

1971

Changes effected by North Central Association visitations to Iowa high schools, 1967-68

Leonard LeRoy Gustafson
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gustafson, Leonard LeRoy, "Changes effected by North Central Association visitations to Iowa high schools, 1967-68 " (1971).
Retrospective Theses and Dissertations. 4401.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/4401>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

71-21,947

GUSTAFSON, Leonard LeRoy, 1921-
CHANGES EFFECTED BY NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION
VISITATIONS TO IOWA HIGH SCHOOLS, 1967-1968.

Iowa State University, Ph.D., 1971
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Changes effected by North Central Association
visitations to Iowa high schools,
1967-1968

by

Leonard LeRoy Gustafson

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Subject: Educational Administration

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

~~In Charge of Major Work~~

Signature was redacted for privacy.

~~Head of Major Area~~

Signature was redacted for privacy.

~~Dean of Graduate College~~

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
The Problem	2
Terminology	6
Sources of Data	9
Organization of the Study	9
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	31
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS	57
General Findings: Space, People, Program, Things	57
Findings by Subject Area	82
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	117
Summary	117
Conclusions	120
Limitations	125
Recommendations	126
Discussions	129
BIBLIOGRAPHY	133
APPENDIX	134

CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Since its inception in 1896, the North Central Association (N.C.A.) has been engaged in the process of visiting and investigating the educational programs of its member high schools. By its visitation program and investigation procedures many high schools have been accredited over the years. To have accreditation by the N.C.A. has meant a great deal to the many high schools because it was thought that accreditation meant a good educational program. The approval of N.C.A. has meant adequate facilities, a well-trained and qualified teaching staff, a properly certified administrative staff, a good school board, sufficient and up-to-date equipment adequate to carry on a good educational program, a curriculum that includes the necessary offerings to meet the needs of the student body, and many other acceptances of course content as well as the proper staff of noncertified employees. The symbol of being accredited has given status and a source of pride to all the high schools that have been scrutinized and evaluated by the N.C.A. visitation team. Once approved by visitation and review, annual reports by local school administrations are reviewed by state and regional committees to determine that approval status should be maintained.

The Problem

It is the activity of visitation together with the recommendations made to the particular school that will make up the problem of this dissertation. Many man hours are spent in the visitation process by highly-trained and well qualified individuals, and expenses such as meals, mileage, and lodging also count into the total cost of the visitation. Clerical help to ready the forms for the State Reviewing Committee and the man hours used by the state committee in reading and evaluating the visitation report also add a definite cost to the accreditation process as well as the additional cost of reviewing by the N.C.A. committee.

It is usual in a visitation to have the person in charge of the visitation team report the findings and recommendations to the local school board, and in due time the school reviewed receives a written copy of the visitation report.

It is the function of the visitation team to review the total program of the high school, to report what it finds, and to make recommendations for improvement in the educational program of the school. To go and look, to study what you have seen, and to set down items or ideas that will improve what you have seen exemplifies the whole idea of accreditation. All phases of the visitation and accreditation are important, but it shall be the thesis of

this investigation to deal with the recommendations the team has made because it is within the confines of this area the "real good" for education appears. Only by investigation and study can concrete ideas come for improvement; and, once they are known, it is very important they be implemented. If the proper study is made and recommendations made are not implemented, then all the time, effort, and expenses have gone for naught and the meaningful aspects of accreditation have been lost.

A visitation team usually consists of 20 to 25 educators who have various degrees of expertise in one or more areas of the secondary educational program. These various persons come from surrounding schools, nearby universities or colleges, and the state education agency. All are contacted by the team leader, usually a member of the state N.C.A. committee, and agree to serve on the visitation team.

It is the function of the team leader to assign a certain subject or administrative area to one or two persons on the team and it is their task to investigate the area, report in writing what they have found, and to make recommendations concerning the program in which they become involved.

The customary procedure for a visitation is as follows:

- a. Notice is given by the state N.C.A. committee that the school will be visited.

- b. The dates of the visitation are arranged.
- c. The visitation team usually has its first meeting in the afternoon of the first day. This meeting is directed by the team leader and all assignments are confirmed, necessary report forms are handed out, etc.
- d. A dinner meeting is usually scheduled for the evening of the first day with the visitation team, the host administration, and the local school board.
- e. During the next two days, the visitation team "gets into" the serious business of investigating all aspects of the school program and a report is filed with the team leader.
- f. At the close of the third day the team leader reports on the findings of his committee to the local school board and administrators.
- g. A written report is filed with the state and national N.C.A. and a copy is filed with the local school district.

While it is true the local school district does not pay "salary per day" for the visitation team, it does pay normal travel expenses. At the same time, however, the members of the visitation team are full-time employees of an educational venture and days not worked in their own

position do constitute a large sum of money not directed in the manner for which they were employed. This is not to say that this practice is bad, but it must be taken into account as a cost in the visitation process.

Another aspect of cost is the time the local staff spends preparing itself and writing reports prior to a visitation. This paper will make no attempt to investigate the man-hours used on the local level in preparation for a visit. It is well to mention here that this kind of investigation and study by local teachers and administrators is good for the local educational system and should be a continuous process if the school is to progress in its own educational endeavors. However, it is a cost that must be considered in the accreditation process.

To determine the cost factor of the N.C.A. team visitation will not be a part of this paper. The costs are a part of every evaluation visit and can be justified if the recommendations made to the local school are worthwhile and are implemented.

To research this particular problem the following questions need to be answered:

1. How many recommendations were made to the local selected schools?
2. Are all, none or some of the recommendations implemented within a three-year period?

3. What are the reasons why the recommendations are not implemented?
 - a. cost to the district?
 - b. worthiness?
 - c. practicability?
 - d. other
4. How many recommendations are partially implemented?
5. Do N.C.A. evaluation visitations improve the educational offerings and the content of the curriculum?
6. What areas warranted the most recommendations?
7. In what areas were the fewest recommendations made?
8. Are similar recommendations made to every school?
9. What is the most common reason for not implementing the recommendations?
10. In what area were the most recommendations implemented?

Terminology

The following terms and organizations with their various functions need to be defined to add clarity to this study. The terms and definitions are as follows:

North Central Association. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (N.C.A.), founded in 1896 is a voluntary association of higher educational institutions and secondary schools which share a common

purpose--the improvement of education.

The North Central Association serves schools in 19 states--Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming--and American Dependents' Schools operated overseas for children of American military and civilian personnel.

Membership in the North Central Association is entirely voluntary. A school will be accredited when it meets the criteria for membership as defined by the Association. An institution may continue its membership so long as it complies with the criteria and conditions of membership.

Membership denotes--to other educational institutions and the general public--recognition of the quality of a school's program.

"The object of the Association shall be the development and maintenance of high standards of excellence for universities, colleges, and secondary schools, the continued improvement of the educational program and the effectiveness of instruction on secondary and college levels through a scientific and professional approach to the solutions of educational problems, the establishment of cooperative relationships between the secondary schools and colleges and universities within the territory of the Association,

and the maintenance of effective working relationships with other educational organizations and accrediting agencies" (1, p. 200).

Accreditation. The act of being approved by the N.C.A. according to adopted standards and criteria for the organization.

Visitation. The act of being appraised by a team of educators who have expertise in their own particular field.

Visitation team. The team of educators, usually 20-25, who visit and explore the secondary school.

Visitation Period. The length of time spent by the team scrutinizing the secondary school.

NCA Report. The written account of the visitation containing an overview of the educational program, specific comments about the various subject area fields, and recommendations.

Recommendations. Statements concerning the improvement of the educational program of the school. They may also contain building improvements.

Team Leader. The person in charge of the visitation team; usually a member of the State NCA Committee.

Has Implemented. The act of putting into effect a recommendation.

Will implement. A recommendation that has been adopted but is not in effect at the present time.

Will not implement. A recommendation that has not been adopted nor will be adopted by the local secondary school system.

Sources of Data

The data for this study have been secured from the files of the State Chairman of the State N.C.A. Committee and from the principals of the selected secondary schools.

The recommendations made to the particular schools have been taken from the actual report sent to schools.

The data concerning the status of the recommendations within that particular school have been supplied by the principal.

Organization of the Study

This study reviews the literature available in the field of the effectiveness of NCA visitations in relation to the improvement of instruction in the secondary school.

It also lists the various recommendations sent to each selected school and those recommendations that have been implemented and, those that will not be implemented in the very near future.

The study shows the percentage of recommendations already adopted in each selected school as well as all of the schools; the percentage of recommendations that will be adopted in each school as well as all of the schools,

and the percentage of recommendations not adopted for each school and all the selected schools.

The concluding chapter gives an indication of the validity of NCA visitations and the effectiveness of the organization in implementing improvement of the educational program within its member schools.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Evaluation should be a stimulating force leading to definite improvements in the services offered by the school to its students and community. The entire process in a forward-looking school will include self-analysis of the school's program and services; objective checking of the school's analysis by a visiting committee; oral, written, and graphic reports to the school by the committee chairman; and a resultant program of constant improvement by the school itself (2).

The manual, Evaluative Criteria 1960 (2, pp. 16-17) (1970 revision includes the same advice) suggests the following activities for the local school following the evaluation:

1. The worst thing that could happen would be for nothing to happen. And almost as bad would be to attempt to change everything "overnight" and thus achieve a most unwholesome state of "educational indigestion". The logical thing to do in most schools would be to develop an organized plan of improving the school's program over a period of time in line with the findings of the evaluation.

2. Every member of the faculty should become thoroughly familiar with the main findings concerning both the strong and weak areas of the school.

3. Where a school ranks in a certain area is much less important than the extent to which it is improving or whether it is improving at all.

4. Schools that are well-organized will keep the same committee structure for a program of follow-up and improvement.

5. Regular meetings should be held to work on ways to implement the recommendations.

Often it is easier to study and arrive at agreements for improvements than to inaugurate new practices or institute different programs. The full leadership efforts of the principal and the effort of the faculty are necessary for substantial development.

Considerable evidence has shown that program improvements which are designed to facilitate learning must often result from cooperative efforts to identify problems and propose solutions. It is antagonistic to the fundamental tenets of education to go about a task or to perpetuate a practice in a perfunctory fashion without critical inquiry. All that the school does should be in relation to its carefully constructed objectives.

Evaluation does not imply that something defective exists. It is quite the opposite. Evaluation is a form of insurance that good practice will be nurtured and continued. School evaluation makes good schools even better (3).

The above citations point out the strength of the evaluative process and that the recommendations should be implemented in an orderly fashion by the local district.

Although there have been literally thousands of recommendations made to the local districts since the conception of the idea to evaluate schools, there has been relatively little research done concerning the implementation of these recommendations. More work has been done in the area of the self-study of the school program by the local faculty prior to the visitation by the committee and its relation to the improvement of instruction. This self-study by the local faculty using the Evaluative Criteria Guide has been and still is the basic tool used in the evaluative process since its adoption in 1933 (4).

In 1933, the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards was organized by representatives of the six regional accrediting associations, namely; North Central Association, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The main aims of this study were (4):

1. to determine the characteristics of a good secondary school.

2. to find practical means and methods to evaluate the effectiveness of the school in terms of its objectives.
3. to determine the means and processes by which a good school develops into a better one.
4. to devise ways by which regional associations could stimulate and assist secondary schools to continuous growth.

The Evaluative Criteria resulted from this study. This material was revised in 1950, in 1960, and again for the 1970 edition (4).

The process of self-study and visitation as used with the Evaluative Criteria is one in which the entire faculty and staff of a particular school take a planned and systematic look at the kind of job they are doing in light of their philosophy and objectives. The document deals with each subject area: Art, Music, Social Studies, Health and Physical Education, Math, Science, English, Foreign Language, Vocational Education, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, and Business Education; and the general areas of the school: School Staff and Administration, School Plant, Philosophy and Objectives, School and Community, Program of Studies, Guidance Services, Health Services, Instructional Materials, and Student Activities (3). Members of the faculty are usually assigned to an area of their particular

interest. Each area is investigated and the accomplishments of the local school are rated on a five point scale as to how well the schools meet the suggested standard found in the Evaluative Criteria.

This completed Evaluation Guide is distributed to the members of the Visitation team who then conduct their own investigations into their assigned area. After investigation, the members of the visitation team may change the ratings up or down on the five point scale and submit their written report describing their particular field of investigation with or without recommendations for improvement and/or statements concerning items of excellence.

It is only human nature for an individual to fear the new which creates uncertainty and may disturb the security in which he works, but if an individual is allowed to participate in the new process, he will more readily accept the changes affecting him. It is a principle of democracy that those affected by judgments or decisions should understand and participate in making them. Therefore, faculty participation in an evaluation program is a sound democratic practice (4). In addition to the democratic principle, research findings demonstrate that when a faculty helps to define the ends toward which they are working, productivity is greatly increased (4).

Kimble Wiles (3 , p.309) states that "evidence from

studies available leads to the conclusion that participation in decision-making will result in higher morale, maintenance of interest, and willingness to change."

Lawrence Ely found in his study of 613 teachers who used the Evaluative Criteria in 1953-54 that four-fifths of the teachers believed that the evaluation resulted in benefits to them as teachers and seven-eighths of them thought it brought benefits to the school. The most frequently mentioned benefits to teachers were self-evaluation and self-analysis, increased knowledge of the overall program of the school, and encouragement for self-improvement (6).

L. W. Hedge reported (4 , p.235), "We find that the experience of an entire faculty and staff taking time for a good look at the job they were doing, a re-examination of their philosophy, and a re-evaluation of their accomplishments were extremely beneficial. This resulted in the broadening of the outlook of members of a specific department to the conception of their contribution to the job as a whole. The evaluation experience has helped our staff in the matter of coordinating their teaching into a unified educational experience for our students."

Other studies claim the following additional benefits from the self-evaluation process (4 , pp. 235-236):

1. Evaluation provides an impetus for critical self-analysis and self-improvement. It motivates us to examine ourselves and our programs carefully, to recognize shortcomings and needs, and to see ways and means of bringing out improvement.

2. Evaluation helps to filter out and crystallize dissatisfactions which eventually give rise to curriculum improvement and needed organizational and administrative changes.

3. The faculty is self-energized. Faculty members are challenged to re-examine their own methods and accomplishments, seek improvement through experimentation, and search for better ways of instruction.

4. Evaluation creates an esprit de corps that makes the seeking of improvement permeate the entire administration and staff. It reaffirms the fact that each teacher has a stake in determining programs and curriculum, and the staff feels a greater incentive to participate. Evaluation helps the entire staff to coordinate the teaching program into a unified educational experience for students.

As stated earlier, much research has been done concerning the evaluative self-study process and in most instances it has proved beneficial to the staff and should have improved the educational programs. This kind of research does much to promote the evaluation process but

does not give any indication as to what was improved in the school program after the total process. How teachers are affected by the evaluative process does not necessarily mean the improvements "thought of" or "designed" became a part of the educational program.

Edwards of Illinois State University conducted an interesting study concerning the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria. Not since 1930 has any major attempt been made to validate the use of the Evaluative Criteria as an instrument for rating schools. His study identified 18 Iowa schools that had been evaluated by committees of the North Central Association. Each school was evaluated by a different committee and had been evaluated between the years 1960 and 1964 using the "Evaluative Criteria". These schools also had participated in the same testing program and the cost per pupil was secured and rated. These costs were then adjusted for fluctuating factors with 1963 as the base year. Grade point averages were secured for the first grading period of post high school training for the graduates of the schools in the study. The graduates who attended some type of higher institutions were divided in two groups. The first group contained graduates attending colleges and universities. The second group contained those other types of post-high school institutions. The two groups were then combined to determine mean grade points for all graduates

attending higher institutions.

Other measures secured were the opinion and ratings of high school programs by those graduates not continuing their formal education. These ratings were secured by means of a questionnaire.

All of these factors were then correlated with the ratings made on the "Evaluative Criteria" scales by the visiting NCA Committee.

All statistical tests of comparisons between the NCA Visiting Committee evaluations and the four variables previously listed were made by product-moment correlations. The .05 level of significance was used.

None of the correlations between the NCA Committee ratings on the "Evaluative Criteria" and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development was large enough to retain the hypothesis that a significant positive relationship exists between them. All were rejected at the .05 level of significance.

There were no significant correlations at the .05 level between the committee ratings and the grade point average of graduates in their first grading period.

Also, the correlation between the committee evaluations and the cost per pupil was not large enough to retain at the .05 significance level.

The correlations made between the committee evaluation

and the ratings made by students not continuing their formal education were significant in the areas of activity program, the social studies program, the social studies physical facilities, and the mathematics physical facilities but in all the other areas (library, guidance, English, mathematics, science, etc.) the correlations were not significant.

The conclusions reached by this study were that the "Evaluative Criteria" as used in the evaluations studied is not sufficient in itself as an instrument to evaluate the quality of the total high school program. More study is needed to determine if the fault lies in the instrument itself or the way it is used (5).

To judge the adequacy of the "Evaluative Criteria" by this study alone would be very unfair to those who have spent many long hours revising and upgrading the form and to date it is the best single instrument available for evaluating schools.

In 1954-55 Ely (6) obtained opinions of teachers regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as it was applied in the self-evaluation of their respective schools. His findings were:

1. Approximately 80 percent of the teachers believed that the self-evaluation resulted in benefits to them as teachers. The most frequently mentioned benefits were self-evaluation and self-analysis, increased knowledge of

the total school program and encouragement for self-improvement.

2. Approximately 88 percent of the teachers felt it resulted in definite benefits to their school. The most frequently mentioned benefits to the schools were acquisition of needed physical facilities, addition of needed personnel, and an increased awareness of school needs by school board members and citizens in the community.

3. Very few teachers identified undesirable effects of the self-evaluation either on the teacher or on the school.

Cawelti's study, made through the auspices of the North Central Association in 1968, concerned the reaction of administration to school evaluations. The study was started in November, 1968, by asking the administrators of all member schools who had been evaluated between September, 1965, to June, 1968, to complete an 11 question survey. The total population (schools visited during this period) was 1,409. Response to all questions, except one--#9, exceeded 1,020, averaging about 75 percent.

(Question #9 received a 63 percent return. Most respondents who did not answer this question indicated not enough time had elapsed to determine what aspect of the school's operation benefited most from the evaluation.)

Because of the unusually large numbers of total respondents to this study, it would appear considerable

confidence can be placed in its findings. However, it is good to remember that it represents the self-reporting of attitudes and judgments on the part of building administrators alone. This factor must be recognized in determining the validity of the study. However, the presumptions of the building administrator are central to whatever ultimate effects the evaluation process may have upon the school; hence the findings of this study are of significance to the North Central Association.

The following conclusions were reached by Cawelti (7):

1. Teachers on the whole became highly involved and fully engaged in the school evaluation process. Greater efforts, however, seem to be needed to acquaint them with the general purposes and specific values of school evaluation.

2. There is broad room for improvement in the format and language of the evaluation instruments. More flexibility and adaptability need to be provided within evaluation guidelines. (The revised edition of both major instruments may satisfy this need somewhat.)

3. Visiting teams need to develop more thorough, more adequate on-site procedures. Some aspects of the school are well covered in evaluation, while others are being scanted. This would suggest more adequate training of visiting team chairman, as well as more thoughtful selection

of team members to bring a greater breadth of expertise to the task.

4. In general, visiting teams are focusing their attention and efforts on the crucial factors within the school. The work of the visiting team is not an essay into triviality; to the contrary, it addresses itself to major concerns.

5. The working rapport between teachers and team members is sound. It is evident the visitors bring a highly professional attitude to the task of school evaluation. It is equally evident that teachers too approach team members with highly positive attitude. This would indicate that extramural evaluation is neither considered an external, extraneous inspection nor perceived as posing a threat to the staff of the school.

6. School evaluation has an appreciable and salutary impact on the school's operation, primarily and most directly on the instructional program. Instructional procedures and teacher attitudes are affected positively by school evaluation, at least as seen by building administrators.

7. School evaluation is helpful in assisting a staff to classify and to more realize its goals. An important fall-out is the enhanced professionalization and the broadened insights gained by the faculty, particularly

during the self-study stage.

8. The desirability of a follow-up review of the school's progress toward improvement at some stated period after the evaluation is still an open question. However, a sufficiently large number of principals endorse this idea, at least partially, to warrant its serious consideration by the Commission on Secondary Schools.

9. The need for an early and continuing orientation of the faculty and the administration of the school to be evaluated is pressing. Too many schools are plunged into the evaluation process with the most slender understanding of what it signifies and with a dearth of experienced personnel to provide direction to the school's early, and frequently fumbling, efforts. The Commission should consider the provision of a consultant who would work cooperatively with the principal and the staff of the school from the preliminary stages through the implementation phase.

10. The sharp variations in both the length and the nature of self-evaluations by NCA schools would suggest the development of some minimal common requirements for all member schools undergoing the process. It is vital the individual school be permitted as much local autonomy as feasible, but there may be minimum procedures that should be imposed on all schools to guarantee effective evaluation.

11. A "fortiori", the same statement can be made about the conditions under which the visiting team functions. While broad range should be granted for local and state options, it would seem that the size of the team, the length of the visit, and certain critical procedures and operations require closer definition if all school evaluations are to achieve maximum results.

In a study made by Hahn (8) of the evaluation of 35 Oregon schools in 1955, it was found:

1. Most principals and teachers agreed it was a good venture for their schools. Twenty-one principals agreed while only 2 said no, and 169 teachers agreed while only 16 said it was not beneficial.

2. 1914 recommendations for improvement were made by the investigators and local staff.

3. Fifty-eight and one-tenth percent were implemented within one year and 73 percent has been implemented with a three year period.

In 1969, Richmond (9) made a study of the effect of accrediting agencies on the improvement of instruction in Ohio. The data were obtained by direct-mail questionnaire to a probability sample of 100 Ohio public high schools. The study covered the on-site evaluation during 1965-66 and 1968-69 by the State Department of Education and 1962-63 and 1968-69 by the North Central Association. A 68 percent

response was received.

The major findings of the study were:

1. Agencies recognize a variety of techniques for accreditation.
2. Paralleling of data for technique and frequency may have implications for combination of structure in Ohio.
3. Data indicate there has been a lack of consistent evaluation policy by the State Department of Education; however, the 1968-69 pace, if maintained, should insure on-site visits during a four-year period.
4. Ohio North Central schools show progress in implementation of a seven-year evaluation interval; however, further increase in activity seem desirable.
5. Extensive deviation from North Central recommendations for length of on-site visit.
6. A number of Ohio high schools demonstrated originality in conduct of on-site visits related to State standards.
7. Composition of North Central evaluation teams generally follows recommendations for breadth and variety.
8. Little discernible pattern to on-site procedures of the State Department of Education, and recommendations of the agency are not a logical extension.
9. North Central on-site procedures show a definite pattern, with recommendations as a logical extension.

10. Recommendations of the agencies are generally not considered as imperative by principals shown by a reported average implementation rate of "about one-half".

11. Evaluative visits result in improvement of instruction, but described as "moderate".

12. Data are supportive of a hypothesis that schools generally desire an effective and broadly-based kind of evaluation.

It is interesting to note that although the study was designed to bring out the effect of evaluation on the improvement of instruction the only conclusion that was designated was "moderate". In order to fully understand the effect of evaluation, one would have to know the researcher's definition of moderate.

Also, the implementation of recommendations as "about one-half" could range from about 30 percent to at least 65 percent dependent on the imaginative qualities of the reader. It appears this study answered many other questions rather than the real question of the effect of evaluations upon the improvement of instruction (9).

Boersma (10) conducted a study, 1967, concerning the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria, 1960 Edition, as a stimulus for school improvement in 11 Michigan high schools. Teachers were asked to state their presumptions concerning: (1) the statement of school philosophy and

objectives, (2) course objectives and course of study, (3) curriculum planning, (4) knowledge of the school program, (5) self-evaluation of teaching performance. The teachers were also asked to judge the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria.

In 11 high schools which completed the Evaluative Criteria, 383 teachers served as the experimental group; 131 teachers in four high schools which had not completed the Evaluative Criteria for at least ten years served as the control group. Two questionnaires were administered to teachers in both experimental and control schools. Part I and Part II of both questionnaires were identical for teachers in both experimental and control schools. The second questionnaire for teachers in experimental schools also obtained teachers' judgments regarding the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria.

The change in responses by teachers in experimental schools was compared with the change in responses by teachers in control schools in an attempt to determine the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement. The chi-square method of statistical analysis was employed to determine the significance of the change in responses. No change was considered as significant unless P (probability) measured .05 or less.

1. Teachers perceived themselves as increasingly

familiar with the written philosophy and objectives of their high school.

2. The teachers felt there was increased discussion and agreement by the faculty regarding the philosophy and specific objectives of their high school program.

3. The teachers attached increasing importance to the need for their high school to employ a written, carefully formulated, comprehensive philosophy of education with specific objectives.

4. The teachers increasingly employed written course objectives for the courses they teach.

5. The teachers felt there was an increase in their ability to assess the quality of the total educational program in their high school.

6. The teachers attached increasing importance to the effect of their knowledge of the total educational program on the quality of their teaching performance.

He also concludes (10, p. 69): "Thus, if the questionnaire accurately measured teachers' judgments relative to the five areas of the educational program included in this study, and if the teachers' judgments can be interpreted as correct, then little evidence is presented in support of the Evaluative Criteria as a stimulus for school improvement in the eleven experimental schools of this study."

Up to the present time the need to clearly research the problem of implementing the recommendations of a visitation committee has not appeared to be prevalent in the annals of educational research. Most of the research has been done in the area of the effectiveness the Evaluative Criteria in school evaluations with very little research in the area of implementation. Implementation of the recommendations is crucial to the whole idea of evaluation because without implementation, the time and money expended is mostly wasted and not a sound educational investment.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

To measure the effectiveness of North Central Associations visitations to member high schools, it is necessary to know what schools have been evaluated and what recommendations were made to each individual school. Each school receives several copies of the committee's recommendation and a copy is filed with the state chairman of the North Central Association. In Iowa, the state chairman is Wendell C. Borsema, College of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. Permission was granted by Dr. Borsema to obtain a copy of the written report sent to each Iowa school evaluated during the 1967-68 school year.

Although roughly one-seventh of the Iowa NCA schools are evaluated every year, a study of this kind could involve many years and many schools. This study is limited to the schools visited during the 1967-68 school year for the following reasons:

1. To limit the number of schools to a workable number.
2. Recommendations implemented after a two year period may result from other factions and pressures not related to the recommendations of the visiting committee.

Only the recommendations concerning space, people, process, and things as related to each school are included

in this study. The space area will deal with all recommendations made to each school concerning the changing of the schools facilities such as remodeling, replacing, or additions to the present building.

The people area deals with recommendations concerning the additions or deletions of staff members; administrators, teachers, clerical workers, custodians, and other non-artificial staff members.

The process area deals with the recommendations made to each school concerning the addition or deletion of subject matter and vocational courses.

The things area of the study includes each recommendation made by the visiting committee concerning the addition or replacement of school equipment.

To limit the study to these four areas it is necessary to exclude recommendations such as "a study should be made", "the seating arrangement would be better if change to", "move the pencil sharpener", etc. To include all recommendations made would make the scope of the study too broad. Space, persons, process, and things includes the most important recommendations made to each individual school.

A letter of introduction to the study was sent from Richard P. Manatt, College of Education, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, to each high school principal. The main purpose of this letter was to introduce the idea of

the study to the principal and to ready him for the questionnaire that will follow.

With the questionnaire, a cover letter was sent in the name of Iowa State University asking each principal to complete the questionnaire concerning his school as soon as possible.

Each written visitation report made to each school was analyzed and the appropriate recommendations were listed on a questionnaire. Although the general format of the questionnaire is the same for all schools, each questionnaire includes the recommendations made to that particular school. Each questionnaire was mailed to the appropriate high school principal. Each principal completed the questionnaire answering yes or no to the question, "Has this recommendation been implemented and is now in effect in the school system?"

It is well to note here the high school principal in charge with the responsibility for educational leadership in his school. The assumption is made that his answers to the questions should be accepted as a valid indication of the effectiveness of the evaluative structure as it affects his school.

Also the question, "Do you agree with the recommendation?" was asked. The purpose of this question is to determine whether or not a visitation group has the ability

to grasp an acute awareness of a particular situation in a school system with the same degree of ability as a high school principal who is well acquainted and knowledgeable about the school system.

When the questionnaires were returned, they were tabulated according to space, people, process, things, and agreement to the recommendations. Tabulations in each area included:

1. number of recommendations made,
2. number of recommendations implemented,
3. a summary of agreement or disagreement with the recommendations.

Also, a tabulation was made concerning:

1. the total number of recommendations,
2. the total number implemented,
3. the total number agreed with,
4. the total number disagreed with,
5. why the recommendations were not implemented.

In addition to the above tabulations, a listing was made of all schools included in the study identifying the enrollment of the school, the number of members on the visitation committee and the total number of recommendations made to each school. No attempt was made to relate these particular items and it is presented only to show the variance in size of school, size of the visitation

committee, and the total number of recommendations made to the school. This information was obtained from the written reports of the visitation committee sent to each school.

The following letter is a copy of the introductory letter to the study.

Mr. Clark Stevens
High School Principal
Nevada Community High School
Nevada, Iowa

Dear Mr. Stevens:

This letter is to introduce you to a study being made by one of our graduate students at Iowa State University. The study will involve your school and some of your time and I trust we can count on you to help us complete the study.

The study is concerned with the effectiveness of the North Central Association Evaluation program and uses the technique of asking if certain recommendations made have been implemented in your school system. Only the recommendations concerned with space, people, process, and things will be included in the questionnaire.

I feel this study will make a contribution to the field of education and especially will be beneficial to the Iowa North Central Association schools.

Thank you very much for your contribution of time and effort in this matter.

Have a pleasant and successful school year.

Sincerely,

Richard P. Manatt
Associate Professor and
Chairman of Educational
Administration
College of Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

The following cover letter and questionnaire is a sample of the questionnaire that was mailed to each school.

Mr. Clark Stevens
High School Principal
Nevada Community High School
Nevada, Iowa

Dear Mr. Stevens:

Please find attached a questionnaire concerning recommendations made by the North Central Evaluation Committee for your school by their visitation during the 1967-68 school year. The recommendations are concerned with space, people, process, and things as related to your school and we can ask your cooperation in completing the questionnaire and returning it in the enclosed envelope.

This study is being made under the auspices of the College of Education, Iowa State University and has the approval of Wendell Baersma, Chairman, Iowa North Central Association. Richard P. Manatt, Associate Professor of Education is the faculty representative supervising the study. The study is necessary to complete the requirements of a Doctor of Philosophy degree and your willingness to participate is deeply appreciated.

There will be no identification of any school included in the study.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Leonard L. Gustafson
Graduate Student
College of Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Richard P. Manatt
Associate Professor and
Chairman of Educational
Administration
College of Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

Changes effected by
North Central Association
Visitations to
Iowa High Schools
1967-1968

Iowa State University
College of Education
Ames, Iowa

Questionnaire

Section D. Program of Studies

1. Clerical persons should be employed to help prepare instructional materials.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

2. Add courses for noncollege pupils.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section D-1. Vocational Agriculture

1. Discontinue the Vocational Agriculture Program.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost ()
 Worthiness ()
 Practicability ()
 Other ()

2. Add agriculture to the curriculum.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost ()
 Worthiness ()
 Practicability ()
 Other ()

Section D-2. Art

1. Enlarge room with more in-room storage.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost ()
 Worthiness ()
 Practicability ()
 Other ()

2. Room needs a walk-in storage area.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost ()
 Worthiness ()
 Practicability ()
 Other ()

Section D-3. Business Education and Distributive Education

1. Remove book wall to enlarge room and install a glass partition.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

2. A course in general business should be added for ninth and tenth grade students.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

3. Six 10-key adding machines should be purchased.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

Section D-6. Driver Education

Section D-7. English

1. Appoint a department chairman and give him release time.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

2. Continue the special communication course through tenth and eleventh grades.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

3. Expand library facilities.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

4. Expand the number of books in library.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

Section D-8. Foreign Language

1. Purchase filmstrips, tapes, books, periodicals, and newspapers.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

2. Make the adjoining room available for conversational Spanish.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

Section D-9. Health Education and Health Services

1. Add a planned program of sequential units in health education to the present curriculum.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

2. Add a staff member to teach health.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

Section D-10. Home Ec

1. Redecorate the department.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

2. Replace drapes in sewing room.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

3. Offer a course for senior girls that has no pre-requisite.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }
If No		
Cost	{ }	
Worthiness	{ }	
Practicability	{ }	
Other	{ }	

4. Electric range should be replaced.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }
If No		
Cost	{ }	
Worthiness	{ }	
Practicability	{ }	
Other	{ }	

5. Install a demonstration table with a mirror.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }
If No		
Cost	{ }	
Worthiness	{ }	
Practicability	{ }	
Other	{ }	

6. A plan should be initiated to purchase new tableware, dinnerware, and small equipment.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section D-11. Industrial Arts

1. Add several one semester courses to promote greater flexibility.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

2. Add courses of electricity, electronics, auto mechanics.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

3. Increase the staff members from 1.4 to two teachers.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section D-12. Mathematics

1. Add a second course in general mathematics.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

2. Add a course for college bound students who are not math orientated.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

3. Add a one-semester course for juniors and seniors.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

4. Calculus should not be taught at this time.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section D-13. Music

1. Add music course for nonperformers.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

2. Add music course for the gifted music students.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

3. Add course allied with fine arts.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost ()
 Worthiness ()
 Practicability ()
 Other ()

4. Add the teaching of strings.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost ()
 Worthiness ()
 Practicability ()
 Other ()

5. Replace chairs in music room.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost ()
 Worthiness ()
 Practicability ()
 Other ()

6. Add an additional staff member.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost ()
 Worthiness ()
 Practicability ()
 Other ()

7. Appoint one teacher as department head and give release time.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section D-14. Physical Education

1. Secure more land for outdoor activities.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

2. Make more space available in the girls' gymnasium.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

3. Improve girls' shower and dressing facilities.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section D-15. Science

1. Grant release time to one person to coordinate the entire science program.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section D-16. Social Studies

1. One member of the staff should be made coordinator of the K-12 program and be given release time.

	Yes	No
Agree with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section D-17. Vocational Trade and Industrial Education

1. Classroom needs more storage space.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

2. The coordinator needs more time to assume his numerous responsibilities.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section E. Student Activity

Section F. Instructional Materials Service

1. Employ a full-time audio-visual specialist to coordinate the entire program.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

2. Employ a qualified clerk.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

3. Provide funds to bring library collection to the required size.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

4. The reading room needs individual study carrels.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

5. Storage facilities are needed.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

6. A work area with a sink is needed.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

Section G. Guidance Service

1. Clerical assistance is needed at the earliest possible time.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

2. Additional professional personnel are needed.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

3. Larger physical facilities are needed.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

Section I. School Plant

1. Many lockers needed to be repaired.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

2. Better lighting is needed in the auditorium for note taking.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

3. A centralized storage facility is needed.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

4. A rheostat should be installed at the speaker's stand.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

5. Remote control switches should be provided for the audio-visual equipment.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

6. The auditorium seats should have tablet arms.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	()	()
Implemented	()	()
Partially implemented	()	()

If No

Cost	()
Worthiness	()
Practicability	()
Other	()

7. A new cafeteria should be built.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

8. Build a new instructional materials center.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

Section J. School Staff and Administration

1. Professional assistance is needed in the superintendent's office.

	Yes	No
Agreed with recommendations	{ }	{ }
Implemented	{ }	{ }
Partially implemented	{ }	{ }

If No

Cost	{ }
Worthiness	{ }
Practicability	{ }
Other	{ }

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

General Findings: Space, People, Program, Things

During the 1967-68 school year 29 Iowa high schools were visited, evaluated and received a written report. Table 1 shows that these 29 schools received 2,625 recommendations that were concerned with space, people, program and things. The highest number any one school received was 129 and the least number of recommendations made in these four areas was 60. It is interesting to note the fewest recommendations were made to the largest school visited.

Table 1 also denotes the enrollments of each particular school. The enrollments range from 2,283 to 160.

Also, it is interesting to note the size of the visitation committee varied from 16 members to 29 members. However, the smallest visitation team did not visit the smallest high school nor did the largest visitation team go to the largest high school.

Table 1 also contains the number of recommendations made in each area. Recommendations concerning changes in program had the highest number, 878. Recommendations concerned with acquiring "things" for the school had the second highest number of 875. There were 555 recommendations concerned with space and 317 recommendations dealing with school personnel.

Table 1. School enrollments, visitation committee, recommendations

School	H.S. 1969 enrollment (9-12)	No. on visitation committee	Space	People	Program	Things	Total
A	731	21	36	16	33	44	129
B	643	18	14	17	35	16	82
C	843	22	26	23	27	24	100
D	496	23	19	13	29	32	93
E	446	19	15	13	35	30	93
F	289	17	20	17	22	13	72
G	498	19	27	16	48	28	119
H	537	21	11	6	45	18	80
I	394	17	19	12	25	25	81
J	2283	27	16	14	18	12	60
K	551	19	14	15	21	22	72
L	178	18	18	6	23	32	79
M	439	17	27	12	52	33	124
N	2151	21	22	8	37	12	79
O	685	23	23	5	21	23	72
P	273	23	28	8	28	45	109
Q	954	22	20	19	32	54	125
R	225	19	18	5	22	35	80
S	265	16	7	6	33	22	68
T	315	20	17	7	28	37	89
U	263	21	16	10	31	50	107
V	651	22	23	11	24	42	100
W	503	22	13	7	39	26	85
X	1715	29	22	8	36	24	90
Y	665	21	21	17	40	31	109
Z	253	21	12	5	22	33	72

Table 1. (Continued)

School	H.S. 1969 enrollment (9-12)	No. on visitation committee	Space	People	Program	Things	Total
A1	160	20	16	6	18	37	77
B1	175	17	21	8	27	41	97
C1	208	16	14	7	27	34	82
Totals			555	317	878	875	2625

In the space category, the lowest number of recommendations made to any one school was 8 which the highest number was 36.

In the area of people the number varied from a low of 5 to a high of 23.

Program improvement recommendations varied from a low of 18 to a high of 52. Additional materials and/or equipment varied from a low of 12 recommendations to a high of 54.

In no instance did the school with the lowest enrollment receive the least number of recommendations nor did the school with the highest enrollment receive the most recommendations.

Table 2 contains the data concerning the recommendations that pertained to space. The 29 schools had a total of 555; varying from a low of 7 made to one school to a high of 36.

In this area, the local high school principal agreed with 491 of the recommendations while disagreeing with 64.

In the matter of implementation, Table 2 shows that 181 recommendations have been implemented, 289 not implemented and 85 partially implemented.

For those recommendations not implemented, the cost factor was most often cited as the reason, a total of 149 instances. Not practicable was listed as a reason for non-implementation 84 times, worthiness 11 times, and other

Table 2. Recommendations--space

School and enrollment	No. on visitation team	No. of recommendations	Principal agrees	
			Yes	No
A 731	21	36	29	7
B 643	18	14	12	2
C 843	22	26	21	5
D 496	23	19	14	5
E 446	19	15	15	0
F 289	17	20	18	2
G 498	19	27	27	0
H 537	21	11	11	0
I 394	17	19	14	5
J 2283	27	16	12	4
K 551	19	14	13	1
L 178	18	18	15	3
M 439	17	27	26	1
N 2151	21	22	21	1
O 685	23	23	20	3
P 273	23	28	25	3
Q 954	22	20	20	0
R 225	19	18	16	2
S 265	16	7	2	5
T 315	20	17	17	0
U 263	21	16	15	1
V 651	22	23	22	1
W 503	22	13	11	2
X 1715	29	22	22	0
Y 665	21	21	19	2
Z 253	21	12	5	7
A1 160	20	16	14	2
B1 175	17	21	21	0
C1 208	16	14	14	0
Totals		555	491	64

Imple- mented		Partially imple- mented		Reason for not implementing			
Yes	No	Yes	No	Cost	Worthi- ness	Practi- cability	Other
13	14	9				14	
2	7	5		3		2	2
10	16			11	3	1	1
6	13			4	1	6	
2	13			11		1	
8	12			7		6	1
19	7	1		7		1	
2	5	4		3		2	
5	14			2		7	
2	7	7		3	3		
8	2	4		2		1	
6	6	6					
11	16			10		8	1
5	12	5		6			6
8	12	3		3	1	2	6
9	9	10		2		6	1
4	13	3		3		1	9
2	11	5		7		4	
2	5			2		3	
6	11			11	1	1	
6	8	2		4		4	
5	9	9		7		1	1
11	2			1		1	
1	15	6		12			3
4	15	2		8	1	6	
4	7	1		1	1	5	
8	6	2				1	5
7	13	1		10			3
5	9			9			
181	289	85		149	11	84	39

reasons totaled 39.

In the category space, there were 289 recommendations not implemented and only 283 reasons for not implementing. This discrepancy is due to the fact that although the recommendation was marked not implemented on the questionnaire no reason was marked.

Table 3 shows the breakdown of all the recommendations concerning people. This category contains certified and noncertified employees of the school district.

It is well to note here that persons are considered to be indivisible, yet there are 37 recommendations partially implemented. This data results from employing part-time help instead of full-time, thus the partially implemented recommendations. In this area the least number of recommendations were made; 317. Of these 317, the local principals agreed with 260 and disagreed with 57. In this area, 133 have been implemented, 146 not implemented, and as stated before, 37 partially implemented.

Again the cost factor was the most prevalent reason for not implementing the recommendation as it appears 88 times. Not being practical was listed 47 times as the reason not implemented, worthiness 9 times, and other reasons were listed 10 times.

Although the table shows only 146 recommendations not implemented, the total number of reasons given for not

Table 3. Recommendations--people

School and enrollment	No. on visitation team	No. of recommendations	Principal agrees		
			Yes	No	
A	731	21	16	10	6
B	643	18	17	13	4
C	843	22	23	17	6
D	496	23	13	11	2
E	446	19	13	11	2
F	289	20	17	17	0
G	498	27	16	15	1
H	537	11	6	6	0
I	394	19	12	9	3
J	2283	16	14	12	2
K	551	14	15	10	5
L	178	18	6	3	3
M	439	27	12	12	0
N	2151	22	8	8	0
O	685	23	5	5	0
P	273	28	8	7	1
Q	954	20	19	17	2
R	225	18	5	4	1
S	265	16	6	5	1
T	315	20	7	6	1
U	263	21	10	10	0
V	651	22	11	10	1
W	503	22	7	2	5
X	1715	29	8	7	1
Y	665	21	17	14	3
X	253	21	5	3	2
A1	160	20	6	4	2
B1	175	17	8	5	3
C1	208	16	7	7	0
Totals			317	260	59

Imple- mented		Partially imple- mented		Reason for not implementing			
Yes	No	Yes	No	Cost	Worthi- ness	Practi- cability	Other
7	7	4				6	1
6	8	3		6		1	1
6	17			9	4	4	
6	7			3		3	
2	11			6	1	4	
9	8			4	1	6	2
13	2	1		1		1	
1	4	1		4			
2	9	1		5	2	2	
11	2	1			1	1	
6	7	2		4		5	
1	4	1					
10	2			2			
7	1						1
5	0						
2	2	4		1		1	
10	5	4		3		5	2
1	2	2		1			1
3	1	2		1			
2	5			5			
2	9			9			
2	5					5	
2	0	5		1			
2	13	2		12		1	
1	2	2		2			
4	2					2	
3	4	1		2			2
4	2	1		2			
133	146	37		88	9	47	10

implementing totals 154. In this instance, the principals took the liberty of indicating on the questionnaire more than one reason for not implementing the recommendation.

Table 4 contains the data concerning the recommendations in the area of program of the school. Of the four areas, this area had the most recommendations, 878. Of the 878 recommendations, the local principals agreed with 729 while disagreeing with 144. Three hundred fifty-three recommendations have been implemented, 350 have not been put into effect, and 173 have been partially implemented.

In the program classification, not practical was listed 148 times as the reason for nonimplementation. Other reasons were listed 74 times, the cost factor 51 times, and worthiness was listed 49 times.

Once again the total reasons for nonimplementation are less than the number of recommendations not implemented. This discrepancy arises from the fact that some of the principals did not indicate the reason on the questionnaire.

Table 5 contains the information concerning the recommendations that have to do with materials and/or equipment the committee deemed necessary to improve the educational program. The recommendations in this category totaled 875. Of these 875 recommendations, 517 had been implemented, 176 partially implemented, and 180 not implemented. The least number of recommendations made in this area to any

Table 4. Recommendations--program

School and enrollment	No. on visitation team	No. of recommendations	Principal agrees		
			Yes	No	
A	731	21	33	20	13
B	643	18	35	28	7
C	843	22	27	22	5
D	496	23	29	19	10
E	446	19	35	33	2
F	289	17	22	19	3
G	498	19	48	42	6
H	537	21	45	43	2
I	394	17	25	22	3
J	2283	27	18	16	2
K	551	19	21	19	2
L	178	18	23	18	5
M	439	17	52	42	10
N	2151	21	37	35	2
O	685	23	21	17	4
P	273	23	28	25	3
Q	954	22	32	32	0
R	225	19	22	21	1
S	265	16	33	25	8
T	315	20	28	22	1
U	263	21	31	29	2
V	651	22	24	24	0
W	503	22	39	21	18
X	1715	29	36	35	1
Y	665	21	40	31	9
Z	253	21	22	12	10
A1	160	20	18	14	4
B1	175	17	27	23	4
C1	208	16	27	20	7
Totals			878	729	144

Imple- mented		Partially imple- mented		Reason for not implementing			
Yes	No	Yes	No	Cost	Worthi- ness	Practi- cability	Other
12	16	5			3	12	1
8	14	13		3	1	10	
15	12				2	7	3
13	16				2	10	1
19	16			3		9	3
8	13	1		3	1	5	3
28	18	2		8	2	2	
18	17	10		4		10	
11	3	11				1	
9	2	7			2		
10	6	5				3	
10	8	5					
18	29	5		4	4	15	3
12	16	9				2	13
5	14	2		3	2		9
18	7	3				3	4
9	8	15		3		5	2
9	4	9				3	2
11	8	12			2	6	
16	10	2		3	4	2	1
17	10	4		1	2	8	1
5	7	12		2			5
17	18	4		1	9	8	
18	4	14		1	1	1	1
8	29	3		10	2	12	4
3	12	7			4	6	2
4	8	6				4	4
10	16	1		1		3	11
12	9	6		1	6	1	1
353	350	173		51	49	148	74

Table 5. Recommendations--things

School and enrollment	No. on visitation team	No. of recommendations	Principal agrees	
			Yes	No
A 731	21	44	39	5
B 643	18	16	15	1
C 843	22	24	22	2
D 496	23	32	29	3
E 446	19	30	29	1
F 289	17	13	12	1
G 498	19	28	27	1
H 537	21	18	17	1
I 394	17	25	23	2
J 2283	27	12	12	0
K 551	19	22	20	2
L 178	18	32	28	4
M 439	17	33	32	1
N 2151	21	12	9	3
O 685	23	23	23	0
P 273	23	45	39	6
Q 954	22	54	54	0
R 225	19	35	34	1
S 265	16	22	18	4
T 315	20	37	36	1
U 263	21	50	50	0
V 651	22	42	42	0
W 503	22	26	22	4
X 1715	29	24	24	0
Y 665	21	31	25	6
Z 253	21	33	24	9
A1 160	20	37	34	3
B1 175	17	41	41	0
C1 208	16	34	30	4
Totals		875	810	65

Imple- mented		Partially imple- mented		Reason for not implementing			
Yes	No	Yes	No	Cost	Worthi- ness	Practi- cability	Other
30	8	6			1	6	1
4	1	11		2	1	13	3
21	3			1	1	1	
27	5			1	2	2	
24	6			4	1	1	
11	2					1	
22	5	1		2			
8	2	8		2			
15	5	5			1	2	
7	1	4		1			
16	4	2		1		4	
18	6	8					
25	4	4		2		3	
2	3	5		2		2	1
8	2	13		1			1
25	15	5		5	1	5	4
37	6	11		1		3	3
13	5	17		1		3	2
8	4	10		1	1	2	
28	8	1		6	1		1
27	18	5		17		1	
26	5	11		5			
20	3	3			2	2	
11	18	5		6			1
13	9	9		3	1	14	1
11	9	13		6	1	2	
13	10	14		4		3	2
28	11	2		5	1	1	4
19	12	3		9	2		1
517	180	176		88	17	71	25

one school was 12 and the highest number was 54.

The most common reason for nonimplementation was cost, not practical being second, other reasons third, and worthiness was least mentioned.

Although there were only 180 recommendations not implemented, the total number of reasons listed for nonimplementation was 201. Again, the local principals gave one or more reasons, in some instances, for nonimplementation.

Table 6 summarizes all of the recommendations and their implementation. There were a total of 2,625 recommendations made to the 29 schools in the areas of space, people, program, and things.

The local principals agreed with 2,290 recommendations and disagreed with 330. The total of these two figures is 2,620 which leaves only five recommendations not scored properly on the questionnaires. In fact, these five recommendations not marked can be attributed to one principal who failed to mark these items on his particular questionnaire.

The total number of recommendations implemented was 1,184 with 965 not implemented and 471 partially implemented.

Cost was the reason listed the most number of times for nonimplementation, a total of 376. Not being practical was the reason listed 359 times. Other reasons

Table 6. Summary of recommendations

Kind	Recommen- dations No.	Principals agree		Imple- mented		Partially imple- mented		Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Cost	Worthi- ness	Practica- bility	Other
Space	555	491	64	181	289	85	0	149	11	84	39
People	317	260	57	133	146	37	0	88	9	47	10
Program	878	729	144	353	350	173	0	51	49	148	74
Things	875	810	65	517	180	176	0	88	17	80	25
Total	2,625	2,290	330	1,184	965	471	0	376	86	359	148

totaled 148 and worthiness of the recommendations was listed as the reason for nonimplementation 86 times. The total number of reasons for nonimplementation totals 969 which is 4 more than the total number of recommendations not implemented again indicating the principal indicated more than one reason in most instances.

Table 7 contains the percentage figures for agreement. The percent of agreement in the area of space was 88.46 percent, people 82.01 percent, program 83.02 percent, and things 92.57 percent.

Table 8 contains the percentage of implementation by the local schools in the four areas. The classification things had the highest percentage of implementation, 59.08 percent. Recommendations concerning people were implemented at a 41.95 percent level. Changes, additions, or deletions to the program of the school were implemented at a rate of 40.20 percent. Recommendations in the area of space were least implemented with a percentage of 32.61.

Table 9 lists the recommendations partially implemented. Things had an implementation rate of 20.11 percent; program, 19.70 percent; space, 15.31 percent; and people, 11.67 percent.

The total rate of implementation is shown on the bottom line of Table 8. Of the total number of recommendations made 45.10 percent have been implemented, 36.76

Table 7. Percentage of recommendations agreed with

Recommendation	No. of recommendations	No. agreed	No. not agreed	% agreed	% Not agreed
Space	555	491	64	88.46	11.53
People	317	260	57	82.01	17.98
Program	878	729	144	83.02	16.40
Things	875	810	65	92.57	7.42
Totals	2,625	2,290	330	87.23	12.57

Table 8. Percentage of recommendations implemented

Recommendation	No. of recommendations	No. implemented	No. not implemented	% Implemented	% Not implemented	% Partially implemented	Total
Space	555	181	289	32.61	52.07	15.31	99.99
People	317	133	146	41.95	46.05	11.67	99.67
Program	878	353	350	40.20	39.86	19.70	99.76
Things	875	517	180	59.08	20.57	20.11	99.76
Total	2,625	1,184	965	45.10	36.76	17.94	99.80

Table 9. Percentage of recommendation partially implemented

Recommendation	No. of recommendation	Partially implemented	% Partially implemented
Space	555	85	15.31
People	317	37	11.67
Program	878	173	19.70
Things	875	176	20.11
Total	2,625	471	17.94

have not been implemented, and 17.94 percent have been partially implemented.

In response to the question, "Do NCA Evaluation recommendations improve the educational offerings and content of the curriculum?" the 29 principals responded in the following manner:

1. Four principals gave no answer.
2. Seven principals answered "yes".
3. Eighteen principals wrote the following statements:

"It has been a great help to us, as you can see, we have implemented many of the suggestions made by the visiting committee. Most of the recommendations that we have not followed are due to our physical plant, and are just not practical to do at this time."

"Yes, when recommendations are sound and the school district is concerned about education the changes will be made. We feel that we improved our program and facilities in light of the 1967-68 report."

"Too much time is concerned with the physical plant, equipment, added personnel and other physical items and not enough time is given to specific things in course area (content, methods, etc.). I am sure that the addition of equipment and personnel will improve the total program, yet I feel the evaluations should be more in area of curriculum content and methods."

I would have to agree however the NCA evaluations do help in the total improvement."

"The NCA evaluation recommendations lend credence to the self-evaluation process and in this way improve the educational offerings and content of the curriculum."

"Yes--In this day and age, or time in state of Iowa, we need help to convince patrons of need. In our own case, I found it to be very helpful, NOT as an ax but a tool."

"Yes, definitely."

"I would presume they do--however in our case the improvements were needed--a change in superintendents brought them about.

More are needed--bond issue for new high school has failed three times.

I do not feel that in our community the NCA recommendations are much of a factor so far as the taxpayer is concerned. NCA is important to most educators--carries little weight otherwise so far as the public is concerned.

It may have considerably more value in prestige schools or more elite school districts--in rural Iowa I question the influence NCA has unless the administration can do a good selling job to the board on its merits.

I believe we did this."

"To some extent but most of our changes came when we went from a traditional schedule to a modular schedule approach."

"Yes. The answers to this questionnaire indicate that NCA evaluation has affected and improved some of the offerings at our school. The guidelines of the 67-68 report are being used now to help revise curriculum."

"In my opinion, yes. Our problem has been to obtain the support of the Sup't. and thus the Board of Ed. to make the changes. We have improved our curriculum content and offerings, but since we have been turned down on remodeling and schedule changes our program is not as effective as it could be. We lack an instructional materials center and places for students to do independent study. In my opinion, it is practically impossible to change method of teaching and to really improve curriculum unless the job is completely finished by providing the needed physical facilities.

Opinions stated under reasons for not being implemented our (sic) obviously mine--others might say it is cost."

"I felt we used these to help up-grade our program and facilities. We have used these recommendations several times since evaluation.

Really question NCA's power.

Believe some people on evaluation team do not understand their purpose. They feel they are to improve their own working situation instead of considering the total situation in the school they visit, and then make concrete suggestions. It did, in general, have good affects in our school."

"N.C.A. Evaluation recommendations in themselves do not improve the educational offerings and content of the curriculum.

I view the recommendations as one important management tool to assist in making management decisions that will result in the improvement of instruction through such things as improved educational offerings and curriculum content, etc."

"We believe they do. In 1968, the year of the evaluation, we offered 55 courses, mostly 2-semester. For 1971-72, we will offer 92 courses--several departments, especially English and art, have gone completely to semester courses. Home economics is phasing this way as is business education. Quality has also risen. We are on the threshold of being "comprehensive"--course offerings for all students."

"Most recommendations made by the N.C.A. or other educational consultants are to help the school do a better job in all areas. Of course, if these recommendations are not carried out, the evaluations made, time spent, is a lost cause."

"In our case, not much!"

"Yes, when financially (sic) feasible and practical based on personnel and facilities."

"Definitely. One of the chief values is in the staff's evaluation and consideration of what exists and what could and should be done to improve the staff, processes, structures, and material.

The NCA gives reinforcement from an independent group outside the community in a more or less objective manner to the analyses and recommendations on a continuous basis by the people in the school system who constantly seek to bring about improvement of educational opportunities for each young person studying in the school."

"To a degree, yes. The visiting committee is at a disadvantage due to the limited time it is involved in evaluating a school. It is my belief that our faculty did a good job on the self-study. The visiting committee confirmed this and generally agreed with the shortcomings and recommendations of our self-study. We have attempted to implement as many curriculum changes which were recommended. However, this does take time. The report of the visiting committee does carry weight so has had a positive effect with the faculty and Board of Ed."

Of the 25 principals that responded to the question only one indicated the evaluation process and the recommendations made were of little value in the improvement of the educational program of his particular school

Findings by Subject Area

Tables 10 through 36 summarize the recommendations made in the individual subjects or areas as found in the written reports sent to the individual schools. Each table includes all the recommendations made to the 29 schools included in the study. It is important to note, however, that all areas or subjects are not found in all of the schools.

Table 10 contains the summary of all the recommendations made in the general area of the academic program of the high school. Most of the recommendations, 89, are concerned with the program of the school, but also found in this area were 4 recommendations that dealt with space, 11 that referred to persons, and 3 that referred to things. Of the total of 107 recommendations made in this area, 26 were implemented, 39 were not implemented, and 42 were partially implemented. The reason listed the most times for nonimplementation was practicability with the cost factor being the next highest reason.

In the area of agriculture, only 19 schools out of the 29 reported have a program. Table 11 shows 96

Table 10. Subject matter area of program of studies, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Cost	Reason for not implementing		
		Yes	No	Yes	No			Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	4	3	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	1
People	11	11	0	4	5	2	3	0	3	0
Program	89	81	8	21	31	37	6	9	17	5
Things	3	3	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0
Total	107	98	9	26	39	42	10	9	21	6
Percent 100		91.58	8.41	24.30	36.44	39.25				

Table 11. Subject matter area of agriculture, 19 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	24	22	2	5	13	6	4	1	7	2
People	8	5	3	3	5		3	3	1	
Program	27	20	7	9	11	7		3	4	2
Things	37	34	3	21	9	7	2	2	4	1
Total	96	81	15	38	38	20	7	9	16	5
Percent	100	84.37	15.62	39.58	39.58	20.83				

recommendations were made with an implementation rate of 39.58 percent. The reason listed most times for not implementing the recommendations was practicability.

Twenty-seven out of the 29 schools indicated a program in art. Out of the 135 recommendations made 48.14 percent have been implemented as shown in Table 12. In this area the cost factor was listed the most times as the reason for nonimplementation.

Table 13 is concerned with the recommendations in the field of business education. All 29 schools reported a program in this area. Of the 159 recommendations made, 48.42 percent had been implemented with the practical aspect (18), the cost factor (17), and other reasons (15) as why the recommendation had not been implemented.

Table 14 deals with the recommendations made in the area of distributive education. Only 7 out of the 29 schools reported having a program. Of the 19 recommendations made in this area, 47.36 percent have been implemented with "other" reasons listed the most times for nonimplementation.

Table 15 shows 26 out of the 29 schools having a driver's education program. Forty-two out of the 83 recommendations made have been implemented with the cost factor being the reason listed the most times for nonimplementation.

Table 12. Subject matter area of art, 27 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	28	25	3	11	14	3	6	1	6	4
People	15	12	3	1	11	3	7	1	5	0
Program	30	24	6	15	12	3	1	1	5	9
Things	62	60	2	38	12	12	6	2	2	4
Total	135	121	14	65	49	21	20	5	18	17
Percent	100	89.62	10.39	48.14	36.29	15.55				

Table 13. Subject matter area of business education, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	21	20	1	6	9	6	5	0	1	2
People	7	5	2	5	2	0	0	0	1	1
Program	61	48	13	27	30	4	2	5	12	10
Things	70	65	5	39	18	13	12	3	4	2
Total	159	138	21	77	59	23	17	8	18	15
Percent	100	86.79	13.20	48.42	37.10	14.46				

Table 14. Subject matter area of distributive education, 7 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	4	4	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
People	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program	9	7	2	3	5	1	0	1	0	4
Things	6	6	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total	19	17	2	9	5	5	0	1	0	4
Percent	100	89.47	10.52	47.36	26.31	26.31				

Table 15. Subject matter area of driver education, 26 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	13	13	0	4	7	2	5	0	1	1
People	8	4	4	4	4	0	3	0	1	0
Program	23	20	3	10	7	6	4	0	3	2
Things	39	37	2	24	6	9	5	0	3	1
Total	83	74	9	42	24	17	17	0	8	4
Percent	100	89.15	10.84	50.60	28.91	20.48				

All schools reported having an English program and 130 recommendations were made in this area. Table 16 indicates 55.38 percent of the recommendations have been adopted with the cost factor the main reason for non-implementation.

Table 17 lists the recommendations made in the subject area of foreign language. Of the 11 recommendations made 47.74 percent have been implemented with the practical aspect of the recommendation listed the most times for nonimplementation.

Only 18 schools out of the 29 listed a program in health education. Only 42 recommendations were made in this area with a 40.47 percent implementation rate (Table 18). Not practical was the reason listed the most times for the nonimplementation.

The data found in Table 19 refers to the subject area of Home Economics. All 29 schools have a program in this area and out of the 156 recommendations made, 51.92 percent have been implemented. Not practical was listed 41 times out of the 62 recommendations not implemented as the the reason for nonimplementation.

Table 20 shows 28 out of the 29 schools as having a program in industrial arts. Out of the 188 recommendations made in this area, 44.68 percent have been implemented with the cost factor the most listed reason

Table 16. Subject matter area of English, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	12	12	0	5	5	2	2	0	2	2
People	9	9	0	6	2	1	1	0	1	0
Program	75	64	11	34	30	11	12	6	8	3
Things	34	33	1	27	2	5	2	0	0	0
Total	130	118	12	72	39	19	17	6	11	5
Percent	100	90.76	9.23	55.38	30.00	14.61				

Table 17. Subject matter area of foreign language, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	10	9	1	4	5	1	2	0	3	1
People	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	1	0
Program	30	24	6	9	16	5	2	3	5	8
Things	69	64	5	40	15	14	7	1	5	2
Total	111	97	14	53	38	20	12	5	14	11
Percent	100	87.38	12.61	47.74	34.23	18.01				

Table 18. Subject matter area of health education, 18 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	3	3	0	0	3	0	1	0	2	0
People	6	6	0	2	4	0	3	0	1	0
Program	23	21	2	10	8	5	1	1	4	2
Things	10	10	0	5	1	4	0	0	1	0
Total	42	40	2	17	16	9	5	1	8	2
Percent	100	95.23	4.76	40.47	38.09	21.42				

Table 19. Subject matter area of home economics, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	17	14	3	10	7	0	2	0	5	1
People	7	3	4	3	4	0	0	1	3	0
Program	60	45	15	23	31	6	3	5	19	5
Things	72	65	7	45	20	7	9	0	14	0
Total	156	127	29	81	62	13	14	6	41	6
Percent 100		81.41	18.58	51.92	39.74	8.33				

Table 20. Subject matter area of industrial arts, 28 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple- mented		Partially imple- mented	Cost	Reason for not implementing		
		Yes	No	Yes	No			Worthi- ness	Practica- bility	Other
Space	69	62	7	22	35	12	15	2	7	7
People	8	8	0	4	4	0	4	0	0	1
Program	48	41	7	22	17	9	4	1	9	5
Things	63	57	6	36	10	17	3	1	3	3
Total	188	168	20	84	66	38	26	4	19	16
Percent 100		89.36	10.63	44.68	35.10	20.21				

for nonimplementation.

All 29 schools reported having a mathematics program as listed in Table 21. Eighty recommendations were made in the area with a 51.25 percent implementation rate. Not practical was given the most times as the reason for nonimplementation.

Table 22 shows 146 recommendations made in the area of music with an implementation rate of 43.83 percent. Again, not practical was the reason listed the most times for nonimplementation.

Tables 23, 24, and 25 refer to the area of physical education in the 29 schools. Eight schools reported boys and girls physical education as one program while 21 schools reported a separate program for boys and for girls. Table 23 shows 61 recommendations made for boys and girls with an implementation rate of 36.06 percent. Table 24 lists 121 recommendations for boys physical education with 42.97 percent implementation, and Table 25 lists an implementation rate of 29.62 percent for the 81 recommendations made in the area of girls physical education.

Only one school, Table 26, listed a program in the area of religion with four recommendations made and implemented at the rate of 25 percent.

Table 21. Subject matter area of mathematics, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	6	6	0	4	1	1	0	0	1	0
People	6	4	2	1	5	0	1	0	2	0
Program	35	23	12	13	20	2	4	4	9	3
Things	33	33	0	23	3	7	2	0	1	0
Total	80	66	14	41	29	10	7	4	13	3
Percent 100		82.50	17.50	51.25	36.25	12.50				

Table 22. Subject matter area of music, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	34	28	6	12	20	2	9	0	9	2
People	15	7	8	4	10	1	4	2	5	0
Program	50	39	11	21	22	7	3	3	13	2
Things	47	38	9	27	11	9	7	0	4	0
Total	146	112	34	64	63	19	23	5	31	4
Percent	100	76.71	23.28	43.83	43.15	13.01				

Table 23. Subject matter area of physical education for boys and girls, 8 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Cost	Reason for not implementing		
		Yes	No	Yes	No			Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	16	11	5	5	11	0	4	1	4	2
People	6	6	0	5	1	0	1	0	0	0
Program	28	21	7	9	13	7	1	1	9	2
Things	11	10	1	3	4	3	1	0	2	1
Total	61	48	13	22	29	10	7	2	15	5
Percent 100		78.68	21.31	36.06	47.54	16.39				

Table 24. Subject matter area of physical education for boys, 21 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	24	22	2	7	13	4	9	0	4	2
People	9	5	3	2	7	1	4	0	1	1
Program	53	51	2	23	17	13	3	4	3	3
Things	35	32	3	20	10	5	4	0	5	2
Total	121	111	10	52	46	23	20	4	13	8
Percent	100	91.73	8.26	42.97	33.01	19.00				

Table 25. Subject matter area of physical education for girls, 21 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	20	20	0	4	10	6	7	0	1	2
People	9	6	3	3	5	1	2	0	2	0
Program	39	33	6	12	19	8	2	0	6	7
Things	13	13	0	5	7	1	3	0	3	1
Total	81	72	9	24	41	16	14	0	12	10
Percent	100	88.89	11.11	29.62	50.61	19.75				

Table 26. Subject matter area of religion, 1 school

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
People	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Things	3	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
Total	4	4	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
Percent	100	100	0	25.00	0	75.00				

In the area of science, 150 recommendations were made to the 29 schools as shown in Table 27. The cost factor was listed the most times for nonimplementation and the adoption rate is shown as 53.33 percent.

Table 28 deals with the area of social studies. In this area 124 recommendations were made with an implementation rate of 40.32 percent. Reasons for nonimplementation were about equal in the four categories.

Table 29 shows only one school as having a program in special education with only three recommendations made.

Table 30 refers to vocational trades and industrial education. Six schools reported a program with only 15 recommendations. However, 66.66 percent of these recommendations have been implemented.

Table 31 is concerned with the student activity programs in the 29 schools. Fifty-three recommendations were made in this area and implemented at a rate of 45.28 percent. Not practical was listed the most times for nonimplementation.

Table 32 refers to the recommendations made in the area of instructional materials services, library and audiovisual. Out of the 170 recommendations made, 45.29 percent have been implemented with the cost factor the most frequent reason for nonimplementation.

There were 85 recommendations made to the 29 schools

Table 27. Subject matter area of science, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	23	18	5	8	11	4	4	0	3	3
People	3	2	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	0
Program	54	48	6	28	16	10	4	0	8	6
Things	70	62	8	44	19	7	12	1	5	5
Total	150	130	20	80	48	22	22	1	16	14
Percent	100	86.66	13.33	53.33	32.00	14.66				

Table 28. Subject matter area of social studies, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	3	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
People	5	5	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0
Program	55	40	15	12	33	10	6	7	9	10
Things	61	55	6	36	9	16	2	3	3	2
Total	124	102	22	50	46	28	10	10	12	12
Percent 100		82.25	17.74	40.32	37.09	22.58				

Table 29. Subject matter area of special education, 1 school

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
People	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Things	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Percent 100		66.67	33.33	66.67	33.33	0				

Table 30. Subject matter area of vocational trades and industrial education,
6 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
People	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Program	8	7	1	5	0	3	0	0	0	0
Things	6	6	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0
Total	15	14	1	10	0	5	0	0	0	0
Percent	100	93.33	6.66	66.66	0	33.33				

Table 31. Subject matter area of student activity program, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
People	6	5	1	2	3	1	1	0	1	1
Program	45	39	6	21	18	6	0	3	11	4
Things	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	53	46	7	24	22	7	1	3	13	5
Percent	100	86.79	13.20	45.28	41.50	13.21				

Table 32. Subject matter area of instructional materials services, library-audiovisual, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	33	28	5	12	20	1	9	1	6	3
People	33	30	3	15	13	5	10	0	2	0
Program	25	22	3	11	5	9	1	3	1	0
Things	79	74	5	39	19	21	10	2	4	1
Total	170	154	16	77	57	36	30	6	13	4
Percent	100	90.58	9.41	45.29	33.52	21.17				

in the area of guidance, Table 33. The cost factor was listed the most times for not adopting the recommendations. The implementation rate is shown to be 49.41 percent.

Only 26 schools reported in the area of health services. Fifty-nine recommendations were made in this area with an implementation rate of 40.67 percent, Table 34.

Recommendations concerning the school plant totaled 168, Table 35. Of these, only 36.30 percent had been implemented at the time of the study.

Table 36 is concerned with the recommendations in the area of staff and administration. Seventy-nine recommendations were made in this area but only 51 of them were concerned with people. The implementation rate is shown as 49.36 percent with the cost factor as the most listed reason for nonimplementation.

Table 37 summarizes all of the recommendations according to subject area.

Table 33. Subject matter area of guidance services, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Reason for not implementing			
		Yes	No	Yes	No		Cost	Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	16	13	3	3	11	2	8	2	0	1
People	36	32	4	19	9	8	5	1	1	1
Program	20	18	2	13	3	4	1	2	0	0
Things	13	12	1	7	3	3	0	0	1	2
Total	85	75	10	42	26	17	14	5	2	4
Percent	100	88.23	11.76	49.41	30.58	20.00				

Table 34. Subject matter area of health services, 26 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple- mented		Partially imple- mented	Cost	Reason for not implementing		
		Yes	No	Yes	No			Worthi- ness	Practica- bility	Other
Space	11	11	0	5	5	1	2	0	2	1
People	17	14	3	5	10	2	6	0	3	0
Program	18	16	2	7	10	1	4	0	9	0
Things	13	11	2	7	5	1	2	0	3	0
Total	59	52	7	24	30	5	14	0	17	1
Percent 100		88.13	11.86	40.69	50.84	8.47				

Table 35. Subject matter area of school plant, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Cost	Reason for not implementing		
		Yes	No	Yes	No			Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	126	112	14	39	69	17	43	4	17	13
People	8	6	2	3	5	1	1	0	2	0
Program	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Things	33	33	0	19	7	7	6	0	2	0
Total	168	151	17	61	82	25	50	5	21	13
Percent	100	89.88	10.11	36.30	48.80	14.88				

Table 36. Subject matter area of staff and administration, 29 schools

Kind	No.	Principal agrees		Imple-mented		Partially imple-mented	Cost	Reason for not implementing		
		Yes	No	Yes	No			Worthi-ness	Practica-bility	Other
Space	6	6	0	2	2	3	2	0	0	0
People	51	46	5	22	23	7	17	2	2	2
Program	17	15	2	12	3	0	1	0	1	1
Things	5	5	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	0
Total	79	72	7	39	29	11	20	2	4	3
Percent 100		91.13	8.86	49.36	36.70	13.92				

Table 37. Summary of findings by subject area

Subject	Schools	No. of recommenda- tions
Program of studies	29	107
Agriculture	19	96
Art	27	135
Business education	29	159
Distributive education	7	19
Driver education	26	83
English	29	130
Foreign language	29	111
Health education	18	42
Home economics	29	156
Industrial arts	28	188
Mathematics	29	80
Music	29	112
Physical education for boys and girls	8	61
Physical education for boys	21	121
Physical education for girls	21	81
Religion	1	4
Science	29	150
Social studies	29	124
Special education	1	3
Vocational trades and industrial education	6	15
Student activity program	29	53
Instructional material services	29	170
Guidance service	29	85
Health service	26	59
School plant	29	168
Staff and administration	29	79

Impl.	Recommendations				
	Not impl.	Part. impl.	% impl.	% Not impl.	% Part. impl.
26	39	42	24.30	36.44	39.25
38	38	20	39.58	39.58	20.83
65	49	21	48.14	26.29	15.55
77	59	23	48.42	37.10	14.46
9	5	5	47.36	26.31	26.31
42	24	17	50.60	28.91	20.48
72	39	19	55.38	30.00	14.61
53	38	20	47.74	34.23	18.01
17	16	9	40.47	38.09	21.42
81	62	13	51.92	39.74	8.33
84	66	38	44.68	35.10	20.21
41	29	10	51.25	36.25	12.50
64	63	19	43.83	43.15	13.01
22	29	10	36.06	47.54	16.39
52	46	23	42.97	38.01	19.00
24	41	16	29.62	50.61	19.75
1	0	3	25.00	0	75.00
80	48	22	53.33	32.00	14.66
50	46	28	40.32	37.09	22.58
2	1	0	66.67	33.33	0
10	0	5	66.67	0	33.33
24	22	7	45.28	41.50	13.21
77	57	36	45.29	33.52	21.17
42	26	17	49.41	30.58	20.00
24	30	5	40.67	50.84	8.47
61	82	25	36.30	48.80	14.88
39	29	11	49.36	36.70	13.92

CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem, as stated in Chapter I, was to investigate the implementation rate of recommendations made by a North Central Association visitation teams to the various local Iowa schools visited during the school year 1967-68.

As stated before, the local school district is notified by the state North Central Association chairman that the school will be visited for evaluation purposes and will ultimately be approved by the North Central Association as a member in good standing if recommended by the visitation committee.

In its process of evaluation, the committee makes recommendations for improvement in a written report sent to the local district and it has been generally assumed the recommendations will be implemented and the school will continue to be a member in good standing of the association.

This study concerned itself with the 29 Iowa schools visited during the 1967-68 school year. The study was limited to reviewing only the recommendations that had to do with space, people, program, and things as found in the written reports made to each local school.

It was found that 2,625 recommendations were made in the four areas specified. There were 555 recommendations concerned with space, 317 that referred to people, 878

that were made concerning the program of the school, and 875 were concerned with things needed by the local schools.

Of the 555 recommendations that had to do with space 181 had been implemented or 32.61 percent. Two hundred eighty-nine had not been implemented or 52.07 percent and 15.31 percent of the recommendations had been partially implemented.

The recommendations that involved people were 31 percent of the total recommendations. The number implemented was 133 or 41.95 percent, not implemented 146 or 46.05 percent and those partially implemented totaled 11.67 percent.

In the area of program, there were 878 recommendations of which 353 had been implemented or 40.20 percent. Three hundred and fifty had not been implemented or 39.86 percent and 19.70 percent were partially implemented.

Recommendations having to do with things numbered 875. In this area 59.08 percent had been implemented, 20.57 percent not implemented, and 20.11 percent partially implemented.

Of the total number of recommendations, 2,625, made to the 29 schools 45.10 percent had been implemented, 36.76 percent partially implemented, and 17.94 percent partially implemented since the school was visited during the 1967-68 school year.

The major reason given for nonimplementation was cost

listed 376 times. The reason of practicability or not being practical for the local school was listed 359 times for nonimplementation and the worthiness of the recommendation was given 86 times. Other reasons for nonimplementation totaled 148.

According to the high school principals whose schools were visited during the school year 1967-68, North Central Evaluations do improve the educational offerings and content of the curriculum. Seven principals answered yes to this question, 18 principals wrote statements of which 17 contained positive answers and 4 principals did not respond.

In the subject matter areas, the most recommendations were made in the area of industrial arts--188. Other areas with over 100 recommendations include instructional materials services-library and audiovisual--170, the school plant--168, business education--159, home economics--156, science--150, art--135, English--130, social studies--124, physical education for boys--121, music--112, foreign language--111, and program of studies--107.

The area having the least number of recommendations reported by all 29 schools was the student activity program listing only 53. Some of the other areas with a low number of recommendations were mathematics with 80 and guidance with 85.

Looking at the question of the similarity of recommenda-

tions made to each school, the examination of data shows in the area of space the recommendations varied from a low of 7 recommendations made to one school to 36 made to another school. The recommendations in the people area varied from a low of 5 to a high of 23; in program from 18 to 52, and things from a low of 12 to a high of 54. It is possible some of the recommendations are similar due to the fact the item being evaluated is a school, but each recommendation made is made for that particular school.

According to subject area, and limiting the areas to those reported by every school, English had the best implementation rate--55.38 percent with science at 53.33 percent, home economics--51.92 percent, mathematics--51.25 percent, guidance--49.41 percent, staff and administration--49.36 percent, business education--48.42 percent, foreign language--47.74 percent, instrumental materials--45.29 percent; student activity program--45.28 percent, music--43.83 percent, social studies--40.32 percent, school plant--36.30 percent, program of studies--24.30 percent.

Conclusions

It is apparent from the data that North Central Association evaluations do bring some improvement and make some changes for the betterment of the schools that are evaluated each year. Examination of the results indicate

that 45.10 percent of all recommendations were implemented and that 17.94 percent of all recommendations have been partially implemented. If these two totals are combined to include all recommendations that were partially or fully implemented, the total then becomes 63.04 percent. It is, however, somewhat unrealistic to include the partially implemented recommendations to determine the changes effected because the degree of implementation is not known. The partially implemented recommendations may vary from a 1 percent implementation to a 99 percent implementation and in scoring a questionnaire it would be very easy to mark the column partially implemented instead of not implemented if only very little progress had been made to adopt any one recommendation. Thus, it becomes apparent the implementation rate should be set at 45.10 percent to be meaningful.

While it is true that 45.10 percent of the recommendations have been implemented, it is also necessary to look at the time period that has elapsed since the recommendations were made to truly evaluate the effectiveness of the visitation.

In any visitation made by the North Central Association an oral report is given to the local school board and administrative staff as the last procedure of the evaluation team. This oral report is usually made by the chairman of

the visitation team and includes most of the recommendations that will be a part of the written report to the local school. By using this procedure, the local school is made aware of most of its shortcomings immediately and could take action to implement some of the recommendations within a very short time after the visitation.

This study has allowed three years to expire before inquiring about what recommendations had been implemented. If 45.10 percent of the recommendations were implemented over a three-year period it can be assumed that about 15 percent were implemented each year.

Also, it is generally assumed that most North Central Association schools are usually progressive in nature and usually have good forward-looking school board members and an administrative staff that is inclined to look for better ways to do things to improve the program of the school. If this assumption is correct, then the question becomes how much improvement would have been made without being visited by the evaluation committee. To improve a mere 15 percent each year is not a drastic improvement and a serious question can be asked if all the money spent, actual cash plus the paid time of the members of the team, can be justifiable expense to the taxpayers of the local districts.

In view of the above reasoning, the effectiveness of

the North Central Association visitations can be seriously questioned.

It is also interesting to note the part the principal plays in the actual implementation of the recommendations as well as the agreement between the principal and the visitation committee with regard to the recommendations.

This survey indicates that local principals, as a group of 29, agreed with the recommendations of the committee 87.23 percent of the time and disagreed 12.57 percent of the time. The data also show the reasons for nonimplementation. The cost reason was listed 376 times and practicability was listed as the reason 359 times.

It is possible that both the principal and the committee could agree on recommendations that would involve extra money to be spent and the decision to implement the recommendations would rest outside the jurisdiction of the principal as most people would agree this is of vital interest to the school board and the taxpayers of the district.

In the case of being practical, or the reason practicability, a very interesting comparison can be made. The data reveal that 12.57 percent of the recommendations made by the committee were not in agreement with the views of the high school principal. The data also show that 359 of the recommendations were not implemented because of

practicability. These 359 recommendations not implemented because of being not practical constitutes a 13.67 percent of the total recommendations. With a difference of only 1 percent between the percentage of recommendations not agreed with and those recommendations not thought to be practical, it appears the principal is highly relevant to what is and to what is not implemented.

In this same general area it can be stated the visitation team is quite effective in determining what needs to be done to improve the program of the school. While it is true the local staff members have prepared for the visitation committee by completing the Evaluative Criteria forms prior to the visitation, much can be said for the members of the committee in evaluating the local school. Usually, the first contact a member of the committee has with the local school and its program is when he is handed the evaluation booklet prepared by the local staff members. It is then his responsibility within a short two-to-three day stay to review all of the aspects of the school in his particular area, to evaluate the program as he sees it, and to make recommendations if found to be necessary to improve the local school.

This effectiveness of being able to judge, evaluate, and to recommend is shown by the 87.23 percent agreement factor of the principal to the recommendations made by the visitation committee.

Limitations

This study is limited because of the following reasons:

1. The study included schools that were visited during one year which limited the number of schools to 29. A longer period of time would have allowed more schools to be included in the study, thus making a larger sample.
2. The reliance of the data on the judgment of one individual per school. The study would have been better if time and money would have allowed the researcher to visit each individual school to investigate the status of each recommendation.
3. Limiting the study to recommendations that were concerned only with space, people, program and things left out some recommendations made to each school that could possibly alter the findings had they been included.
4. The method of tabulating the questionnaires would have been more accurate had a "print-out" card system been used and the tabulations made by a computer. The "by-hand" method makes the data as reliable as the reliability and effectiveness of the researchers.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in the interest of improving the evaluative process and the written reports sent to the local school.

1. More direction needs to be given to the members of the visitation team concerning what recommendations should appear where in the written report. It appears logical to find the recommendations pertaining to the improvement of the school building to be found only in the section given over to the school plant in the Evaluative Criteria. If recommendations pertaining to building and space requirements were found only in the school plant category there would be less chance of duplication of recommendations. For example, it appears more logical to have a recommendation such as, "The wall between the typing room and the machines room needs to be removed to improve the accessibility to the machines" belongs in the section entitled school plant than in the business education section.
2. It also appears logical to have all recommendations pertaining to school personnel appear in the section entitled staff and administration. This would avoid duplication of recommendations and

would give a clearer picture of the personnel needs of the school.

3. It is recommended the section, "Program of Studies" be only a review of the total educational program without any specific recommendations for any one subject area. The specific recommendations can appear in the other areas of the written report and only recommendations concerned with the overall program should be in this section.
4. If the visitation process is necessary for continued membership in the North Central Association and this has been the case in the past years, then it only seems logical a follow-up study should be made by the Association after the visitation to see if the recommendations made have been implemented. This process would improve the symbol of North Central Accreditation which stands for good schools and a good educational program. To merely recommend and not to investigate to see what has been done is almost the same as buying a new suit of clothes and then never wearing the suit. The natural question to follow is, "Why should the suit have been purchased in the first place?"
5. Only 18 schools out of the 29 schools surveyed reported a health education program. It is recom-

mended that health education be a requirement for North Central approval and that a school nurse be a member of the visitation team to study the health education program of every school that is evaluated.

6. In the area of special education it should be a requirement of the North Central Association to have every member school have these kind of services available for their students. The special education services could be available at the local level or on a regional basis.
7. It should be a requirement of the North Central Association to have every school report on their health services. Again, this area could be handled by a school nurse if she were a member of the visitation team.
8. It is recommended the oral report made at the end of the visitation to the school board and administrative staff be continued and expanded to include a written report. By having a written report, a greater emphasis would be placed on the conditions as found by the committee and would possibly place greater emphasis on the recommendations offered for the improvement of the school.

Further study in this field could include the following:

1. Replicate this study covering a different year and a different set of schools.
2. Investigate in more detail the recommendations for one particular item such as:
 - a. paraprofessionals added to the school staff because of N.C.A. recommendations.
 - b. the number of certified teachers added to the staff as a result of N.C.A. recommendations.
 - c. the number of courses added and/or deleted as a result of the evaluative process.
 - d. the number of changes and additions made to buildings as a result of N.C.A. evaluations.
3. Devise a study to compare the improvements made in the educational program of non-N.C.A. member schools as opposed to member schools.

Discussions

1. In the reading of the written reports of the 29 schools there was no mention made concerning the approval or disapproval of continued membership in the North Central Association. It seems a statement to this effect could be made by the committee in their report to the State N.C.A. committee and a statement concerning this aspect

of continued membership could be made a part of the written report.

2. Although many persons in the field of education are afraid to be measured by a standard, it seems there should be some way to distinguish between schools that have an excellent building and a broad and varied educational program as opposed to those schools which have an outdated and inadequate building with only the essentials of an educational program. If the symbol of the North Central Association is going to continue to stand for quality and excellence in education something different must be done. In the 29 Iowa schools studied the variance in program, the equipment needed, and the condition and adequacy of the building was very noticeable. Yet, in spite of these great differences, each school still is a member in good standing with the North Central Association.
3. In reviewing the 29 written reports it was noted there were at least 54 recommendations that dealt with persons and/or programs not connected with the high school program. Recommendations concerning elementary art teachers, seventh grade science, and elementary vocal music have no place in the North Central Association's evaluative process of the local high school. If these kind of recommendations are to be made, then the North

Central Association must change from only a high school association to a total school association.

4. Also there seems to be a great difference between the evaluative process and the yearly reports sent to the association. In the yearly reports the proper training of teachers with the proper number of hours in the subject matter fields they are teaching is stressed quite effectively. Schools are warned immediately if a teacher does not have the proper number of hours. Yet, no mention of the certification of teachers or the number of hours of college work in the particular teaching field was mentioned in any of the written reports. This, it would seem, would be of value to the local school if an evaluation of the teaching staff with regard to proper training and certification could be included in the written report.
5. It was also noted in reading the 29 written reports and seeking out the recommendations that on occasion some members of some visiting team merely described the situation as he or she found it. Even though the statements made were excellent in describing the obvious poor condition of the particular area, no recommendations were made to correct or improve the situation.
6. Also, there is room to wonder about the many evaluations

and recommendations written because almost every area in every school studied warranted some kind of recommendations except for those mentioned in number five. Surely there should have been at least one area in the program of the 29 schools that did not warrant any recommendations because the program was exceptional and very adequate. Could it be true that some recommendations are made merely for the sake of making recommendations?

This could be part of the reason so many of the reasons for nonimplementation were listed as not practical.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Know Your North Central. The North Central Association Quarterly 39, No. 2: 200-203. 1964.
2. Evaluative Criteria. National Study of Secondary School Evaluation 1960: 16-17. 1960.
3. Evaluation Guide for Secondary Schools. The North Central Association Quarterly 43, No. 3: 297-309. 1969.
4. Manlove, Donald C. Self Study and Visitation for All Member Schools. The North Central Association Quarterly 39, No. 3: 233-237. 1965.
5. Edwards, Charles. Evaluative Criteria--Let's Improve Our Use of It. The North Central Association Quarterly 39, No. 3: 238-241. 1965.
6. Ely, Lawrence E. Teacher's Reactions to School Evaluations Using Evaluative Criteria. The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 43: 42. 1959.
7. Stananage, John A. NCA Administrators' Reactions to School Evaluation. The North Central Association Quarterly 44, No. 2: 238-239. 1969.
8. Hahn, Bruce Jackson. A Follow-Up Study of High School Evaluation in Oregon. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Ann Arbor, Michigan, Library, University of Michigan. (Microfilm copy. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms). 1955.
9. Richmond, Jerald DuWayne. The Effect of Accrediting Agencies on Improvement of Instruction in Ohio. Unpublished M.S. thesis. Oxford, Ohio, Library, Miami University. 1969.
10. Boersma, Wendell C. The Effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria as a Stimulus for School Improvement in Elwen, Michigan High Schools. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Ann Arbor, Michigan, Library, University of Michigan. (Microfilm Order 68-7562. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms). 1967.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

For The
NEVADA COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL
NEVADA, IOWA

Recommendations implemented as a result of the Evaluation by the North Central Association, 1967-68, in matters of Space, People, Process, and Things as Related to the Nevada Community High School, Nevada, Iowa.

Study being conducted under the Auspices of Iowa State University, College of Education. Richard P. Manatt, Associate Professor; Advisor. Leonard L. Gustafson Graduate Student.

Directions:

1. Please read each recommendation.
2. Answer the following questions for each recommendation.
 - a. Do you agree with the recommendation? Yes_____ No_____
 - b. Has the recommendation been implemented? Yes_____ No_____
 - c. Has the recommendation been partially implemented?
Yes_____ No_____
 - d. If not implemented, please check the appropriate square:
Cost
Worthiness
Practicability
Other _____
3. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return in the enclosed envelope.
4. Thank you very much for your kind cooperation and help.

Leonard L. Gustafson

QUESTIONNAIRE

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

QUESTIONNAIRE

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

	Yes	No	If No
Agree with Recommendations	()	()	Cost ()
Implemented	()	()	Worthiness ()
Partially Implemented	()	()	Practicability ()
			Other

Do NCA Evaluation recommendations improve the educational offerings and content of the curriculum?