literature (see Chapter II) indicated that effective evaluations were important to both the superintendent (CSSO) and the educational board who, ultimately, was responsible for the education of its citizens. Although formal evaluations were not the only way in which many of these specific objectives could be met, they did provide one important element to effective educational management and did fulfill the following needs:

1) Evaluations enhanced the effectiveness of the chief administrator. The majority of the State Boards of Education in 49 individual states and 6 territories did not evaluate the Chief State School Officer. Even when the governance structure of the state allowed the State Board of Education to appoint the Chief State School Officer, only 63% actually conducted a performance evaluation. If a formal performance evaluation enhanced the effectiveness of the chief administrator, and only 32% of the total responding states and territories actually used this technique, then there appeared to be a genuine need for State Boards of Education to improve.
2) Evaluations assured the board that its policies were being carried out. Although 75 per cent of the states that evaluated the Chief State School Officer stated that such assurances were one of the primary reasons for evaluations, more than 75% of all responding states did not see this as important. If the board had no assurances that its policies were not, in fact, being transformed into meaningful action, then one can rightfully question the ability of state boards to govern.

3) Evaluations clarified responsibilities. If only 12% of responding Chief State School Officers saw the evaluation process as one in which he (she) determined state board's expectations and clarified responsibilities, then 88% had no access to this insight. Although it was beyond the scope of this research to determine whether those responsibilities were in fact, ever clarified, it was reasonable to assume that no formal process existed for doing so.

4) Evaluations served as one means of strengthening the working relationship between the board and the Chief State School Officer. Although it was not the position of this paper to suggest that evaluation was even the most effective means of strengthening the critical working relationships, it was significant that only 6% of state board presidents who responded to this questionnaire viewed this as an important purpose behind the evaluation process. Since some type of evaluation was often the only formal constructive communication available to the Chief State School Officer, and since his/her self-respect and self-improvement are linked to job
performance, it seemed absolutely critical that State Boards of Education did everything that was reasonably within their power and authority to open lines of effective communication and strengthen these critical working relationships.

5) Effective evaluations provided both the CSSO and the board with the opportunity to identify possible priorities. When resources were scarce, such identification helped to specify important priorities and directions. Although $81.2\%$ of the states where an evaluation process was in place actually used this process as an opportunity to set goals and standards for future performance, that only represented approximately $32\%$ of all responding State Boards of Education. Again, since formal evaluations were not the only time when such priorities could be identified and specific plans formulated, this statistic may provide only a rough indication of the extent to which such plans were actually made. If, on the other hand, the statistic was somewhat reliable, State Boards of Education need to become much more pro-active in this key role.

**Implications**

The purpose of this research has been to conduct an assessment of the policy, scope, and methods used by State Boards of Education to evaluate the Chief State School Officer. The results of the research indicated that states differed considerably with respect to their formal educational governance structures and the formal authority of the State Board of Education. Obviously, the political culture varied greatly from state to state and this culture defined the state role
in education. States differed in their perception of the traditional role of the State Board of Education. Each state had different practices and operational styles.

Nonetheless, it was the state who was ultimately responsible for education. And "weakness at the top," to quote Machiavelli's marvelous insight, "drives power down." Unless the state, with its legal authority to govern all educational entities, could not meet the demands of a vast array of political challenges, education would never fulfill its unique mission in providing every American child with an opportunity to receive a quality education.

State Boards of Education are powerful political bodies. It was they who, along with the Chief State School Officer, had to marshal fiscal and policy support from the legislature and governor, political support from the public and business community, and practical support from local school administrators and educators. It was they who had to listen, understand, and translate the concerns of a variety of partisan stakeholders into successful educational policies.

The job was so large, the stakes were so high, failure was so costly, that the State Board of Education simply could not do it alone. The Chief State School Officer, along with the Department of Education and competent educators throughout all the state had to join in a common quest for educational improvement.

Accountability was crucial in this process. Education demanded that teachers be accountable for student learning, that site-administrators be accountable for instructional programs within individual school sites, and that local superintendents be accountable
to local boards for the successful operation of school districts.

The results of this research, however, indicated that Chief State School Officers in all but 17 states, were accountable to no specific person or entity. In thirty-two states and four U.S. territories, there was no educational body that evaluated the professional performance of the Chief State School Officer.

Although chiefs in states where they received their authority from the electorate would argue that they were accountable to the people, that model has not always resulted in efficiency of resources nor good educational agendas. Such a governance structure often led to a dual system of educational leadership that translated into weak policies and little leadership. In states where the Chief State School Officer was elected, the State Board of Education played no role in evaluating the performance of this key leader. They did not have an opportunity to indicate whether the duties and responsibilities of the Chief were being performed, whether board expectations of performance were realistic, to provide suggestions for improvement, and, perhaps most important, they had no vehicle by which they held the Chief State School Officer accountable for carrying out the policies and responding to the priorities of the board.

If this was the case, and it appeared to be, how could the State Board of Education, vested with the tremendous responsibility of providing educational opportunities and programs for children living within the state, perform its responsibilities? Perhaps it could not.

Governor-appointed Chief State School Officers could also argue
that they, too, were accountable. Their supervisor was the governor and the expectation was that the Chief would implement the governor's educational plans and programs. Unfortunately, this established clear gubernatorial authority over the educational system. Without the authority to evaluate the governor-appointed Chief, State Boards of Education found it difficult, if not impossible, to hold the Chief State School Officer accountable for carrying out its policies and responding to its priorities.

The implications of this research were many. To summarize:

1) Thirty-two states and four U.S. territories had no process in place for evaluating the Chief State School Officer. This researcher was convinced that it was only through some type of evaluative process that State Boards of Education could determine if the duties and responsibilities of the CSSO were being performed, that the board's expectations were realistic, that performance could be measured against expectations, that suggestions for improvement could be met, and that the board could hold the CSSO accountable for carrying out its policies and responding to its priorities.

2) Formal evaluations, in which specific procedures and regulations were followed exactly, were most conducive to higher expectations and increased performance. This research indicated that only nine states (17%) actually formalized the evaluative process. Could State Boards of Education follow their mandate to improve this nation's educational agenda when only nine states formally inspected the performance of the key person in the
Implementation of this agenda? It was the opinion of this researcher that such an undertaking would be most difficult.

3) Evaluation instruments, in order to effectively measure what they purported to measure, must have been well written, validated and pertinent to the job description. This research indicated that most instruments were developed by lay State Boards of Education, constantly undergoing some type of change, and never validated. Although the value of performance evaluations were critical to accountability issues, they lost their reliability if the instruments used in the evaluation were not good instruments. It was the contention of this author that that was the case in many of the states where the State Board of Education was given the authority to evaluate the Chief State School Officer.

Before Chief State School Officer evaluations could become the tool for effective change that they were capable of becoming, this issue must be addressed by people knowledgeable enough to address it with authority.

4) Unless the State Board of Education provided the Chief State School Officer with appropriate written and oral feedback to the evaluation process, the Chief could not be expected to make significant improvements in his performance. Only a little more than half of the states who performed an evaluation of the Chief State School Officer produced a written summary. Again, it was the contention of this author that this step was critical. State Boards of Education were negligent in fulfilling their responsibilities
unless Chiefs clearly understood expectations and improvement standards. It cannot be assumed that an individual can actually perform at higher levels without such input.

5) The fact that State Boards of Education and Chief State School Officers perceived the purpose of the evaluation so differently was most interesting. Over 81% of the State Board Presidents saw the entire process as one by which they could hold the Chief State School Officer accountable. Only 41% of the Chiefs perceived this element to be important. Their highest score, indicating whether their duties and responsibilities had been performed, illustrated their need for effective input from the Board. Could this author have rightfully assumed that Chief State School Officers were anxious for constructive input from State Boards of Education and, once provided, they could and would implement such suggestions into the state's educational system?

Despite the obvious differences in state governance structure and the reluctance of State Boards of Education to implement sound evaluative procedures, achieving the true educational renaissance imperative to the success of our society is still possible and perhaps even probable. It would be impossible, however, without effective policymaking at the state level. It is this policymaking that is the major function of State Boards of Education. It is because State Boards of Education need some assurance that its policies are implemented that some evaluative process is critical.

Although it is beyond the scope of this research to recommend
whether state board members should be elected or appointed, it appeared that those boards that had the authority to appoint the Chief State School Officer enjoyed a smoother-functioning process of educational policy-making and administration. This researcher would take the position that State Boards of Education should appoint the Chief State School Officer. This research has verified the fact that such authority allowed the board to evaluate the CSSO and hold him/her accountable to the board.

If such a governance structure were in place in each state and territory, the State Board of Education would be in a position to enhance administrator effectiveness, clarify the job description and responsibilities of the Chief State School Officer, strengthen the working relationship among educational leaders and be assured that sound educational policies were developed and implemented.

In reality this research will have little impact upon legislators who make critical governance decisions. Although the ability to appoint the CSSO is a key element that affects how a board operates and how that board relates to external forces, i.e., the legislature, the governor, local boards of education, and other educational entities, it has less bearing on the influence of the board than does other factors. In order to be effective, each State Board of Education, regardless of the governance structure in place, must work within the structure and environment of the state and must build a cooperative working relationship with the Chief State School Officer.

To do otherwise would negate the ultimate responsibility for
progress towards educational excellence that is the goal of every State Board of Education.
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ALABAMA

Mr. John M. Tyson, Jr. President
Alabama State Board of Education
Mobile, Alabama 36606

ALASKA

Mr. Barney Gottstein, President
Alaska State Board of Education
Anchorage, Alaska 99518

ARIZONA

Mr. Eddie N. Basha, President
Arizona State Board of Education
Chandler, Arizona

ARKANSAS

Mr. Jeff Starling, President
Arkansas State Board of Education
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71611

CALIFORNIA

Dr. Francis Laufenberg, President
California State Board of Education
Orange, California 92667

COLORADO

Dr. Tom Howerton, President
Colorado State Board of Education
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80904

CONNECTICUT

Mr. Abraham Glassman, President
Connecticut State Board of Education
South Windsor, Connecticut 06074

DELAWARE

Mr. Paul R. Fine, President
Delaware State Board of Education
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
FLORIDA

The Honorable Bob Martinez
Governor, State of Florida
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

GEORGIA

Mr. Hollis Q. Lathem, President
Georgia State Board of Education
Canton, Georgia 30114

HAWAII

Mr. Francis McMillen, President
Hawaii Board of Education
Mililani, Hawaii 96789

IDAHO

Mr. Charles Grant, President
Idaho State Board of Education
Boise, Idaho 83720

ILLINOIS

Mr. Thomas Lay Burroughs, President
Illinois State Board of Education
Collinsville, Illinois 62234

INDIANA

Dr. H. Dean Evans, Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2798

IOWA

Mrs. Karen K. Goodenow, President
Iowa State Board of Education
Spirit Lake, Iowa 51360

KANSAS

Mrs. Connie Hubbell, President
Kansas State Board of Education
Topeka, Kansas 66611
KENTUCKY

Mr. Henry E. Pogue, IV President
Kentucky State Board of Education
Ft. Thomas, Kentucky, 41075

LOUISIANA

Mr. Keith Johnson, President
Louisiana State Board of Education
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

MAINE

Ms. Carol Wishcamper, President
Maine State Board of Education
Freeport, Maine 04032

MARYLAND

Mr. Wilson H. Parran, President
Maryland State Board of Education
Hintingtown, Maryland 20639

MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. James F. Crain, President
Massachusetts State Board of Education
Boston, Massachusetts 02107

MICHIGAN

Mrs. Cherry Jacobus, President
Michigan State Board of Education
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

MINNESOTA

Mr. Thomas Lindquist, President
Minnesota State Board of Education
Savage, Minnesota 55378

MISSISSIPPI

Mr. Arthur Peyton, President
Mississippi State Board of Education
Greenville, Mississippi
MISSOURI

Mr. Thomas R. Davis, President
Missouri State Board of Education
Sedalia, Missouri 65301

MONTANA

Mr. Alan D. Nicholson, President
Montana State Board of Education
Helena, Montana 59624

NEBRASKA

Mr. James Monahan, President
Nebraska State Board of Education
Omaha, Nebraska 68102

NEVADA

Mrs. June Herrmann, President
Nevada State Board of Education
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. R. Patrick Corbin, President
New Hampshire State Board of Education
Salem, New Hampshire 03079

NEW JERSEY

Dr. James A. Jones, President
New Jersey State Board of Education
Teaneck, New Jersey 07666

NEW MEXICO

Ms. Catherine M. Smith, President
New Mexico State Board of Education
Mimbres, New Mexico 88049

NEW YORK:

Honorable Martin C. Barell, President
New York State Board of Regents
New York, New York 10022
NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Howard H. Haworth, President
North Carolina State Board of Education
Morganton, North Carolina  28655

NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. Verne Bennett, President
North Dakota State Board of Education
Bismarck, North Dakota  58501

OHIO

Mr. Paul Brickner, President
Ohio State Board of Education
Silloughby, Ohio  44094

OKLAHOMA

Mr. Gerald Hoeltzel, President
Oklahoma State Board of Education
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

OREGON

Mr. Don Kruse, President
Oregon State Board of Education
Roseburg, Oregon  97470

PENNSYLVANIA

Sister M. Lareace Antown, Chairperson
State Board of Education
Erie, Pennsylvania  16505

RHODE ISLAND

Dr. Augustine Capotosto, Jr., President
Rhode Island State Board of Education
East Greenwich, Rhode Island  02818

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Theo Lane, President
South Carolina State Board of Education
Woodruff, South Carolina  29388
SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. Randolph Seiler, President
South Dakota State Board of Education
Morbridge, South Dakota  57601

TENNESSEE

Mr. Nelson Andrews, President
Tennessee State Board of Education
Nashville, Tennessee  37209

TEXAS

Mr. Monte Hasie, Chairman
Texas State Board of Education
Luvick, Texas  79407

UTAH

Mrs. Ruth Funk, President
Utah State Board of Education
Salt Lake City, Utah  84109

VERMONT

Mr. Douglas Tudhope, President
Vermont State Board of Education
N. Hero, Vermont  05474

VIRGINIA

Mr. Robert H. DeFord, Jr., President
Virginia State Board of Education
Virginia Beach, Virginia  23452

WASHINGTON

Mr. Grant L. Anderson, President
Washington State Board of Education
Tacoma, Washington  98466

WEST VIRGINIA

Mrs. Patricia Full Hamner, President
West Virginia State Board of Education
Buckhannon, West Virginia  26201
WYOMING

Mr. Raymond A. Holt, President
Wyoming State Board of Education
Buffalo, Wyoming 82834

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Ms. Linda Cropp, Chairman
District of Columbia State Board of Education
Washington, D.C. 20004

GUAM

Dr. Lawrence Kasperbauer
Guam State Board of Education
Mangilao, Guam 96923
APPENDIX B

CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS PARTICIPATING
IN THIS RESEARCH
APPENDIX B

ALABAMA

Wayne Teague, Superintendent of Education  
State Department of Education  
501 Dexter Avenue  
481 State Office Building  
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

ALASKA

William G. Demmert, Commissioner of Education  
State Department of Education  
Pouch F  
801 East 10th Street  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

ARIZONA

C. Diane Bishop, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
State Department of Education  
1535 West Jefferson  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

ARKANSAS

Ruth Steele, Director, General Education Division  
Department of Education  
#4 Capitol Mall  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-1071

CALIFORNIA

Bill Honig, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
State Department of Education  
721 Capitol Mall  
Sacramento, California 94244-2720

COLORADO

William T. Randall, Commissioner of Education  
State Department of Education  
201 East Colfax Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80203-1705
CONNECTICUT

Gerald N. Tirozzi, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education 165 Capitol Avenue
Room 308, State Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

DELWARE

William B. Keene, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Public Instruction
P. O. Box 1402 - Townsend Building., #279
Federal & Lockerman Streets
Dover, Delaware 19903

FLORIDA

Betty Castor, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Capitol Building, Room PL 116
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

GEORGIA

Werner Rogers, Superintendent of Schools
State Department of Education
Twin Towers East - Capitol Square
Atlanta, Georgia 30334-5020

HAWAII

Charles Toguchi, Superintendent of Education
Department of Education
Post Office Box 2360
1390 Miller Street, #307
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

IDAHO

Jerry L. Evans, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
650 West State Street
Boise, Idaho 83720

ILLINOIS

Dr. Ted Sanders, Undersecretary
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208
INDIANA

H. Dean Evans, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education #229
100 North Capitol Street
Indianapolis, Indiana  56205-2798

IOWA

William L. Lepley, Director of Education
State Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
East 14th & Grand Streets
Des Moines, Iowa  50319-0146

KANSAS

Lee Droegemueller, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
120 East Tenth Street
Topeka, Kansas  66612

KENTUCKY

John Brock, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
1725 Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky  40601

LOUISIANA

Wilmer S. Cody, Superintendent of Education
State Department of Education
Post Office Box  94064
626 North 4th Street
Baton Rouge, Louisiana  70804-9064

MAINE

Eve M. Bither, Commissioner of Education
Department of Educational and Cultural Services
State House, Station #23
Augusta, Maine  04333

MARYLAND

Joseph L. Shilling, State Superintendent of Schools
State Department of Education
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland  21201
MASSACHUSETTS

Harold Reynolds, Jr., Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Quincy Center Plaza
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, Massachusetts, 02169

MICHIGAN

Donald Bemis, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Post Office Box 30008
608 West Allegan Street
Lansing, Michigan, 48909

MINNESOTA

Ruth E. Randall, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
712 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

MISSISSIPPI

Richard A. Boyd, Superintendent of Education
State Department of Education
Post Office Box 771, High Street
Jackson, Mississippi 30205-0771

MISSOURI

Robert E. Bartman, Commissioner of Education
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
P. O. Box 480
280 Jefferson Street, 6th Floor
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

MONTANA

Nancy Keenan, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Office of Public Instruction
106 State Capitol
Helena, Montana 59620
NEBRASKA

Joseph E. Lutjaharman, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Post Office Box 94987
301 Centennial Mall, South
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

NEVADA

Eugene T. Paslov, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
400 West King Street
Carson City, Nevada 89710

NEW HAMPSHIRE

John T. MacDonald, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
State Office Park South
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

NEW JERSEY

Saul Cooperman, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

NEW MEXICO

Alan Morgan, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education Bldg.
300 Don Gaspar
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-2786

NEW YORK

Thomas Sobol, Commissioner of Education
State Education Department
111 Education Building
Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12234
NORTH CAROLINA

Bob Etheridge, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Public Instruction
Education Building, Room 318
Edenton & Salisbury Streets
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603-1712

NORTH DAKOTA

Wayne G. Sanstead, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol Building, 11th Floor
600 Boulevard Avenue East
Bismark, North Dakota 58505-0164

OHIO

Franklin B. Walter, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
65 South Front Street, Room 808
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0308

OREGON

Verne A. Duncan, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway, S.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas K. Gilhool, Secretary of Education
State Department of Education
333 Market Street, 10th Floor
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

RHODE ISLAND

J. Troy Earhart, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908
SOUTH CAROLINA

Charlie G. Williams, Superintendent of Education
State Department of Education
1006 Rutledge Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

SOUTH DAKOTA

Henry Kosters, State Superintendent
Department of Education
Division of Elementary/Secondary Ed.
700 Governors Drive
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

TENNESSEE

Charles E. Smith, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
100 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

TEXAS

William N. Kirby, Commissioner of Education
Texas Education Agency
William B. Travis Building
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

UTAH

James R. Moss, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Office of Education
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

VERMONT

Richard P. Mills, Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602-2703
VIRGINIA

S. John Davis, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Post Office Box 6Q
James Monroe Building
Fourteenth and Franklin Streets
Richmond, Virginia 23216-1060

WASHINGTON

Judith Billings, Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Bldg., Washington & Legion
Mail Stop FG-11
Olympia, Washington 98504

WEST VIRGINIA

John Fisapia, State Superintendent of Schools
State Department of Education
1900 Washington Street
Building B, Room 358
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

WYOMING

Lynn C. Simons, State Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Andrew E. Jenkins, III, Superintendent of Public Schools
District of Columbia Public Schools
413 Twelfth Street N.W.
Washington D.C., 20004

GUAM

Rosa Sals Palomo, Director of Education
Department of Education
Post Office Box DE
Agana, Guam 96910
NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Henry I. Sablan, Superintendent of Education
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Department of Education
Saipan CM 96950

PUERTO RICO

Rafael Cartagena, Secretary of Education
Department of Education
Post Office Box 759
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919

SAMOA

Lealofi Uiagalelei, Director of Education
Department of Education
Pago Pago, Tutuila 96799

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Linda Creque, Commissioner of Education
Department of Education Station
44-46 Kongens Gade
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00802
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STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE
EVALUATING THE CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER

A STUDY OF CURRENT PRACTICES

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of person completing questionnaire __________________________________

Position held:

  ____ President/Chairman, State Board of Education
  ____ Vice/President/Vice Chairman, State Board of Education
  ____ Member, State Board of Education
  ____ Department of Education Staff, Position __________
  ____ Other ___________________________________________

Name of State or Territory _____________________________________________

1. Please describe how the Chief State School Officer is selected in your state:

  ____ Appointed by Governor
  ____ Appointed by State Board of Education
  ____ Elected
  ____ Other (Please explain) ________________________________

2. Did the State Board of Education conduct a performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer during the 1988-89 fiscal year? (From July 1, 1988 to June 30, 1989)

  ____ Yes  ____ No
3. Did the State Board of Education conduct a performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer during the 1987-88 fiscal year? (From July 1, 1987 to June 30, 1988)

_____ Yes  _____ No

4. Is the evaluation of the Chief State School Officer mandated by

_____ State Statute -- (a state law established by a legislative enactment)

_____ State Regulation -- (a governmental order having the force of law but enacted by government agencies and/or boards)

_____ State Board Policy -- (a plan, initiated by the state board to assist in carrying out specific regulations)

_____ Tradition

_____ Don't Know

_____ Not Mandated

5. There are many reasons why evaluations are conducted. Listed below are some of the purposes for superintendent evaluation as identified in a joint publication of the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association. Please rank the importance of the top four of these items to the C.S.S.O. evaluation in your state. (Ranking #1 is the most important. Please do not duplicate rankings.)

a. _____ To indicate whether the duties and responsibilities of the C.S.S.O. are being performed.

b. _____ To determine if the board's expectations of the C.S.S.O.'s performance are realistic.

(See next page)
c. _____ To enable the C.S.S.O. to measure his (her) performance against the expectations of the board.

d. _____ To identify both areas of strength and weakness in the C.S.S.O's performance.

e. _____ To improve communication between the board and C.S.S.O.

f. _____ To provide suggestions by which needs for improvement can be met.

g. _____ To foster a high trust level between the C.S.S.O. and the State Board of Education.

h. _____ To enable the Board to hold the C.S.S.O. accountable for carrying out its policies and responding to its priorities.

6. Evaluations can be both formal and informal. For the purpose of this discussion, a formal evaluation is one in which specific procedures and/or regulations are followed exactly. Would you consider the last evaluation of the Chief State School Officer to be _____ formal? _____ informal?

7. How often is the performance of the Chief State School Officer evaluated by the State Board of Education?

_____ Every six months

_____ Every year

_____ Every two years

_____ As needed
8. How was the instrument used in evaluating the Chief State School Officer obtained?

_____ Used to evaluate the C.S.S.O. in another state
_____ Derived from other educational personnel measures
_____ Composed by the State Board of Education
_____ Composed by the State Department of Education
_____ Don't know
_____ Other (Please explain) _____________________________

9. Validity is generally defined as the degree to which a test measures what it claims to measure. Has the instrument currently in use been validated? Yes _____ No _____

How? __________________________________________________________

10. Check all the methods used by your State Board of Education in evaluating the performance of the Chief State School Officer:

_____ Checklist ratings (This method consists of a statement about a particular behavior and the board member circles a number indicating, for example, whether the statement is always true, true most of the time, true about half the time, seldom true, or never true)

_____ Essay Evaluation (This method requires the board member to write a brief summary paragraph indicating his assessment of the particular area, i.e., relations with the board, staff management, etc.)

(See next page)
Forced Choice Ratings (This method requires the board member to choose one sentence in each category that best describes his assessment of the C.S.S.O. An example might be "Materials and reports prepared for the board -- (a) always comprehensive and detailed; (b) usually complete and thorough; (c) sometimes lacking in depth and detail; (d) consistently poor."

Graphic Profiles (This method requires the rater to mark each of the items in Column A along a nine-point scale provided in Column B. By placing a mark in the appropriate space, under the desired letter rating, it is possible to join all of the marks with a line that will result in a graphic presentation of the evaluation.)

Other (Please describe)

11. How many times has the instrument currently employed to evaluate the Chief State School Officer been used by the State Board of Education?

Once
Two times
Three times
More than three times

12. Listed on page 6 of this questionnaire is a process suggested by the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association to evaluate a local school superintendent. Please numerically list (1, 2, 3, 4, etc) all the steps that your state utilizes in the formal evaluation of the C.S.S.O.
a. _____ Individual board members independently rate the Chief State School Officers' performance.

b. _____ President of the board convenes members to discuss assessment and to prepare composite evaluation.

c. _____ Copy of composite evaluation transmitted to the Chief State School Officer.

d. _____ Conference scheduled with Chief State School Officer and State Board of Education members to discuss evaluation.

e. _____ The C.S.S.O. retains a copy of the evaluation.

f. _____ Other (Please describe)

13. Once the 1988-89 evaluation of the Chief State School Officer had been completed by the State Board of Education, did the board discuss the results with the C.S.S.O?

_____ yes   _____ no

14. Was the evaluation written up as a formal document?

_____ yes   _____ no

15. There can be many outcomes to the evaluation process. Please indicate which outcomes your State Board of Education expects from the evaluation of the Chief State School Officer:


_____ A continuing record of the effectiveness of the Chief State School Officer.

_____ Tangible evidence upon which to base decisions to renew the contract and set his (her) salary.

(See next page)
16. In your opinion, how does the Chief State School Officer perceive the effectiveness of this evaluation?

- He (She) thinks it is very effective in helping him (her) improve performance standards.
- He (She) thinks it is somewhat effective in helping improve performance standards.
- He (She) thinks it is not effective in helping improve performance standards.
- He (She) sees no purpose in performance evaluation.

17. Additional Comments:

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Would you like to have a summary of the results of this survey? Yes _____ No _____

Please enclose a copy of the current C.S.S.O. evaluation instrument used by your State Board of Education.
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CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of person completing questionnaire ______________________________

Position held:

_____ Chief State School Officer

_____ Department of Education Staff, Position __________

______________________________

_____ Other (Please describe) ______________________________

______________________________

Check the statement that best describes how long you have been a Chief State School Officer:

_____ Less than one year

_____ Less than two years

_____ Less than three years

_____ Less than four years

_____ Less than five years

_____ More than five years

Name of State or Territory ______________________________

1. Did the State Board of Education conduct a performance evaluation of the Chief State School Officer during the 1988-89 fiscal year?
(From July 1, 1988 to June 30, 1989)

_____ Yes  _____ No
2. There are many reasons why evaluations are conducted. Listed below are some of the purposes for local superintendent evaluation as identified in a joint publication of the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association. In your perception, how important are these items to your evaluation? Please rank the top four items with #1 being the most important. Do not duplicate rankings.

a. _____ To indicate whether the duties and responsibilities of the C.S.S.O. are being performed.

b. _____ To determine if the board's expectations of the C.S.S.O.'s performance are realistic.

c. _____ To enable the C.S.S.O. to measure his (her) performance against the expectations of the board.

d. _____ To identify both areas of strength and weakness in the C.S.S.O's performance.

e. _____ To improve communication between the board and C.S.S.O.

f. _____ To provide suggestions by which needs for improvement can be met.

g. _____ To foster a high trust level between the C.S.S.O. and the State Board of Education.

h. _____ To enable the Board to hold the C.S.S.O. accountable for carrying out its policies and responding to its priorities.

3. Once the 1988-89 evaluation of the Chief State School Officer had been completed by the State Board of Education, did the board discuss the results with you?

_____ yes  _____ no
4. Were the results of the evaluation written up as a formal document?
   _____ yes       _____ no

5. Did you have an opportunity to review the document and ask questions?
   _____ yes       _____ no

6. In your perception, was the 1988-89 performance evaluation conducted by the State Board of Education
   _____ Very effective in helping you improve performance standards.
   _____ Somewhat effective in helping improve performance standards.
   _____ Not effective in helping improve performance standards.

7. Although the following question will not be analyzed as part of the study, it would be interesting to know what evaluation procedures would best meet your need as a Chief State School Officer. In your own words, describe an "ideal" evaluation instrument and evaluative procedures. You may use additional sheets as necessary.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Would you like to have a summary of the results of this survey? Yes _____ No _____
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LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL
Mr. Robert H. DeFord, Jr., President  
Virginia State Board of Education  
2712 Southern Blvd., Suite 100  
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23452

Dear Mr. DeFord:

As President of the State Board of Education in Virginia, you are well aware of the importance of improving the quality of educational services within your state. Although there are a wide variety of ways to accomplish this goal, your Chief State School Officer plays a crucial leadership role in this and all state educational functions.

When I served as President of the Nevada State Board of Education, it was my responsibility to conduct the annual performance evaluation of our Chief State School Officer. Because of my frustration over the lack of appropriate evaluative instruments and the lack of information available through the literature, I have chosen to do my doctoral dissertation on current Chief State School Officer evaluation practices. This research project will survey each State Board President and each Chief State School Officer in 49 states and some U.S. territories. The results of this study will provide baseline data on the status of C.S.S.O. evaluations from around the country.

I am particularly desirous that you, as State Board President, respond to this questionnaire. Although it is beyond the scope of this research to develop an evaluation model, your response will contribute significantly to the data that will be collected and will provide critical information as to the current status of C.S.S.O. evaluations. It will be appreciated if you will respond to this questionnaire prior to November 20 and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope. I welcome any comments you might have. In order to supplement this research, I would appreciate a copy of your current C.S.S.O. evaluation instrument.

Thank you for your cooperation. I will be pleased to send you a summary of questionnaire results if you so indicate on the enclosed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Marianne Long, Member  
Nevada State Board of Education

An Equal Opportunity Agency
Dr. Andrew E. Jenkins, III  
Superintendent of Public Schools  
District of Columbia Public Schools  
415 Twelfth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  

Dear Dr. Jenkins:

As Chief State School Officer for the District of Columbia Public Schools, you have great leadership responsibility in all state educational decisions and functions. In order to be most effective, however, it is undoubtedly crucial that you work with the District Board of Education in affecting the quality of educational services within your area.

When I served as President of the Nevada State Board of Education, it was my responsibility to conduct the annual performance evaluation of our Chief State School Officer. Because of my frustration over the lack of appropriate evaluative instruments and the lack of information available through the literature, I have chosen to do my doctoral dissertation on current Chief State School Officer evaluation practices. This research project will survey each Chief State School Officer and each State Board President in 49 states and six U. S. territories. The results of this study will provide base line data on the status of C.S.S.O. evaluations from around the country.

I am particularly desirous that you, as Chief State School Officer, take a few moments and respond to the seven questions on the enclosed questionnaire. Although it is beyond the scope of this research to develop an evaluation model, your response will contribute significantly to the data that will be collected. You can be assured that your responses will be kept confidential.

I would appreciate a quick response to this questionnaire. Please return the form to me in the enclosed envelope prior to November 30. Thank you for your cooperation. I will be pleased to send you a summary of the questionnaire results if you so indicate on the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Marianne Long, Member  
Nevada State Board of Education  

An Equal Opportunity Agency
Dr. Gerald N. Tirozzi  
Commissioner of Education  
State Department of Education  
165 Capitol Avenue  
Room 308, State Office Building  
Hartford, Connecticut 06106  

Dear Dr. Tirozzi:

Sometime during the month of November, you received a short questionnaire dealing with the current practice of the Connecticut State Board of Education in evaluating your position as Chief State School Officer. As of this date, I have not received any reply from you or from your designated representative. Although I certainly realize how very busy you must be, I do hope that you can find time to answer these questions and return the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest convenience.

Because Connecticut is one of only twenty-seven states and two territories where the State Board of Education appoints the Chief State School Officer, it is extremely critical that I receive your answers if the picture of Chief State School Officer evaluations is to be complete. Although I have not finished tallying all of the results of the earlier mailing, you might be interested in knowing that 18 of the twenty-seven states conduct formal performance evaluations. In most of the states where the Chief State School Officer is elected or appointed by the Governor of the state, there is no performance evaluation by the State Board of Education.

Although it is beyond the scope of this research to develop an evaluation model, your responses, along with the responses on the questionnaire mailed to your state board president, will provide critical information on the current status of C.S.S.O. evaluations. Again, please respond to this questionnaire as quickly as possible and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope. Please accept my sincere thanks for your time and cooperation as well as best wishes for a happy and productive New Year.

Sincerely,

Marianne Long, Member  
Nevada State Board of Education  

An Equal Opportunity Agency
Mr. Jeff Starling, President
Arkansas State Board of Education
P. O. Box 8509
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71611

Dear Mr. Starling:

Sometime during the first part of November, you received a questionnaire concerning the evaluation of your Chief State School Officer. The initial letter of transmittal requested that you complete the questionnaire in order to provide input into the current status of Chief State School Officer evaluation practices throughout the United States and six U.S. Territories. As of this date, I have not received any reply from you or from your designated representative. Although I certainly realize how very busy State Board of Education presidents can be, I do hope that you can find time to complete the enclosed questionnaire and mail it back to me at your very earliest convenience.

Arkansas is one of twenty-seven states that appoints the Chief State School Officer. As such, your board undoubtedly evaluates his performance periodically. Your answers to this questionnaire are really necessary if the picture of Chief State School Officer evaluations is to be complete. Although I have not finished tallying all of the results, you might be interested in knowing that of the 27 states where the Chief State School Officer is appointed by the State Board of Education, 18 of the states evaluate his job performance. In those states where the Chief State School Officer is elected or appointed by the governor of the state, there is no performance evaluation by the State Board of Education.

Although it is beyond the scope of this research to develop an evaluation model, your responses will contribute significantly to the data that is being collected and will provide critical information as to the current status of C.S.S.O. evaluations. Again, please respond to this questionnaire as quickly as possible and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope. Please accept my sincere thanks for your time and cooperation as well as best wishes for a happy and productive New Year.

Sincerely,

Marianne Long, Member
Nevada State Board of Education

An Equal Opportunity Agency