

"A Comparison of Program Evaluations Within  
The Texas Education Agency and the  
Austin Independent School District  
For the Period 1980 - 1990"

by  
Allen Corley

An Applied Research Project (Political Science 5397) Submitted to  
The Department of Political Science  
Southwest Texas State University  
In Partial Fulfillment  
For the Requirements for the Degree of  
Masters of Public Administration

(Spring 1992)

Faculty Approval:

Pat Shields  
Iman Shahzad  
William D. Soto

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter One</b>	
"Introduction" _____	1 - 4
<b>Chapter Two</b>	
"The Nature of the Texas Education Agency and The Austin Independent School District" _____	5 - 9
<b>Chapter Three</b>	
"Review of Relevant Literature" _____	10 - 32
<b>Chapter Four</b>	
"Research Methodology" _____	33 - 39
<b>Chapter Five</b>	
"Research Findings" _____	40 - 50
<b>Chapter Six</b>	
"Conclusions" _____	51 - 54
<b>Appendix A</b>	
"Texas Education Agency Evaluation Worksheets" _____	55 - 66
<b>Appendix B</b>	
"Austin Independent School District Evaluation Worksheets" _____	67 - 80
<b>Bibliography</b> _____	81 - 85

## C H A P T E R O N E

## Introduction

This paper compares educational program evaluations within the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Austin Independent School District (AISD) for the period 1980 - 1990. Education is one of the most important functions undertaken by the public sector. At the state level in Texas, it could be argued it is the most important function in terms of dollars and cents. Texas spent over \$10 billion dollars on education in 1990. This represents 44.1% of total state expenditures and is by far the largest single expense category. (Sharp, 1991: 25) At the local level, education represents a large expenditure for the public sector as well. For fiscal year 1991-1992, AISD's operating budget is \$271 million or \$3,908 per student. Yet despite these substantial expenditures, student achievement test scores are still unsatisfactory. If test scores tell an administrator where the student is in terms of academic proficiency, program evaluation can provide information on how the student got there. Evaluation can provide insight into how money is being spent, whether there are measurable improvements from these expenditures, and information on how programs might be improved. If testing tells administrators *what* is happening, evaluations can tell them *how* or *why* it is happening.

This study compares program evaluations within a state agency and a local school district: the Texas Education Agency and the Austin Independent School District. The decision to compare a state agency with a local agency is based

upon changes in education that occurred during the 1980's. The debate regarding state versus local control of education has a long history in Texas and the U.S. In recent months, the debate has intensified in Texas over funding. Texas is currently looking for an equitable way to finance school districts. During the 1980's, there was a national trend for increasing state involvement in funding and monitoring local school districts. This trend appears to be continuing. In February 1990, President Bush endorsed a national plan for education that was adopted by the National Governors Council (NGA). The plan contains six national goals for education to be reached by the year 2000. In conjunction with the national plan, the NGA developed state strategies for achieving these goals. (Texas State Board of Education, 1991: 95)

There are several studies that look at this changing educational relationship between state and local governments from the standpoint of control (see for example Guthrie, 1990 and Fuhrman and Elmore, 1990). These studies examined whether the increasing involvement of the states during the 1980's has lead to increasing state control of education at the local level.

This study will look at the changing state/local relationship in education from the standpoint of evaluation. It is not enough to merely know that student test scores are declining. Administrators need clues into why students are not achieving established goals. Evaluation can provide those clues. During the 1980's, what types of evaluations were done at the state level and what types were done at the local level? It is this study's intent that by comparing the evaluations conducted within these agencies, insight into this question can be

gained and other research questions can be posed.

This study selects evaluations from TEA and AISD and compares and contrasts them on specific comparison criteria. The evaluation documents from each agency were collected and compared using the comparison criteria put forth in Chapter Three. This is an exploratory study. It will be hypothesis generating rather than hypotheses testing. There is also a descriptive element to the study. This research is exploratory in that it seeks to determine what types of evaluations are being done at TEA and AISD. It's descriptive element is a summary table that categorizes the evaluations examined based upon five criteria:

1. evaluator role
2. data collected
3. organizer
4. process/outcome
5. feedback

Chapter Two, "The Nature of the Texas Education Agency and the Austin Independent School District," describes the setting of this study. It describes and compares these agencies' funding sources, origins, missions, accountability (from the standpoint of reporting), and information needs.

Chapter Three provides a review of the relevant literature on program evaluation in education. It culminates with the evaluation criteria this study uses for comparing program evaluations. These criteria are summarized at the end of Chapter Three in a table.

Chapter Four describes the methodology used to measure the evaluation comparison variables. Since this is an exploratory study without statistical analysis, this is a relatively short chapter. It does, however, address some

potential weaknesses of the study due to the subjective nature of the data analysis.

Chapter Five presents the research findings and Chapter Six ends with some concluding comments.

## C H A P T E R   T W O

### The Nature of the Texas Education Agency

### And the Austin Independent School District

#### *Texas Education Agency*

The Texas Education Agency is the department of state government that oversees the elementary and secondary education of over three million children from nearly 1,100 local school districts in Texas. Currently more than half of these children are minorities. Total state enrollment is increasing by about 60,000 students every year. (TEA, 1991b: 1) Texas ranks 34th among the states in revenue per pupil. (Texas State Board of Education, 1991: 23) TEA was established in 1949 by the Gilmer-Aikin law. In fiscal 1990, the agency's budget topped \$10 billion. (Texas State Board of Education, 1991: 23) TEA is directed by a 15 member State Board of Education. The Board appoints the Commissioner of Education and approves the general organizational plan for the agency. The agency itself contains approximately 1,000 staff members. The Commissioner is assisted by five deputy commissioners that correspond to the five functional responsibilities of the agency. These five functions are:

1. educational quality
2. curriculum and program development
3. finance and compliance
4. research and information
5. internal management.

In March 1991, TEA submitted its long-range plan for 1991-1995 which contains the agency's mission statement.

"All students will be literate. They will learn reading, English language arts, mathematics, science, foreign language, social studies, fine arts, health and physical education, and develop technological literacy. They will acquire citizenship skills and appreciate the common American heritage including its multicultural richness. In cooperation with the private sector and colleges, schools will enable learners of all ages, from infancy through adulthood, to acquire academic, vocational, and parenting skills." (Texas State Board of Education, 1991: 1)

TEA's long-range plan contains nine goals covering various facets of public education:

1. student learning
2. curriculum and programs
3. personnel
4. organization and management
5. finance
6. parent responsibility
7. community and business partnerships
8. research, development, and evaluation
9. communications

Each goal in the long-range plan is accompanied by specific action plans for both the state, the districts, and the schools. In some cases, the goals also specify activities for community groups, parents, the private sector, etc. Of particular importance to this study is Goal 8 concerning Research, Development, and Evaluation. Goal 8 contains as one of its priorities, "Establish systems of multiple measures and indicators in program and campus evaluation." (Texas State Board of Education, 1991: 81) Goal 8 also proposes to track students over a 20 to 25 year period to gather information on the long term effects of various



educational experiences. According to the agency's long-range plan, TEA is committed to increasing the resources allocated to educational evaluation in the coming years.

### *Austin Independent School District*

The mission of the Austin Independent School District is:

"... to insure student success through an instructional system permeated with the application of technology; establishing partnerships with parents, business, community and institutions of higher learning; instilling our basic core values in each student; utilizing individual prescriptions for learning; motivating students to optimize their own potential; and inspiring students to personalize a belief in American ingenuity." (AISD, 1991b: 2)

This statement, along with long-range objectives and strategies for achieving those objectives, were developed by the strategic planning team of AISD. Strategic planning is a recent phenomenon of AISD borrowed from business. It was initiated by the district to help deal with issues like educational reform, student achievement, technology, and changing demographics. (AISD, 1991b: 2)

A recent legal development that will have an impact on AISD is the 1991 passage of House Bill 2885, which provides that each school district in the state must have a plan to switch to site-based decision making. AISD plans to have all campuses in compliance with this law by the 1992-1993 school year. (AISD, 1991b: 4)

AISD currently serves 67,992 students from Austin, Texas; a city of about 350,000 people. (AISD, 1991a: 1) To accomplish this, the district employs approximately 7,900 people, 4,900 of which are teachers, librarians, administrators, counselors, and nurses. The remaining 3,000 are clerical, maintenance, and custodial staff. (AISD, 1991a: 3) The average pupil to teacher ratios are 19/1 in elementary school, 20/1 in middle school/junior high, and 20/1 in high school. (AISD, 1991a: 3)

AISD's 1991-1992 operating budget is \$271 million which breaks down to \$3,908 per student. (AISD, 1991a: 3) The bulk of the budget (76.9%) comes from local sources with another 23.1% provided by the state. (AISD, 1991b: 14) Interestingly, the graph provided by AISD to illustrate these figures shows an additional 1.7% of revenues coming from other local sources. (AISD, 1991b: 14) These three sources on the AISD graph total to 101.7% of budget funds. There is no mention on this graph of federal money.

The district is composed of:

65	elementary schools
11	middle schools (grades 6-8)
2	junior high schools (grades 7-8)
11	high schools (grades 9-12)
15	special education programs

At the elementary level, the curriculum includes language arts, mathematics, science, health, computer literacy, social studies, art, physical education, theatre arts, and music. This is augmented at the secondary level by the addition of electives. There are over 1,000 courses offered to high school students and over 250 available to middle school and junior high students (AISD,

1991b: 9). To receive a high school diploma, all students must pass a mandatory statewide graduation test, the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS).

It is in these settings that educational programs are evaluated within TEA and AISD. Chapter Three reviews the literature on educational program evaluation and establishes the criteria this study will use to compare evaluations.

## C H A P T E R   T H R E E

### Review of Relevant Literature

#### *Introduction*

The decision to compare educational program evaluations between agencies, hinges on deciding what characteristics to compare. This decision is not as easy as it may appear. Program evaluation, though technically not a new field, is nonetheless a growing field. There is evidence that evaluations were conducted in China as early as 2200 B.C., but it was not until the 1960's that evaluation of social programs began in earnest. There have been over forty different educational evaluation models identified in the literature. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 11) Before criteria can be selected for comparing evaluations, some type of organization must be made of these models. This chapter will attempt to provide that organization. It will provide an overview of the relevant literature on program evaluation in education with the purpose of finding criteria for comparing program evaluations between agencies. This discussion attempts to present the most popular viewpoints and models to date. From this discussion, the variables this study uses to compare program evaluations within the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and the Austin Independent School District (AISD) are derived. This chapter presents and explains why the variables were chosen.

The selection of these variables is not an attempt to formulate a standard against which all educational evaluations should be measured. Rather, it is an

attempt to pick some of the more relevant facets of evaluation identified in the literature for the purpose of comparing evaluation documents within TEA and AISD. It is hoped that by comparing these variables across different evaluations, some type of meaningful analysis and conclusions can be drawn. Chapter Four, dealing with the methodology of this study, will explain how each variable is measured.

### *Why TEA and AISD?*

For this research, a state agency and a local agency were chosen for comparison. During the 1980's, there were significant reforms in education. Specifically, the states became more involved in funding local school districts. With the increased funding came a corresponding increase in state monitoring of local school districts (see for example Guthrie, 1990 and Fuhrman and Elmore, 1990). Researchers theorized that these changes would translate into less control at the local level over education. The control issue was viewed as a zero-sum game with the states gaining influence at the expense of the local school districts. This is not what Fuhrman and Elmore found when they looked at the state-local issue of control. (Fuhrman and Elmore, 1990) Regarding the subject of evaluation, Guthrie found that the reforms of the 1980's changed evaluation in two ways: 1) evaluation was increasingly undertaken to comply with managerial directive and less for professional purposes and 2) the context in which educational evaluation is conducted and performance results reported is increasingly politicized. (Guthrie, 1990: 122)

This study will look at TEA and AISD evaluations for several purposes. First, what types of evaluations were done by these agencies during the period 1980-1990. It is hoped that these findings will provide insight into other questions. After the changes of the 1980's, are states and local school districts doing different types of evaluations? Has the state of Texas assumed control for program evaluation within the last decade? If TEA and AISD both conduct evaluations, are they looking for different types of information? Are they duplicating each others efforts?

In an attempt to answer some of these questions, this study examines and compares program evaluations within a state agency and a local school district. TEA and AISD were chosen because they satisfy the criteria of a state and local agency and because they are geographically accessible to this researcher. The decision to look at evaluations for the period 1980-1990 was made because it covers the period of educational change discussed earlier and because a ten year span should give a representative picture of program evaluation within these two agencies.

### *The Comparison Variables*

Educational evaluation, a term coined by Ralph Tyler (Madaus, 1983: 8), can be viewed, albeit in simplified terms, as consisting of three phases: planning the evaluation, implementing the evaluation, and reporting the results of the evaluation. When looking for comparison variables, it seemed appropriate that the variables selected should measure aspects of all three phases.

With this in mind, the variables chosen for comparison are:

1. the role of the evaluator
2. type of data collected
3. the organizer of the evaluation
4. process/outcome
5. nature of the feedback of the evaluation's findings

These variables will be described in more detail in subsequent sections.

Refer to Table 3.1 to see where each variable falls during the evaluation.

**TABLE 3.1**

*Evaluation Comparison Variables by Evaluation Phase*

EVALUATION PHASE		
Planning	Implementation	Results
Evaluator Role	Data Collected	
Organizer	Process, Outcome (purpose)	
		Feedback

It can be argued that some of these variables affect more than one phase of an evaluation. They do. The type of data collected obviously affects decisions in the planning, implementing, and feedback phases. The role of the evaluator also affects all three phases. The final decision to categorize the variables by phase is based on a subjective assessment of their greatest impact. The role of the evaluator is placed under the planning phase because this decision, made during the planning phase, will control the entire evaluation. In a similar manner, choosing the organizer during the planning phase, will determine to a large

extent what types of model the evaluation uses.

During the implementation phase, data collection will dictate how the research design is implemented. The process/outcome variable determines the purpose of the evaluation. It is placed under implementation because this variable seems to impact this phase the most. According to Scriven, an evaluation can focus on processes or outcomes. This is obviously also a planning decision, but it seems to impact implementation more than planning. Focusing on a program's processes or outcomes guides the evaluator's effort during implementation.

Admittedly this is an arbitrary placement of some variables. It should be remembered that this discussion is not presented to provide an absolute classification scheme, but rather to illustrate why certain variables were chosen by this study. Feedback is the least ambiguous of the lot. The feedback variable looks at the type of feedback provided the clients. Therefore it is concerned with the results aspect of the evaluation. To summarize, the five educational evaluation comparison criteria this study uses are:

1. role of the evaluator
2. data collected
3. organizer
4. process/outcome
5. feedback.

Just as there was some overlap and ambiguity in exactly where a criterion falls during the evaluation, there is also some ambiguity in the comparison criteria themselves. The variables all measure to some degree, the quantitative-qualitative nature of the evaluation. This shared quality causes some blurring in



measurement of the variables. The following sections discuss these criteria in more detail and hopefully clarify some of the ambiguity.

### *The Role of the Evaluator*

Borich describes the role of the evaluator (see Table 3.2) as falling on a continuum with functions ranging from a compiler of data ("evaluator as statistician") to one of active participant in decision making (described on the right side of the continuum). The continuum in Table 3.2 is a version of the quantitative-qualitative continuum which will surface again later in this chapter.

**TABLE 3.2**

#### *Evaluator's Functional Role Continuum*

<b>Evaluator as Statistician</b>	<b>Evaluator as Researcher</b>	<b>Evaluator as Technician</b>	<b>Evaluator as Integrator, Coordinator, &amp; Decision Maker</b>
Compiles facts from natural data sources for funder-report purposes	Attacks problems of applied research interest	Reports potentially valuable information to management but does not participate in decision making	Actually becomes involved in decision making; ensures evaluative data input into the decision making process

Source: Borich, 1989

In the left-hand position of Table 3.2, the evaluator collects mathematical data and prepares reports for the client. In this role, the evaluator functions only

to provide data to the client. As you move farther to the right on the continuum, the evaluator's role moves more into the qualitative realm. The evaluator begins to take a more autonomous, active role in problem solving and decision making. At the position on the far right, the evaluator assists the client in decision making based on the evaluation's results. In this study, evaluations will be examined to determine where, relative to Borich's scale the role of the evaluator falls. Therefore, the first evaluation criterion is to determine what the evaluator's role was according to Borich's classification scale: statistician, researcher, technician, or integrator/coordinator/decision maker.

#### *Data Collected: Quantitative or Qualitative?*

Although admittedly an oversimplification, educational evaluation models can be viewed as falling on a quantitative-qualitative continuum. This study is not the first to use such a classification system.<sup>1</sup> At one end of the continuum are those models that employ primarily quantitative evaluation methods. At the other end are models that advocate a qualitative approach. There is no consensus in the literature regarding which approach is the most appropriate for educational evaluation. Chen states, "Evaluation has never been dominated by any single paradigm, nor is it likely to be in the foreseeable future." (Chen, 1989: 299) Some writers see the field as moving toward a more quantitative approach.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example Guba and Lincoln, 1987 and Smith and Hauer, 1990

They believe this type of evaluation is more appropriate for education and produces better information than one that is qualitative in nature (see for example Wentling, 1991 or Klein and Alkin, 1972).

Others, like Guba and Lincoln, believe the naturalistic approach to educational evaluation is the best method. "It is our position that responsive evaluation as proposed by Stake and elaborated by others offers the most meaningful and useful approach to performing evaluations." (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 33) There is also a compromise position which advocates incorporating both methods. Those advocating using both methods, view the methods as complementary rather than incompatible.<sup>2</sup> Borich believes this lack of consensus on an appropriate model has been a stifling factor in the development of this field. (Borich, 1974: 7) Table 3.3 lists the relative positions of noted writers in the field on this issue.

Often when attempting to organize models, writers list the various models on a continuum with quantitative models at one end and qualitative models at the other. Guba and Lincoln's organizational scheme (Table 3.4), also follows this continuum although it classifies models based on the model's organizer and not specifically on quantitative-qualitative criteria. Organizers will be discussed in more detail in the next section, but essentially they are the focus of the evaluation. Organizers dictate what types of information an evaluator collects. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 11)

---

<sup>2</sup> See for example Cronbach, 1982; Kidder, 1987; and Borich, 1989

**TABLE 3.3**  
*Quantitative-Qualitative Positions of Evaluators*

<b>Favors Quantitative Approach</b>	<b>Favors Qualitative Approach</b>
Tyler (1950)	Stake (1967)
Campbell and Stanley (1963)	Chen and Rossi (1983)
Hammond (1973)	Eisner (1983)
Provus (1971)	Ginsburg (1989)
Pophams (1975)	Guba and Lincoln (1987)
Wentling (1991)	Patton (1986)

**TABLE 3.4**  
*Evaluation Model Classification System*

<b>MODEL</b>	<b>ORGANIZER</b>
Objective Based Tyler, 1950	Objectives
Countenance Stake, 1967	Objectives
Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) Stufflebeam, 1971	Decisions
Goal-Free Scriven, 1972	Effects
Connoisseurship Eisner, 1975	Critical Guideposts
Responsive Stake, 1975	Stakeholder Interests

Source: Guba and Lincoln, 1987

Note in Table 3.4, that the list of models Guba and Lincoln use to illustrate different organizers fall along the quantitative-qualitative continuum. At the quantitative end is Tyler's Objective Based model. The models become more qualitative as you move down the list with the qualitative end point represented by Stake's Responsive model.

Compare this to Smith and Hauer's classification scheme in Table 3.5. Smith and Hauer are comparing the investigative aspects of various evaluation models. Notice their table follows a continuum similar to Guba and Lincoln's.<sup>3</sup> Compare again Table 3.4 with Table 3.5. In Table 3.5, Stake's Portrayal model is the same model Guba and Lincoln refer to as Stake's Responsive model. Although Guba and Lincoln do not include Levin's Cost-Effectiveness model in their discussion of quantitative models, notice that it falls just after Tyler's Objective Based evaluation which they do include. Notice also that every model in Guba and Lincoln's classification scheme is included in Smith and Hauer's table.

What are the advantages to either of these different approaches? A quantitative model has the advantages of the classic research methodology: control of experimental variables and the power of parametric statistical techniques. (Borich, 1989: 12) This tends to lend an air of legitimacy to the model because of the great acceptance of the scientific paradigm.

---

<sup>3</sup> Smith and Hauer note that their classification system is based on the original structure of the model. Some models, particularly Stufflebeam's CIPP, have changed over the years in response to criticism and suggestions from other evaluators. For classification, these authors chose the model in its original presentation (Smith and Hauer, 1990: 489).

TABLE 3.5

*Evaluation Models Classified by Investigative Properties*

## Aspects of Evaluations

Evaluation Models	Clients	Audience	Purpose	Object/ Focus	Questions	Values/ Judgment criteria	Data to be collected	Data collection methods	Data analysis methods	Reporting content & methods
Portrayal Stake (1983)		+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Adversary Wolf (1983)	+	++	++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++
Utilization Patton (1978)	+	++	++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++
Investigative Journalism Guba (1981)	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
Goal-free Scriven (1973)		++		+++	+++	+++	++	++	++	++
Modus Operandi Scriven (1974)			+	+	+++	+	++	++	++	+
Connoisseurial Eisner (1983)				++	++	++	++	++	++	++
CIPP Stufflebeam (1971)	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Objective based Tyler (1983)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cost-Effectiveness Levin (1983)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

+++ generally permitted ++ in some cases permitted + rarely permitted

Source: Smith and Hauer, 1990

Quantitative models use a systematic approach to evaluation. Therefore, detailed and specific directions for implementation can be written. This encourages utilization of the model. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 4) Also the

scientific paradigm is comparatively easy to understand with outcomes typically explained with one independent variable. Quantitative models force the evaluator to specify outcome variables which provides a means of judging the effectiveness of a program. (Borich, 1989: 14)

There are, however, disadvantages with the quantitative model. The literature contains extensive criticism of this model. Discussing a few of these critical points should provide a general idea of the nature of this criticism. The experimental design attempts to control for all confounding and extraneous variables. Educational evaluation is usually concerned, however, with all factors that impact results. This often includes extraneous variables. (Borich, 1989: 12)

With experimental research, you can measure the outcomes of the program without understanding how the program works. (Chen, 1983: 284)

Some writers believe the experimental design is not appropriate for educational evaluation because these programs take many forms with broad guidelines. In education, there is usually not a single treatment variable to examine. (Ginsburg, 1989: 583) Eichelberger believes a qualitative evaluation provides more useful information to the client. "It is much more convincing to have information that allows outcomes to be attributed to program variables than to treat the program as a 'black box,' reporting only general outcome data." (Eichelberger, 1974: 349)

The literature also contains criticism of the qualitative approach. In addition to criticism about the lack of rigor in qualitative studies, there are criticisms regarding: the difficulty in implementing a naturalistic evaluation; the

expense of these studies; the difficulty in identifying all parties with a relevant interest in the program; the length of time to perform the evaluation; etc.<sup>4</sup>

The purpose here is not to add another opinion to this debate. Rather, this discussion is presented because the variables chosen for comparing evaluations, all measure to some degree where on the quantitative-qualitative continuum an evaluation falls. The comparison variable, "data collected" was chosen specifically for this purpose. To summarize, the second comparison criterion determines if the evaluation collected quantitative or qualitative data.

### *The Organizer*

Along with evaluator's role and type of data collected, the organizer is another comparison variable used in this study. Look again at Table 3.4. Guba and Lincoln have categorized educational evaluation models based upon what the model uses as its organizer. They define an organizer as the focus of an evaluation. If the organizer is objectives, the evaluation must specify and measure the program's objectives. If the organizer is effects, as in Scriven's Goal-Free model, the evaluator must determine all the effects of the program. Selection of an organizer directs the evaluator's investigations. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 11) An organizer determines *what* types of data the evaluator will collect. This is in contrast to the next comparison criterion, "Process/Outcome" which explains *why* the evaluator performed the evaluation.

---

<sup>4</sup> See for example Borich, 1989: 14; Chen, 1989; Guba and Lincoln, 1987



TABLE 3.4

*Evaluation Model Classification System*

MODEL	ORGANIZER
Objective Based Tyler, 1950	Objectives
Countenance Stake, 1967	Objectives
Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) Stufflebeam, 1971	Decisions
Goal-Free Scriven, 1972	Effects
Connoisseurship Eisner, 1975	Critical Guideposts
Responsive Stake, 1975	Stakeholder Interests

Source: Guba and Lincoln, 1987

The following discussion describes the models in Guba and Lincoln's classification system.

*Countenance Model*

Objectives (the outputs of a program) are the organizer for both Tyler's model (Tyler, 1950) and Stake's Countenance model (Stake, 1967). When performing an objective based evaluation, the evaluator specifies and measures

the outcomes of the program. These results are then compared to a frame of reference to determine the effectiveness of the program. In education, outcomes of programs are typically measured by testing. Test scores are then compared against an agreed upon standard, like a state or national standard. The comparison can also take the form of a pre-test / post-test comparison. In which case, the difference in scores is presumed to be due to the program's impact. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 5)

### *Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) Model*

Stufflebeam's CIPP model, which stands for Context-Inter-Process-Product, takes decisions as its organizer. (Stufflebeam, et al, 1971) In the CIPP model, the evaluator does not need information about objectives, but rather information about what decisions are to be made and who is to make them. In this model, evaluators also need information on what constitutes the decision making criteria and when the decision will be made. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 14) Stufflebeam divided decision making into four areas that required evaluation. Stufflebeam saw a need for *context* evaluation to inform planning decisions, *input* evaluation to serve structuring decisions, *process* evaluation to guide implementing decisions, and *product* evaluation to serve recycling decisions. (Stufflebeam, 1983: 122) The planning phase dealt with intended objectives. The structuring phase dealt with intended processes. The implementing phase dealt with actual processes and the recycling phase dealt

with actual ends. The recycling decision came after actual results were in and a decision was needed to either terminate, adjust, or leave the program unchanged.

Cronbach also believes decisions are a proper organizer for evaluations. He believes that if evaluation is to provide maximum utility to the developer of curriculum, it should focus on the decisions the developers will be making in conjunction with curriculum development. (Cronbach, 1963: 676) It should be noted that Stufflebeam's CIPP model is not limited to decision making by curriculum developers. It also takes into account the information needs of other types of decision makers, not just those involved in curriculum development. (Madaus et al, 1983: 121)

### *Goal-Free Model*

Scriven suggests effects as an organizer. (Scriven, 1972) He is talking about intended and unintentional effects. He went so far as to say that evaluation should be goal-free. In other words, evaluators should not go into an evaluation with preconceived notions about what effects they were looking for. He argues they should attempt to discover *all* the effects of a program. Scriven came to this conclusion while working on a project to screen candidates for a proven products list. He and his group were evaluating educational innovations and developments. Their goal was to develop a list of worthwhile products for dissemination nationally. They started their analysis by looking at the stated objectives of each product and comparing performance against stated criteria. Originally, a product needed to meet its stated objective for inclusion on the list.

Scriven noticed, however, that some of the products had benefits that were not intended. In some cases, the product failed to achieve its stated goal, but had side effects which were so useful that Scriven felt it belonged on the list. From this experience, he became convinced that intent clouded the judgement of evaluators. "The rhetoric of intent was being used as a substitute for evidence of success." (Scriven, 1974: 1) Scriven said that evaluators should focus on effects, both intended and unintended. He proposed comparing these effects against a list of demonstrated needs in education. In practice, this model has not been sufficiently developed to provide useful guidelines for conducting evaluations. Conceptually, however, it does provide a useful organizer. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 18)

### *Connoisseurship Model*

Eisner's Connoisseurship model (Eisner, 1983) is unique in that it uses "critical guideposts" as its organizer. These critical guideposts are internal and exist solely within the mind of the evaluator. The evaluator's experience and training provide the foundation for these guideposts. Eisner's model is analogous to the role of the art critic. He believes evaluators, like connoisseurs of art, possess special talents and insights that lend importance to their opinions. "Connoisseurs of anything - and one can have connoisseurship about anything - appreciate what they encounter in the proper meaning of the word. Appreciation means an awareness and an understanding of what one has experienced." (Eisner, 1983: 339)

Eisner added the art of disclosure (which he calls criticism), to the art of appreciation. Much like art criticism this disclosure is necessary for the connoisseur to render what was discovered in the evaluation in linguistic terms to those not possessed of the same abilities as the connoisseur. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 19) Not surprisingly, with this much emphasis placed upon the abilities of one person, and with no empirical evidence to support the opinions of the connoisseur, this model has come under considerable criticism. It offers no guidelines for potential evaluators who wish to use it and its methodology runs contrary to the training of most practitioners. Also, the model has an air of elitism about it that repels some evaluators. But it has some benefits. It is the first model to break completely with traditional evaluation. It offers a completely new way to look at educational programs which should yield different results for the evaluator. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 20) Eisner remains convinced that this is a useful model and continues to argue for its use. (Eisner, 1983: 347)

### *Responsive Model*

The sixth model in Guba and Lincoln's classification scheme and the fifth organizer belongs to Stake. The organizer in Stake's Responsive model is "stakeholder interests." (Stake, 1975) Stakeholders are any group that has a relevant interest in the program being evaluated. This model is designed to respond to the needs of these stakeholders. This responsiveness to stakeholder interests allows the evaluator great flexibility in deciding how to conduct an

evaluation. If the stakeholder wants objective results, this model will accommodate. If a client wants an evaluation that gives them a feel for how the program operates, it can accommodate that request also. In Stake's words,

"I prefer to think of ways that evaluation can perform a service and be useful to specific persons. For an evaluation to be useful, the evaluator should know the interests and the language of his audiences. During an evaluation study, a substantial amount of time may well be spent in learning about the information needs of the persons for whom the evaluation is being done. The evaluator should have a good sense of whom he is working for and their concerns." (Stake 1975: 13)

Stake is not alone in his belief that flexibility is a desirable quality in evaluation (see for example Kaplan, 1964 and Lee, 1991).

Based on Guba and Lincoln's classification of models by organizer, this study compares program evaluations in TEA and AISD to determine what organizers these evaluations used. Selection of an organizer will determine *what* types of data the evaluation collected.

The five organizers, as presented by Guba and Lincoln, are:

1. objectives
2. decisions,
3. effects
4. critical guideposts
5. stakeholder interests

### *Process/Outcome*

The process/outcome variable this study uses for comparing evaluations is determined based on Scriven's description of formative and summative evaluation. (Scriven, 1967) The purpose of formative evaluation is refinement

and improvement. Formative evaluations are used to provide a program developer with information on revising a system. (Edwards, 1974: 376)

Formative evaluations look at the processes rather than the outcomes of a program. They are more interested in determining how things are done rather than the results of the program.

By contrast, summative evaluations attempt to determine and measure outcome or impact. A summative evaluation asks questions like: Is the program achieving its goals? Does the program have an effect? How much larger, on the average, is the outcome under Plan A than under Plan B? (Cronbach, 1982: 12).

The evaluations in this study are judged on whether their purpose was summative or formative. This determination will be made by answering questions like, did the evaluation focus on outcomes or did it look at the processes of the program? Was it more concerned with measuring the program's impact or was it trying to gather information to refine and improve the program? There is probably a formative element to all evaluations since presumably any problems discovered will be addressed. This study makes the formative / summative determination based on the evaluation research design. If the design looks at the processes of the program, it will be considered a formative evaluation. If it looks at the outcomes of the program, it will be considered a summative evaluation. This criterion in essence measures *why* an evaluation is done. The third criterion, the organizer, identifies *what* type of information the evaluator gathers.

## *Feedback*

The fifth comparison criterion this study uses is feedback. This variable, as do the others, depends upon the type of evaluation design used. A scientific design that emphasizes quantitative factors will usually report the evaluation results in the form of mathematical data. This could take the form of test scores or statistical comparisons to norms. Quantitative reporting almost always takes the form of a written report with compiled and manipulated data. Stake compared the nature of feedback in these two research designs - quantitative and qualitative. He characterized feedback in the scientific model (he called it preordinate) as: written report; identifying variables and depicting the relationships among them; symbolic interpretation. (Stake, 1975)

At the other end of the continuum, are the qualitative models. Feedback in these models can take a greater variety of forms. Again referring to Stake's analysis, he describes feedback in a responsive evaluation as: narrative-type depiction, often oral (if that is what the audience prefers), modeling what the program is like, providing vicarious experience, "holistic" communication. (Stake, 1975) This study will compare educational evaluations based on the nature of the feedback provided to the client. This study will characterize feedback as either quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative feedback takes the form of written statistical data. Qualitative feedback takes the more varied forms expressed by Stake.

Table 3.6 contains the five comparison variables discussed in this chapter. The five comparison variables appear across the top of the table. The vertical



axis lists the different evaluations examined. One table will be prepared for each agency. Each table will list all the evaluations examined with the accompanying results. Using Guba and Lincoln's classification scheme, their five models can be classified using this matrix. The results of that exercise appear in Table 3.7. Table 3.7 is presented to give the reader an idea of what the finished matrix will look like for this study and to summarize the discussion in this chapter. The next chapter explains the methodology used by this study.

TABLE 3.6

*Evaluation Comparison Matrix*

Document Title	Evaluator Role	Data Collected	Organizer	Process, Outcome	Feedback
Evaluation 1					
Evaluation 2					
Evaluation 3					
•					
•					
•					
•					
Evaluation N					

TABLE 3.7

*Evaluation Comparison Matrix Analysis  
of Guba and Lincoln's Classification System*

Evaluation Model	Evaluator Role	Data Collected	Organizer	Process, Outcome	Feedback
Objective Based	statistician	quantitative	objectives	summative	written report
Countenance	statistician	quantitative	objectives	summative	written report
CIPP	researcher	quantitative	decisions	summative	written report
Goal-Free	technician	quantitative/ qualitative	effects	formative	not specified
Connoisseurship	technician	qualitative	critical guideposts	formative	can take any form
Responsive	integrator, coordinator, decision maker	quantitative/ qualitative	stakeholder interests	formative	can take any form

## C H A P T E R F O U R

### Research Methodology

#### *Introduction*

This chapter explains the methodology used to measure the evaluation criteria identified in Chapter Three. This is an exploratory study which relies on document analysis for its data collection. As exploratory research, it is more concerned with formulating questions than with providing answers. For this purpose, the research method chosen was document analysis. A special type of document analysis known as case-survey aggregation analysis was used as the model for this study. These concepts are elaborated upon in the following sections.

#### *Document Analysis*

According to Guba and Lincoln, document analysis is appropriate when the researcher is attempting to, ". . . make inferences about the values, sentiments, intentions, beliefs, or ideologies of the sources or authors of the documents,. . ." (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 237) This is what this study is attempting to accomplish. It is attempting to make inferences about the ideologies of the evaluators within these agencies. It is interested in the evaluator's ideologies regarding educational evaluation. It seeks to determine what types of evaluations are being conducted within these agencies.

Although this study is primarily exploratory, it does have a descriptive

element. Document analysis is also appropriate to answer questions of a descriptive nature. According to Yin, document analysis, is a kin to case study research and is appropriate to answer questions of a descriptive nature. (Yin, 1989: 25)

The term document analysis can be further refined to content analysis. For the purposes of this study, Holsti's definition of content analysis will be used. "Content analysis is any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages." (Holsti, 1969: 14) This study, through the use of the evaluation criteria from Chapter Three, examines specific characteristics of evaluations between agencies for comparative purposes. According to Holsti, content analysis is also appropriate for comparative purposes. "Thus, all content analysis is concerned with comparison, the type of comparison being dictated by the investigator's theory." (Holsti, 1969: 5)

### *Case-Survey Aggregation Analysis*

A specific type of document analysis that looks at case studies of similar programs is case-survey aggregation analysis. (Lucas, 1974b: 1) The purpose of this type of research is to provide a means for aggregating diverse studies together ". . . under a common conceptual framework so that findings will be cumulative." (Lucas, 1974b: 1) The term case study is used more loosely here than is sometimes the case and can include evaluation reports. (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 247) This method has six basic characteristics which are listed

below. The discussion following this list, demonstrates how this study incorporates these characteristics into its research methodology. The six characteristics of case-survey aggregation analysis are:

- 1) checklist
- 2) sampling rules
- 3) decision rules
- 4) analysts to apply the checklist
- 5) confidence scale for analysts
- 6) means for checking reliability (Guba and Lincoln, 1987: 248)

### *Checklist*

The checklist developed by this study was presented in Chapter Three. It is the "Evaluation Comparison Matrix" on Table 3.6.

### *Sampling Rules*

Sampling rules are supposed to prevent bias in the selection of case studies. This study chose a somewhat different method of selecting cases. This study looks at evaluations for the period 1980 - 1990. During this period, TEA produced six evaluations that could be located by this researcher. These six evaluations were identified by interviewing the agency librarian at TEA and by examining the TEA publications list for this period.

Once these six TEA evaluations were found, the publications lists for the same period at AISD were studied to select the AISD sample. This was a much larger task. While this study was able to examine the complete population of TEA evaluations, AISD's publications list contained 34 programs that were evaluated during this period. Some programs were evaluated annually, some

only once. Of these 34, ten could be eliminated because they were not evaluations of actual educational programs. Evaluation topics deemed inappropriate for this study included personnel evaluations, accrediting process evaluations, evaluations of retention and promotion of teachers, etc. After eliminating these evaluations, 24 possible programs remained. Please note that one of the final evaluation topics chosen, the ESEA Chapter II program for 1990-1991, was for training teachers. This was deemed appropriate since the ultimate goal was to provide improved teaching of mathematics and science curriculum for students. It was impossible, for financial reasons, for this researcher to examine all 24 program evaluations from AISD.

Some of the TEA evaluations were purchased (some were free) to examine outside the agency. While it is true that both agencies have libraries that can be used for document analysis, the hours of operation and the uncertainty of availability made it necessary for this researcher to acquire document copies for examination outside the agencies. This researcher is forced to work during the hours the libraries in these agencies are open. Prices for copies of evaluations ranged from \$1.00 to \$10.00 with the average being in the \$3.00 range. For the AISD evaluations, it was often necessary to purchase both the evaluation design and the final report to gather evidence about all five evaluation criteria. With these financial considerations, it was necessary to select a sample of the AISD evaluations for purchase and analysis.

Selecting which evaluations to examine of the remaining 24 programs deemed appropriate, was a two step process. First, attempts were made to select

evaluations that matched with programs as TEA. Four programs satisfied this criteria. This left 20 programs to choose the remainder of the AISD sample from.

The AISD publications lists this study examined actually covered 11 school years. The four AISD evaluations that matched were chosen from four different school years. It was decided to select seven more evaluations such that the final sample would have one evaluation from each school year. The final sample size for AISD, 11 evaluations out of 24 possible programs, represents 46% of the population.

This method of selection is not completely free from bias since it is not a random sample. Four evaluations were chosen to match their counterpart at TEA and seven were chosen because of the year the evaluation was performed. For exploratory purposes, and with the financial constraints by personally financing this research, this selection process seemed acceptable.

### *Decision Rules*

This characteristic is relevant when there are multiple analysts. The idea is to provide rules so all analysts are using the same decision criteria. This study avoids that problem by only having one analyst. However, only one analyst introduces the additional problem of analyst bias and error.

A potential weakness of this study is the use of one analyst, this writer, for all the evaluations. A better system would have independent analysts examine a sample of these evaluations and score them according to the

evaluation criteria. The results of these independent analysts could then be compared to the results reached by this writer. Statistical tests could be used to determine if any differences in scoring were significant. If there were significant discrepancies in the results reached by these two groups, it would cast doubt upon the validity of this writer's findings. Unfortunately, time and resource constraints (again financial) prevent this study from adopting that procedure.

To compensate for this weakness, this study adopted another procedure. Each evaluation had a worksheet prepared for it. These worksheets are in the appendices and provide support for this analyst's findings. Each worksheet has an abstract of the program being evaluated. The five evaluation criteria are listed down the vertical axis of the worksheet and evidence, in the form of passages from the evaluations or references to pages in the evaluation, appear beside each evaluation criteria. This evidence and documentation is presented to allow those with questions to determine what evidence this analyst used to rate an evaluation. It is hoped that the discussion in Chapter Three persuaded readers of the validity of the evaluation criteria selected. It is also hoped that the inclusion of the worksheets in the appendices will persuade readers of the validity and reliability of this analyst's findings.

#### *Analysts To Apply Checklists / Confidence Scales for Analysts*

These characteristics are also for research that includes multiple analysts. These are not applicable to this study.



*Means for Checking Reliability*

These measures often include training and post-training testing to insure that analysts are in sync with study leaders. Again, since this study is personally funded, it is limited to one analyst. Please refer to the sub-section above, "Decision Rules," for a discussion of the measures undertaken by this study to ensure reliability.

Table 4.1 lists the five examination criteria developed in Chapter Three. These are the variables this study uses to compare evaluations between TEA and AISD. Under each variable, is a list of the possible findings for that particular variable. Chapter Five presents the research findings of this study and Chapter Six offers some concluding remarks.

Table 4.1

<i>Evaluation Comparison Criteria</i>				
<b>Evaluator Role</b>	<b>Data Collected</b>	<b>Organizer</b>	<b>Process, Outcome</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
statistician	quantitative	objectives	formative	quantitative
researcher	qualitative	decisions	summative	qualitative
technician		effects		
integrator. coordinantor, decision maker		critical guideposts  stakeholder interests		

## C H A P T E R F I V E

### Research Findings

#### *Texas Education Agency*

Table 5.1 provides a summary of the evaluations from the Texas Education Agency. Note that for some of the evaluations, there are two responses under a criterion column. When there are two responses and one is in bold, it is because this analyst felt the bold response was the most dominant characteristic of the evaluation. When both responses are in normal type face, they are considered to be equal in importance to the evaluation. The following sections describe the findings of the TEA evaluations by evaluation criteria.

#### *Evaluator Role*

Usually, the role of evaluators in TEA is that of researcher or statistician. Statistician was the role in 5 of 6 evaluations. The notable exception was the "At-Risk" evaluation where the evaluator took on the role of integrator, coordinator, and decision maker. This role is at the far right of Borich's scale on Table 3.2. This more advanced role is consistent with the other findings for that evaluation. This evaluation is more complete and comprehensive as evidenced by the more integral role of the evaluator. For this evaluation, note that both types of data are collected and feedback is reported in a qualitative and quantitative format. Also, the purpose of the evaluation is both summative and formative.

**TABLE 5.1**  
**Evaluation Comparison Matrix**  
**Texas Education Agency**

Evaluation Title	Evaluator Role	Data Collected	Organizer	Process, Outcome	Feedback
"A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform on At-Risk Students in Texas (Preliminary Findings)"	integrator, coordinator, decision maker	quantitative, qualitative	effects	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Program Evaluation Report: Compensatory Education"	researcher, statistician	quantitative	effects	summative	quantitative
"Program Evaluation Report: Bilingual/ESL Education"	researcher, statistician	quantitative, qualitative	effects	formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Program Evaluation Report: Gifted/Talented"	researcher, statistician	quantitative	effects	summative, formative	quantitative
"Biennial Report of Progress Under and Compliance with the Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education and an Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs"	statistician	quantitative, qualitative	objectives	summative	quantitative
"Statewide Summary of Chapter 1 Achievement Data - June 10, 1991"	statistician	quantitative	objectives	summative	quantitative

*Data Collected*

All evaluations collected quantitative data. Three of the evaluations collected qualitative data as well. For the evaluations that collected both types of data, the emphasis was evenly split. One evaluation emphasized quantitative data, one emphasized qualitative data, and one showed an even balance between the two.

*Organizer*

For their evaluation focus, these evaluations chose between two organizers, as defined by Guba and Lincoln. These were effects and objectives. Effects and objectives are the organizers at the quantitative end of Guba and Lincoln's classification scheme (refer to Table 3.4). These evaluations used evaluators primarily as statisticians and collected mostly quantitative data. With these factors, it is logical that these evaluations should focus on outcome measures. This is consistent with the other variables measured.

*Process/Outcome*

As would be expected with such quantitatively oriented evaluations, most of TEA's evaluations were summative in nature. However, one was purely formative and two were both formative and summative. These findings are also consistent with the other variables measured. The lone formative evaluation, "Bilingual/ESL," was also unique in that its dominant source of data was qualitative data obtained in interviews. It is this researcher's opinion that this

evaluation demonstrated the most complete evaluation design in terms of collecting data and triangulating results.

### *Feedback*

Most of these evaluations chose to report their findings quantitatively. Two reported both qualitative and quantitative results and the "Bilingual/ESL" evaluation reported the majority of its findings through a qualitative format. Again these results are consistent with the other elements found in the evaluations. The next section summarizes the findings of the AISD evaluations.

### *Austin Independent School District*

Table 5.2 summarizes the findings of the eleven AISD evaluations examined for this period. The evaluations in AISD showed more variety in their results than their counterparts at TEA. This variety could be attributed to the larger sample size. The AISD sample was nearly twice as large as the TEA sample. Note again the use of bold type faces on Table 5.2 to show dominant characteristics of evaluations. Table 5.2 also has one element with an asterisk. Under "Feedback," on the "Compensatory Ed" evaluation, the qualitative description has an asterisk beside it. The asterisk was added because the evaluation plan for this evaluation included the use of presentations to report feedback.

**TABLE 5.2**  
***Evaluation Comparison Matrix***  
***Austin Independent School District***

<b>Evaluation Title</b>	<b>Evaluator Role</b>	<b>Data Collected</b>	<b>Organizer</b>	<b>Process, Outcome</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
"ECIA Chapter 1 / Chapter Migrant: 1990-1991 Evaluation Design"	technician	quantitative, qualitative	effects, decisions	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Drug-Free Schools Program: 1987-1988 Evaluation Design"	statistician	quantitative, qualitative,	objectives, decisions	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Evaluation Design: 1981-1982 Program for the Gifted and Talented"	researcher	quantitative, qualitative	effects	formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Magnet Schools Assistance Program: 1986-1987 Evaluation Design"	technician	quantitative, qualitative	decisions	formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Evaluation Design: 1980-1981 Reading Curriculum Study Grades K-3"	researcher	quantitative, qualitative	effects	formative	quantitative, qualitative
"State Compensatory Education: 1984-1985 Evaluation Design"	integrator, coordinator, decision maker	quantitative, qualitative	objectives, decisions	summative	quantitative, qualitative*
"High School Graduation Minimum Competency Requirements: 1982-1983 Evaluation Design"	researcher	quantitative	objectives, decisions	formative	quantitative
"AISD Local/State Bilingual Program 1983-1984"	statistician	quantitative	objectives	summative	quantitative
"Race Against Time: Secondary Title VII Program Evaluation 1988-1989"	statistician	quantitative	objectives	summative	quantitative
"Final Evaluation Report: Health Objectives in Nutrition Education for Youth (HONEY)"	statistician	quantitative	objectives, decisions	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative
"ESEA Title II: 1989-1990 Evaluation Design"	researcher	quantitative, qualitative	decisions	formative	quantitative, qualitative

These presentations could satisfy the requirements for a qualitative presentation of evaluation results or they could just be a presentation of the findings of the evaluation in statistical form. This researcher was not present at these presentations and therefore could not be certain whether the characteristics for a qualitative presentation of results was satisfied. That is the reason for the asterisk.

### *Evaluator Role*

The AISD evaluations contained all the roles described by Borich in Table 3.2. Like TEA, the most common roles were that of statistician and researcher (four each). Also like TEA, only one evaluation, "Compensatory Ed," had as its evaluator role, that of integrator, coordinator, and decision maker. This expanded role was mostly consistent with the rest of the evaluation. The "Compensatory Ed" evaluation collected qualitative and quantitative data, looked at two organizers, and presented both quantitative and qualitative\* feedback. (Note that this qualitative variable is the one with the asterisk and therefore it is not certain that qualitative feedback was present).

### *Data Collected*

Seven of the AISD evaluations collected both qualitative and quantitative data. Like TEA, when both types of data were collected, quantitative data was most often the dominant type collected. None of the evaluations, in either agency, collected strictly qualitative data. Of the four evaluations that only

collected one type of data, quantitative was the choice. In summary, all AISD evaluations collected quantitative data. Seven collected both qualitative and quantitative data and of those seven, only one concentrated on qualitative data. It is clear that AISD is oriented toward quantitative data collection.

### *Organizer*

Like TEA, the evaluations in AISD leaned toward the quantitative end of the Guba and Lincoln classification scheme in terms of organizer selected. Of the five organizers discussed in Chapter Three, three of them were found in the AISD evaluations. The "critical guideposts" organizer is not expected to be found since only Eisner and a handful of his disciples practice this type of evaluation. Eliminating Eisner's organizer, the AISD evaluations contained 3 of a possible 4. The other organizer not observed is that of "Stakeholder Interests." When dealing with public education, stakeholders can include teachers, administrators, children, parents, and essentially all taxpayers. It is not practical in these types of evaluations to solicit the interests of all stakeholders.

For AISD, just slightly more than half (6 of 11) used objectives as the organizer. If the you add effects to this total, you get 9 of 11. These are outcome oriented organizers and are consistent with the findings in the previous section which found most of the evaluations collected quantitative data. It is logical that an evaluation concerned with outcome variables like objectives and effects, would collect quantitative data.



*Process/Outcome*

Eight of these evaluations had a formative purpose. Five had a strictly formative purpose and three had a dual purpose (both summative and formative). The emphasis on a formative purpose could be due to the relatively new nature of some of the programs being evaluated. Only three of the evaluations had a strictly summative purpose. These three were AISD programs that used either state or federal money. The summative purpose of these evaluations could be due to funding requirements imposed by the state or national government.

*Feedback*

Most of the evaluations reported evaluation results in both a qualitative and quantitative format. All evaluations reported results in a quantitative format. When both types of feedback were used, quantitative feedback was usually dominant. None of the AISD evaluations presented only qualitative feedback.

This heavy emphasis on quantitative feedback is consistent with the findings of the other variables. Most evaluations collected quantitative data and looked at outcome oriented organizers like effects and objectives. It is logical that these types of findings would be reported quantitatively. In evaluations where evaluators acted as technicians with the primary function of providing information to management for decision making, the organizer was decisions. Table 5.3 contains the comprehensive research findings for both agencies.

**TABLE 5.3**  
**Evaluation Comparison Matrix**  
**Texas Education Agency and Austin Independent School District**

<b>Evaluation Title</b>	<b>Evaluator Role</b>	<b>Data Collected</b>	<b>Organizer</b>	<b>Process, Outcome</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
"A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform on At-Risk Students in Texas (Preliminary Findings)" (TEA)	integrator, coordinator, decision maker	quantitative, qualitative	effects	formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Program Evaluation Report: Compensatory Education" (TEA)	researcher, statistician	quantitative	effects	summative	quantitative
"Program Evaluation Report: Bilingual/ESL Education" (TEA)	researcher, statistician	quantitative, qualitative	effects	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Program Evaluation Report: Gifted/Talented" (TEA)	researcher, statistician	quantitative	effects	formative	quantitative
"Vocational and Technical Education" (TEA)	statistician	quantitative, qualitative	objectives	summative	quantitative
"Chapter 1 Achievement Data - June 10, 1991" (TEA)	statistician	quantitative	objectives	summative	quantitative
"ECIA Chapter 1 / Chapter Migrant: 1990-1991 Evaluation Design" (AISD)	technician	quantitative, qualitative	effects, decisions	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Drug-Free Schools Program: 1987-1988 Evaluation Design" (AISD)	statistician	quantitative, qualitative	objectives, decisions	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Evaluation Design: 1981-1982 Program for Gifted and Talented" (AISD)	researcher	quantitative, qualitative	effects	formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Magnet Schools Assistance Program: 1986-1987 Evaluation Design" (AISD)	technician	quantitative, qualitative	decisions	formative	quantitative, qualitative
"Evaluation Design: 1980-1981 Reading Curriculum Study Grades K-3" (AISD)	researcher	quantitative, qualitative	effects	formative	quantitative, qualitative
"State Compensatory Education: 1984-1985 Evaluation Design" (AISD)	integrator, coordinator, decision maker	quantitative, qualitative	objectives, decisions	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative*
"HS Graduation Minimum Competency Requirements: 1982-1983 Evaluation Design"	researcher	quantitative	objectives, decisions	formative	quantitative
"AISD Local/State Bilingual Program 1983-1984"	statistician	quantitative	objectives	summative	quantitative
"Race Against Time: Secondary Title VII Program Evaluation 1988-1989"	statistician	quantitative	objectives	summative	quantitative
"Final Evaluation Report: Health Objectives in Nutrition Education for Youth (HONEY)"	statistician	quantitative	objectives, decisions	summative, formative	quantitative, qualitative
"ESEA Title II: 1989-1990 Evaluation Design"	researcher	quantitative, qualitative	decisions	formative	quantitative, qualitative

*Table 5.3 Results Discussion*

Looking at Table 5.3, several things become apparent. For both agencies, the role of the evaluator is usually that of statistician or researcher. This sample did, however, find evaluations that contained all four evaluator roles as described by Borich.

All evaluations examined by this study collected quantitative data. None of the evaluations in either agency collected strictly qualitative data. Some collected both qualitative and quantitative (10 of 17). This could be attempts on the part of evaluators to triangulate and corroborate their research. The reliance on quantitative data as at least part of each study's data collection could be due to the emphasis on testing in education. The easiest way to determine the effects of a program is to test before and after scores of students.

Of the five organizers presented by Guba and Lincoln in Chapter Three, three were present in these evaluations. As discussed previously, two of the organizers could not realistically be expected to be represented. The three that were found, are outcome oriented organizers like program effects and objectives. Effects were the organizer for 7 of 17 evaluations and objectives for 8 of 17. Decisions were also the organizer in 7 of the evaluations, but in only two of these evaluations were decisions the sole organizer. Usually it was combined with objectives as well.

The "Process,Outcome" criteria were fairly evenly spread between summative, formative, and a combination of the two. The AISD evaluations were more likely to have a formative purpose than were the TEA evaluations. It

appears that evaluations are designed with a distinct purpose in these agencies. Only five evaluations had a dual purpose, the rest were either strictly summative or strictly formative.

The feedback variable follows very closely with the data collected variable. In every case but one, when both qualitative and quantitative data were collected, the feedback was presented in both a quantitative and a qualitative form. These two variables, "Data Collected" and "Feedback," also showed the most likelihood for combining criteria. Both of these variables had 10 evaluations with combined criteria. By contrast, the "Process/Outcome" variable had only two choices possible, but it only combined them in 5 of the evaluations.

Chapter Six presents some concluding remarks for this research.

## C H A P T E R   S I X

### Conclusions

In Chapter One, a question was offered as one reason for this study. What types of educational evaluations are performed at the state and local level? From analysing this study's sample, several conclusions can be drawn. First, evaluators play varied roles in evaluations. They are usually researchers and statisticians, but they assume different roles on occasion. For the most part, these agencies are performing quantitative, outcome oriented evaluations. The results of these evaluations are typically reported in a quantitative fashion, but the use of qualitative feedback is sometimes used. These evaluations are being done for both summative and formative purposes. Occasionally, an evaluation will combine both purposes.

In Chapter Three, Guthrie's research which found that due to the reform of the 1980's, evaluation was undertaken more often to comply with managerial directive and less for professional purposes. (Guthrie, 1990: 122) This research supports that finding to a certain extent. Only three of the AISD evaluations had a strictly summative purpose. These three evaluations were all of programs with state or federal funding. These evaluations are strictly outcome oriented and may be completed to fulfill funding requirements of the state or federal government. Also in Chapter Three, a question was raised, has the state assumed control of program evaluation within the last decade. From the results of this

study, the answer would have to be no.

From this study's sample, there were no discernible trends that differentiated the evaluations being done by each agency. There is some overlap in the evaluations done by these agencies. This is not surprising since both organizations have an interest in the programs and local school districts have a history of preferring autonomy (as evidenced by the word "independent" in their names). In this study, both TEA and AISD evaluated the gifted and talented program. These two evaluations were categorized almost identically, except the state evaluation included a statistical role for the evaluator. Other programs that were jointly evaluated displayed similar results. This study was unable to detect significant differences in the types of evaluations being done by TEA and AISD. The most notable difference was the greater number and the more consistent effort in performing the evaluations at AISD. There were more similarities than differences in the evaluations done by these agencies.

It would seem that both TEA and AISD are performing evaluations that are fairly mainstream. The trend in the literature is toward more naturalistic inquiry. This was observed to a limited extent in these agencies. But when an evaluation does collect qualitative data, it is almost exclusively in the form of interviews with administrators or teachers. There was no use of focus groups, case studies, or other methods of naturalistic inquiry. An interesting topic for future research would be to determine if these agencies have ever used naturalistic research techniques. Another research question is could naturalistic inquiry be used to augment the evaluations being done by these agencies?

There were, however, interesting differences between agencies observed by this writer. Several will be mentioned here. The evaluation division of AISD appears to be more organized and focused than its counterpart at TEA. This is evidenced by the detailed, published outline of evaluations to be performed in the coming fiscal year. In contrast, at TEA when asked how it was determined what would be evaluated next, an evaluator responded, "That's a good question." He did not mean it was an intelligent question, merely that evaluations were done as requested by those with the power to make such requests. At TEA, there was not the systematic collection of data evidenced at AISD. As a sidenote, AISD is now in the third year of GENESYS which stands for "GENeric Evaluation SYStem." This is an evaluation system using computers to collect data continually for evaluative purposes. GENESYS is an attempt to collect and categorize the large amounts of data compiled by AISD. The introduction and use of GENESYS will likely mean a continuation of the quantitative, outcome oriented evaluations at AISD.

TEA's lower evaluation output could be due to the more volatile nature of the agency, particularly in the recent past. Also, AISD has made a substantial commitment to evaluation and spends considerable amounts of money for these reports. The output at AISD may be unusually high rather than the output at TEA being unusually low. It appears at this point, AISD is more systematic about evaluation. However, the evaluations done by TEA are larger, more comprehensive (statewide versus local), and presumably more expensive and time consuming.

Despite the fact these were quantitative type evaluations, there was a high number of evaluations with a formative purpose. Through these evaluations, both agencies are attempting to locate successful and unsuccessful components of a program. This knowledge will allow changes to be made in existing programs to mimic the success of effective programs. This was particularly true of TEA programs. At AISD, the formative evaluations were often done on relatively new programs. Another question for future research is to determine if increased use of naturalistic research methods improve the formative evaluations being done by these agencies?

There are some other questions for future research. How are the results of these evaluations implemented? What is the procedure for review and action once an evaluation is complete? For AISD, a comparative study between the results of the GENESYS system and prior evaluations would be interesting to determine if this type of system might be applicable for other school systems. It would also be interesting to compare the evaluation efforts at TEA to other states and to compare AISD's effort to other urban areas. With the substantial amounts of money being spent on education at all levels of government, it only makes sense to monitor educational programs to make sure the money is being spent wisely. Evaluation can provide information for administrators to make sure these programs are being run effectively and efficiently.



**A P P E N D I X    A**

**Texas Education Agency Evaluation Worksheets**

**Evaluation Title:** "A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform on At-Risk Students in Texas (Preliminary Findings)"

**Agency:** TEA

**Abstract:** School districts have attempted to identify "at-risk" students in the schools in an attempt to take measures to prevent these students from dropping out of school. In the 88-89 school, over 80,000 students were reported to have dropped out of Texas schools. It is estimated at the national level, the current dropout rates will result in lost lifetime earning in the neighborhood of \$50 billion. Additional costs include foregone tax revenues, larger welfare expenditures, poorer physical health of the nation's citizens, and higher costs of crime. The state has implemented some measures to discourage students from dropping out. This study is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of those measures.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

integrator, coordinator, and decision maker - see recommendations for changes on pages vi-vii

#### Data Collected:

qualitative and quantitative - "While much of these data are quantifiable, data from the interview provide faculty, staff, and student's perceptions in more general terms (for example, 'some,' 'few,' 'many') that are not necessarily quantifiable (ix)."

#### Organizer:

effects - "The purpose of this study is twofold: to gain a better understanding of how the term at-risk is defined and applied in the schools and to assess the intended and unintended consequences of the attendance policy, the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) exit-level examination, the no pass/no play rule, and the driver's license law on at-risk students (ix)."

**Evaluation Title:** "A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform on At-Risk Students in Texas (Preliminary Findings)" - page 2

**Agency:** TEA

**Process/Outcome:**

summative with formative end uses - "The purpose of this study is twofold: to gain a better understanding of how the term at-risk is defined and applied in the schools and to assess the intended and unintended consequences of the attendance policy, the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) exit-level examination, the no pass/no play rule, and the driver's license law on at-risk students (ix)."

**Feedback:**

qualitative and quantitative - see findings pages 25-28 and appendices C, D, F-J

**Evaluation Title:** "Program Evaluation Report: Compensatory Education"

**Agency:** TEA

**Abstract:** Compensatory education came about in response to studies in the early 1960's that found that lack of early educational stimulation was a better predictor of student performance than ability. The assumption underlying compensatory education is that remediation of these deficits is possible and the duty of the schools. This evaluation is designed to locate successful compensatory programs. It is also designed to determine what elements make for a successful program with the result of transferring those elements to other districts.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

researcher - "While some of the objectives have been modified since the beginning of the study, the major goals of this research effort can be plainly summarized as:

- (1) What forms of compensatory education are being offered for students?
- (2) What student outcomes can be attributed to the program? (9)

statistician - see Chapter Three "Findings"

#### Data Collected:

quantitative - "In general, the campus questionnaires requested information on program implementation, instructors, students, and student performance. The individual student questionnaire was composed of 57 questions divided into sections covering student background information, performance measure, general and specific program implementation, teacher experience, and parental involvement (ii)."

See questionnaires in appendices.

#### Organizer:

effects - "The goal was neither to differentiate among programs funded by specific state, local, or federal sources, nor among individual districts or campuses but rather to determine the general condition and impact of compensatory education in Texas (13)."

Evaluation Title: "Program Evaluation Report: Compensatory Education" - page 2

Agency: TEA

Process/Outcome:

summative - "A primary goal of this phase of the study was the development of a statewide overview of compensatory education programs as implemented in Texas. An explicit assumption of this evaluation was that findings would be limited to description of compensatory education as currently practiced in Texas, not as programs could or should be implemented (ii)."

Feedback:

quantitative - see Chapter Three "Findings" pages 19 - 99

**Evaluation Title:** "Program Evaluation Report: Bilingual/ESL Education"

**Agency:** TEA

**Abstract:** During the 86-87 school year, there were approximately 274,145 students in Texas schools with limited English proficiency (LEP). This is approximately 8.5% of total enrollments. Districts with 20 or more LEP students are required to provide bilingual education in the elementary grades. This evaluation "examines instructional practices and outcomes evidenced in bilingual programs and provides districts with information for examining local programs (1)."

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

researcher - "A primary goal of this phase of the study was the development of a statewide overview of bilingual and ESL programs as currently implemented in Texas. This report does not include descriptions of how these programs could or should be implemented (ii)."

statistician - see Chapter Three "Findings"

#### Data Collected:

quantitative and qualitative - "The Phase I evaluation strategy consisted of a data collection instrument sent to a sample of 144 districts, which was supplemented by on-site visits to several school districts to interview principals, teachers, and program directors (13)."

#### Organizer:

effects - "The second phase of this study had two main goals, the first being the development of a statewide overview of bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) programs as currently implemented. . . The second goal was to identify practices associated with successful and unsuccessful limited English proficient (LEP) students in bilingual and ESL programs (15)."

**Evaluation Title:** "Program Evaluation Report: Bilingual/ESL Education" - Page 2

**Agency:** TEA

Process/Outcome:

formative - "A primary goal of this phase of the study was the development of a statewide overview of bilingual and ESL programs as currently implemented in Texas (ii)."

"Another goal of this study was the identification of specific practices associated with successful and unsuccessful limited English proficient (LEP) students, which is anticipated to be useful in the development of local programs seeking to improve services to students (ii)."

Feedback:

quantitative and qualitative - see Chapter Three "Findings" pages 20 - 85

**Evaluation Title:** "Program Evaluation Report: Gifted / Talented Education"

**Agency:** TEA

**Abstract:** In 1979, the Texas Legislature began making funds available for gifted and talented students which the legislature defined as a student "... who by virtue of outstanding mental abilities, is capable of high performance. The student may demonstrate, singly or in combination, above-average achievement or potential in such areas as general intellectual ability, specific subject matter aptitude, ability in creative and productive thinking, and leadership ability (1)."

For the 86-87 school year, over \$7 million was distributed to 436 districts for gifted / talented programs. This evaluation was the eighth year the programs were evaluated and its purpose was to gather information from districts about their gifted/talented programs, gather information from a sample of students about the gifted/talented programs, determine where certain districts are in implementing a gifted/talented program, and to determine why certain districts have not applied for these funds.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

researcher - "The 1986 - 1987 program evaluation consisted of four components: (1) an evaluation of operational programs, (2) a case study of high school gifted / talented programs, (3) an evaluation of developmental programs, and (4) a survey of districts without a state-approved gifted / talented program (ii)."

statistician - see statistical results pages 12 - 64

#### Data Collected:

quantitative - "The data collection instrument sent to each operational program contained questions related to student identification, enrollment, program organization, curriculum, and staff development. ... In addition to the annual evaluation, a case study of high school G/T program was conducted (9)."



**Evaluation Title:** "Program Evaluation Report: Gifted / Talented Education" - page 2

**Agency:** TEA

**Organizer:**

effects - "The 1986 - 1987 program evaluation consisted of four components: (1) an evaluation of operational programs, (2) a case study of high school gifted / talented programs, (3) an evaluation of developmental programs, and (4) a survey of districts without a state-approved gifted / talented program (ii)."

**Process/Outcome:**

summative with formative purposes - "The 1986 - 1987 program evaluation consisted of four components: (1) an evaluation of operational programs, (2) a case study of high school gifted / talented programs, (3) an evaluation of developmental programs, and (4) a survey of districts without a state-approved gifted / talented program (ii)."

**Feedback:**

quantitative - see findings pages 12 - 64

**Evaluation Title:** "Biennial Report of Progress Under and Compliance with the Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education and an Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs"

**Agency:** TEA

**Abstract:** Part of the mission of the State Board of Education is to provide students with skills that will allow them to live and work in a changing future while providing the state with a skilled workforce. Vocational education programs are an integral part of fulfilling that mission. This evaluation has two purposes. It is designed to measure compliance and progress with the master plan for vocational education for the 88-89 and 89-90 school years. Second, it is to provide "quantitative and qualitative information on vocational education programs conducted during those years (1)."

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

statistician - see for example results in higher education findings pages 36-40

#### Data Collected:

qualitative and quantitative - "The board is required to report biennially the progress under and compliance with the Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education and to evaluate quantitatively and qualitatively the state's vocational programs (opening remarks)."

#### Organizer:

objectives - "The questions addressed at the site visit are in the evaluation instrument. This instrument is completed by the evaluation team during these site visits (33)."

#### Process/Outcome:

summative - "The purpose of this State Board of Education biennial report, . . . First, this report presents information regarding progress under and compliance with the master plan for vocational and technical education during school years 1988-1989 and 1989-1990. Second, this report presents quantitative and qualitative evaluative information on vocational education programs conducted during those years (introduction)."

**Evaluation Title:** "Biennial Report of Progress Under and Compliance with the Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education and an Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs" - page 2

**Agency:** TEA

**Feedback:**

quantitative - see findings for higher education evaluation pages 33-40

**A P P E N D I X   B**

**Austin Independent School District Evaluation Worksheets**

**Evaluation Title:** "ECIA Chapter 1 / Chapter Migrant: 1990-1991  
**Evaluation Design"**

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** This evaluation is to study the effectiveness of the instructional components of AISD's Chapter 1 program. These instructional components consist of supplemental reading/language arts programs for grades 1-6, reducing teacher/pupil ratios, pre-kindergarten classes, parental involvement, and supplemental assistance to six institutions for neglected and delinquent children.

The Chapter 1 Migrant program consists of reading/language arts for grades 1-12, a health services component, summer school and tutorial, and a parental involvement component.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

#### **Evaluator Role:**

technician - "Needs assessment information is gathered which provides Chapter 1 staff with information for planning and implementing the program as well as providing the basis for the 1991-1992 Chapter 1 application for funding (4)."

#### **Data Collected:**

qualitative and quantitative - "These activities require the collection of a wide variety of data including both process and product data (4)."

#### **Organizer:**

effects - "The major focus of the Chapter 1 evaluation component for 1990-91 will be to study the effectiveness of the instructional components of the Austin Independent School District (AISD) Chapter 1 program (i)."

The major focus of the Chapter 1 Migrant evaluation component for 1990-91 will be to study the effectiveness of the components of the AISD Chapter 1 Migrant Program (i)."

decisions - see Decision Questions pages 7-13

**Evaluation Title:** "ECIA Chapter 1 / Chapter Migrant: 1990-1991  
Evaluation Design" - page 2

**Agency:** AISD

**Process/Outcome:**

formative and summative - "Process data will be used to analyze the extent and efficiency with which program components have been implemented (4)."

"Outcome data will indicate the extent to which the Chapter 1/Chapter 1 Migrant Programs and the Priority Schools have had an impact on the achievement of students (4)."

**Feedback:**

quantitative with small qualitative portion- see Evaluation Findings report, there was a brief paragraph that provided five comments from teachers re: CAI Labs, but this was minor compared to 24 pages of statistics

**Evaluation Title:** "Drug-Free Schools Program: 1987-1988 Evaluation Design"

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** The Drug-Free Schools Program is designed to eliminate the influence of drugs and alcohol from school campuses by educating students to the risks of use and offering alternate choices to drugs and alcohol. Assistance programs are available to those students that are already involved with drugs and/or alcohol. The program is available to all school district personnel and parents.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

#### **Evaluator Role:**

statistician - "The Drug-Free Schools Program evaluation is primarily concerned with the use of monies granted to AISD under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSC) of 1986 (PL-99-570) (3)."

#### **Data Collected:**

qualitative and quantitative - see the Information Sources for "Evaluation Outline" pages 8-11

#### **Organizer:**

objectives and decisions - see the Evaluation Questions for "Evaluation Outline" pages 8-11

#### **Process/Outcome:**

formative and summative - see Evaluation Outline pages 8-11, Decision Questions contain a formative element and Evaluation Questions often address summative data

#### **Feedback:**

qualitative and quantitative - primarily statistical but there was a small area that included teacher comments in Final Report (19)

**Evaluation Title:** "Evaluation Design: 1981-1982 Program for the Gifted and Talented"

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** The gifted and talented program has been in effect since 1975 and is designed to develop the skills and abilities of gifted and talented students in academic subject areas, music, art, problem solving skills, leadership skills, and coping with the special problems associated with being gifted. To accomplish these goals, the program must identify gifted students and provide adequate training for teachers to meet the needs of the students. Appropriate curriculum must be developed for the gifted/talented population. This evaluation is to determine how successful the district is in achieving these goals.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

#### **Evaluator Role:**

researcher - "This year's evaluation of the Gifted and Talented Programs in Austin is primarily exploratory in nature (ii)."

#### **Data Collected:**

qualitative and quantitative - see information sources column on "Decision Questions Overview" sheets pages 5-7

#### **Organizer:**

effects - "The primary focus of this evaluation is the identification of characteristics and unique features of the Gifted and Talented Programs (3)."

#### **Process/Outcome:**

formative - "This year's evaluation of the Gifted and Talented Programs in Austin is primarily exploratory in nature (ii)."

#### **Feedback:**

qualitative and quantitative - see analysis techniques column on Information Sources (11)



**Evaluation Title:** "Magnet Schools Assistance Program: 1986-1987  
**Evaluation Design"**

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** The magnet schools assistance program is a federally funded program that provides funds to support the Science Academy of Austin secondary schools, the science program at Kealing Junior High, and the elementary science program at six elementary schools. The program's goals are to increase racial balance at the schools and to provide access to mathematics and science for under-represented groups (like minorities and women). The program is designed to provide incentives to students to voluntarily transfer to schools experiencing undesirable declines in enrollment.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

technician - evaluation is designed with the idea of providing information for decision making, see "Decision Questions Overview" sheets pages 8-11

#### Data Collected:

qualitative and quantitative - "Program implementation, student recruitment, and student characteristics and outcomes will be assessed through administrator, teacher, and student surveys, interviews with key personnel, and information available from District files (6)."

#### Organizer:

decisions - see Decision Questions Overviews pages 8-11

#### Process/Outcome:

formative - "This design includes description of the programs and an evaluation summary of the implementation activities (i)."

#### Feedback:

quantitative and qualitative - see Information Sources column on "Information Needs Overview" page 12

**Evaluation Title:** "Evaluation Design: 1980-1981 Reading Curriculum Study Grades K-3"

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** This programmed is designed to provide more coordinated reading/language arts curriculum for AISD students. Several factors have lead teachers and administrators to believe this increased coordination is necessary. These factors include reduced scores on reading tests, there is a wide variety of reading programs and materials within the district, and the heavy emphasis on skill development in recent years has produced an imbalance in the District's reading program and limited the opportunity for student's to read for pleasure.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

researcher - "The reading curriculum study has three major objectives: to provide a description of the reading instruction AISD teachers provide for students in grades K-3, to identify areas in which the provision of reading services in grades K-3 can be improved, and to identify additional questions about the AISD reading curriculum that warrant consideration in the future (3)."

#### Data Collected:

qualitative and quantitative - see Information Sources columns on "Decision Questions Overview" sheets pages 5-8

#### Organizer:

effects - evaluation directed by the need for information to make certain decisions, see Decision Question columns on "Decision Questions Overview" sheets pages 5-8

#### Process/Outcome:

formative - "The reading curriculum study has three major objectives: to provide a description of the reading instruction AISD teachers provide for students in grades K-3, to identify areas in which the provision of reading services in grades K-3 can be improved, and to identify additional questions about the AISD reading curriculum that warrant consideration in the future (3)."

**Evaluation Title:** "Evaluation Design: 1980-1981 Reading Curriculum Study Grades K-3" - page 2

**Agency:** AISD

**Feedback:**

qualitative and quantitative - see Analysis Techniques column on "Information Sources" page 10

**Evaluation Title:** "State Compensatory Education: 1984-1985  
**Evaluation Design"**

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** This program is funded by the state legislature for two years at a time. These funds are used for a variety of programs such as providing additional assistance to students identified as low achievers, providing instructional assistance to teachers and students in the area of reading skills at junior and senior high schools, and the summer school programs. This evaluation is prepared to comply with TEA requirements.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

#### **Evaluator Role:**

integrator, coordinator, and decision maker - see "Central Information Needs" sheets pages 4-13 where a decision question is presented and relevant information sources are provided

#### **Data Collected:**

qualitative and quantitative - "Process data will be used to determine component specifics and activities and the extent to which program objectives have been implemented (3).

"Outcome data will be collected from a variety of instruments (3)."

#### **Organizer:**

objectives, decisions - "These activities will require the collection of needs assessment, accountability, process, and outcome data (3).

#### **Process/Outcome:**

summative - "Process data will be used to determine component specifics and activities and the extent to which program objectives have been implemented (3)."

#### **Feedback:**

qualitative and quantitative - dissemination of evaluation findings scheduled to be in the form of handouts and presentation (10)

**Evaluation Title:** "High School Graduation Minimum Competency Requirements: 1982-1983 Evaluation Design"

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** In 1975, a requirement was added for graduation from high school, students must demonstrate through testing, an 8th grade level of knowledge in reading and mathematics. An exception could be made if the student's parent or guardian filed a letter with the district stating they were aware the student was graduating without attaining these skills. In 1983 this level was increased to 9th grade.

In 1982, the AISD developed their own competency test called the Basic Educational Skills Test (BEST). This evaluation is designed to focus on using BEST as a measure of graduation competency and to document student's competency status with summary reporting for needs assessment and decision making.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

researcher - on page 6, the decision questions are listed that guided the evaluators

#### Data Collected:

quantitative - information sources listed on page 13 include copies of competency tests and AISD files on past graduation classes test results on competency tests

#### Organizer:

objectives, decisions - on page 5, the focus of the evaluation is given as development of a competency test (objectives) and to provide information for decision making about what is needed as a competency test

#### Process/Outcome:

formative - the purpose is to develop a competency test for AISD

#### Feedback:

quantitative - final report will use test scores to support findings of evaluation

**Evaluation Title:** "AISD Local/State Bilingual Program 1983-1984"

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** By state law, a district must provide bilingual instruction to each language group that has more than 20 students in a given grade. For AISD, that is Hispanic and Vietnamese students. For groups that don't meet the 20 student limits, English as a second language (ESL) courses must be offered. This evaluation is to measure the progress of these students and to compare their academic achievements to the English speaking counterparts.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

#### **Evaluator Role:**

statistician - on pages 4-9, the test scores of these students are reported and compared to national and district norms

#### **Data Collected:**

quantitative - see graphs on pages 4-9

#### **Organizer:**

objectives - this evaluation measures test results

#### **Process/Outcome:**

summative - this evaluation is to measure the academic achievements of particular student populations

#### **Feedback:**

quantitative - see graphs pages 4-9

**Evaluation Title:** "Race Against Time: Secondary Title VII Program Evaluation, 1988-1989"

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** Title VII federal funds have been used at AISD since 1985-1986 to enhance bilingual programs for Hispanic limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. In 1988-1989, the program was expanded to include all ethnic backgrounds at five campuses. For 1988-1989, Title VII funds were \$81,492 and affected 446 students. This evaluation is to determine the impact of the Title VII efforts.

### **Evaluation Criteria**

#### **Evaluator Role:**

statistician - see major findings on page 1, these consist of test scores, comparison to past scores, dropout rates, etc.

#### **Data Collected:**

quantitative - see graphs, tables, and charts on pages 7-27

#### **Organizer:**

objectives - this evaluation measure test results and other measures of outcomes from the Title VII funds

#### **Process/Outcome:**

summative - this evaluation is to measure the academic achievements of particular student populations

#### **Feedback:**

quantitative - see results of the evaluation on pages 7-27

**Evaluation Title:** "Final Evaluation Report: Health Objectives in Nutrition Education for Youth (HONEY)"

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** A nutrition program was piloted in the Fall of 1985 in response to legislation drafted by the state. The program is for grades K-3. The funds are provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This is the evaluation of the first year pilot project.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

researcher - evaluation instruments included pre-test/post-test for the students to determine learning and questionnaires for teachers to determine training and teacher reactions to the project (page 2)

#### Data Collected:

quantitative - students were tested and teacher responses were rated on a scale from 1-5 (page 3)

#### Organizer:

objectives, decisions - test results give insight into program effectiveness and teacher questionnaires give insight into what areas should be changed in the program (page 4)

#### Process/Outcome:

mostly summative, formative element - primarily concerned with measuring effects, but suggestions made for improving program (pages 4-5)

#### Feedback:

mostly quantitative, some qualitative - see evaluation results on pages 4-5



**Evaluation Title:** "ESEA Title II: 1989-1990 Evaluation Design"

**Agency:** AISD

**Abstract:** ESEA Title II is a 12 month project to improve mathematics and science teaching in grades pre-K through 12. The money is to be spent on workshops and professional development for teachers in these areas. This evaluation is to determine teacher and administrator feedback to the workshops and materials presented during the workshops.

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Evaluator Role:

researcher - see list of questions on page 3, this is evaluation of first year efforts

#### Data Collected:

mostly qualitative, quantitative component - "... the evaluation will be primarily of the process type. Very limited outcome data will be available ... (3)"

quantitative component from counts of attendance, number of trainers, financial records, etc. and use of Likert scale that could be used to provide percentages that score a certain response (pages 8-10)

#### Organizer:

decisions - see evaluation objectives on page 3, questions are designed to make decisions about program needs

#### Process/Outcome:

formative - see list of evaluation objectives on page 3

#### Feedback:

qualitative, quantitative - results reported in narrative form with comments from workshop attendees and graphs that show percentages responding to certain numbers on the Likert scale (final report pages 4-26)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin Independent School District. A Capital Place for Kids. Austin, Texas, 1990a.
- Austin Independent School District. About the Austin Independent School District. . . Austin, Texas, 1991a.
- Austin Independent School District. Annual Performance Report, 1990 - 1991. Austin, Texas, 1991b.
- Austin Independent School District. Austin Independent School District. Austin, Texas, 1990b.
- Austin Independent School District. Chapter 1 and Chapter 1 Migrant Evaluation Findings. Austin, Texas, 1991c.
- Austin Independent School District. Drug-Free Schools Program: 1987-1988 Evaluation Design. Austin, Texas, 1988a.
- Austin Independent School District. Drug-Free Schools Program Evaluation 1987-1988. Austin, Texas, 1988b.
- Austin Independent School District. ECIA Chapter 1 / Chapter 1 Migrant: 1990-1991 Evaluation Design. Austin, Texas, 1990c.
- Austin Independent School District. ESEA Title II: 1989-1990 Evaluation Design. Austin, Texas, 1990d.
- Austin Independent School District. Evaluation Design: 1980-1981 Reading Curriculum Study Grades K-3. Austin, Texas, 1980.
- Austin Independent School District. Evaluation Design: 1981-1982 Program for the Gifted and Talented. Austin, Texas, 1981.
- Austin Independent School District. Final Evaluation Report: Health Objectives in Nutrition Education for Youth. Austin, Texas, 1985.
- Austin Independent School District. High School Graduation Minimum Competency Requirements: 1982-1983 Evaluation Design. Austin, Texas, 1982.
- Austin Independent School District. Humanities: 1987-1989 Evaluation Design. Austin, Texas, 1987.
- Austin Independent School District. Improving Mathematics and Science Teaching: 1990-1991 ESEA Title II Evaluation Report. Austin, Texas, 1991d.
- Austin Independent School District. Local/State Bilingual Program 1983-1984. Austin, Texas, 1984.
- Austin Independent School District. Magnet Schools Assistance Program: 1986-1987 Evaluation Design. Austin, Texas, 1986.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY - CONTINUED**

- Austin Independent School District. Performance and Funds Management Reports. Austin, Texas, 1991e.
- Austin Independent School District. Race Against Time: Secondary Title VII Program Evaluation, 1988-1989. Austin, Texas, 1989.
- Austin Independent School District. State Compensatory Education: 1984-1985 Evaluation Design. Austin, Texas, 1984.
- Borich, Gary D. Evaluating Education Programs and Products. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Evaluation Technology Publication, 1974.
- Borich, Gary D. "The History and Growth of Program Evaluation." In Program Evaluation in the Field of Education, ed. Gary D. Borich, 1-26. EDC 383N / EDP 380P.
- Campbell, D. T. and J. C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Chen, H. T. and P. H. Rossi. "Evaluating With Sense: The Theory Driven Approach." Evaluation Review Vol. 17, No. 3 (June 1983): 283-302.
- Chen, H. T. "The Theory Driven Perspective." Evaluation and Program Planning Vol. 12, No. 4 (1989): 299-307.
- Cronbach, Lee J. "Course Improvement Through Evaluation." Teacher College Record 64 (1963): 672-683.
- Cronbach, Lee J. Designing Evaluation for Educational and Social Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Edwards, Keith J. "Summative Evaluation: Some Basic Considerations." In Evaluating Educational Programs, ed. Gary D. Borich. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1974.
- Eichelberger, R. Tony. "Evaluating Ongoing Instructional Programs." In Evaluating Educational Programs, ed. Gary D. Borich, 348-372. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1974.
- Eisner, Elliott W. "Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism: Their Form and Functions in Educational Evaluation." In Evaluation Models: Viewpoints in Educational and Human Services Evaluation, ed. George F. Madaus, Michael S. Scriven, and Daniel L. Stufflebeam, 335-347. Boston: Luwer-Wijhoff Publishing, 1983.
- Fuhrman, S., W. Clune, and R. F. Elmore. "Research on Educational Reform: Lessons on the Implementation of Policy." Teacher's College Record, 90 (2) (1988): 237-258.
- Fuhrman, Susan H. and Richard F. Elmore. "Understanding Local Control in the Wake of State Education Reform." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis Vol. 12, No. 1 (Spring, 1990): 82-96.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY - CONTINUED

Ginsburg, Alan L. "Revitalizing Program Evaluation: The U.S. Department of Education Experience." Evaluation Review Vol. 13, No. 6 (December 1989): 579-597.

Guba, Egon and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Guthrie, James W. "The Evolving Political Economy of Education and the Implications for Educational Evaluation." Evaluation Review Vol. 42, No. 2 (1990): 109-131.

Hammond, R. L. "Evaluation at the Local Level." In Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice, ed. by B. R. Worthen and J. R. Sanders. Worthington, OH: Jones, 1973.

Holsti, O. R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Kaplan, A. The Conduct of Inquiry. San Francisco: Chandler, 1964.

Kidder, Louise H. and Michelle Fine. "Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: When Stories Converge." In Multiple Methods in Program Evaluation, ed. Melvin M. Mark, 57-75. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.

Klein, Stephen P. and Marvin C. Alkin. "Evaluating Teachers for Outcome Accountability." Evaluation Comment (1972): 5-11.

Lee, Rebecca A. and J. C. M. Schute. "An Approach to Naturalistic Evaluation: A Study of the Social Implications of an International Development Project." Evaluation Review Vol. 15, No. 2 (April 1991): 254-265.

Lucas, W. The Case Survey and Alternative Methods for Research Aggregation. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1974a.

Lucas, W. The Case-Survey Method: Aggregating Case Experience. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1974b.

Madaus, George F., Michael S. Scriven, and Daniel L. Stufflebeam. Evaluation Models. Boston: Kluwer-Wijhoff Publishing, 1983.

Patton, M. Q. Utilization Focused Evaluation, 2nd ed. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1986.

Popham, W. J. Educational Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Provus, M. Discrepancy Evaluation. Berkely, CA: McCutchan, 1971.

Scriven, Michael. "The Methodology of Evaluation." In Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation, ed. Ralph Tyler, Robert Gagne, and Michael Scriven, 39-83. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Scriven, Michael. "Objectivity and Subjectivity in Educational Research." In Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research ed. by L. G. Thomas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY - CONTINUED

Scriven, Michael. "Prose and Cons About Goal-Free Evaluation." Evaluation Comment 3 (1974): 1-4.

Sharp, John. Breaking the Mold: New Ways to Govern Texas. Austin, Texas: Texas Performance Review, 1990.

Smith, Nick L. and Diane M. Hauer. "The Applicability of Selected Evaluation Models to Evolving Investigative Designs." Studies in Educational Evaluation Vol. 16, No. 3 (1990): 489-500.

Stake, R. E. "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation." Teachers College Record 68, (1967): 523-540.

Stake, R. E. Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsive Approach. Columbus, OH: Merrill, 1975.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. et al. Education Evaluation and Decision-Making. Itasca, IL: Peacock Publishing, 1971.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. "The CIPP Model for Program Evaluation." In Evaluation Models: Viewpoints in Educational and Human Services Evaluation, ed. George F. Madaus, Michael S. Scriven, and Daniel L. Stufflebeam, 117-145. Boston: Luwer-Wijhoff Publishing, 1983.

Texas Education Agency. A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform on At-Risk Students in Texas. Austin, Texas, 1991a.

Texas Education Agency. Biennial Report of Progress Under and Compliance with the Master Plan for Vocational and Technical Education and an Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs. Austin, Texas, 1991b.

Texas Education Agency. Guidance Regarding 1991-1992 Chapter 1 Evaluation Methods. Austin, Texas, 1991c.

Texas Education Agency. Program Evaluation Report: Bilingual/ESL Education. Austin, Texas, 1988a.

Texas Education Agency. Program Evaluation Report: Compensatory Education. Austin, Texas, 1988b.

Texas Education Agency. Program Evaluation Report: Gifted / Talented Education. Austin, Texas, 1988c.

Texas Education Agency. Snapshot '90: 1989 - 1990 School District Profiles. Austin, Texas, 1991c.

Texas Education Agency. Texas Public Education and You. Austin, Texas, 1991d.

Texas State Board of Education. Quality, Equity, and Accountability: Long-Range Plan for Public Education 1991-1995. Austin, Texas, 1991.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY - CONTINUED**

Tyler, R. W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 1950.

Wentling, Tim L. and Chris A. Roegge. "Computer-Assisted Outcomes Based Evaluation for School Programs." Evaluation Review Vol. 15, No. 3 (June 1991): 378-392.

Yin, Robert K. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications: 1989.

---