REPORT ON THE FIELD TESTING OF THE CSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EVALUATION KIT: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Ralph Hoepfner
Ira Nelken
Paul A. Bradley
Guy P. Strickland
Richard C. Williams
Dale C. Woolley
Delores Barnes

School Evaluation Program
Center for the Study of Evaluation
UCLA Graduate School of Education
Los Angeles, California

CSE Report No. 70
September 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the field testing of the KIT would be of no value unless the KIT developers learned things that would enable them to improve the product or its dissemination. Criticisms of the KIT and recommendations for its improvement were solicited at many stages of all the field-test strategies. What was learned (or relearned) and the actions taken in response to what was learned are itemized below:

1. The principal is a pivotal decision maker regarding instructional programs in the school. The KIT will continue to be addressed primarily to principals.

2. Principals presently feel pressures for curricular reform from district administrators, teachers, and parents. Our approach to points-of-view needs assessment will be maintained as a realistic approach to addressing the felt pressures for change.

3. The principal does not consult very much with his teaching staff or the parents in matters of planning curriculum because he does not know how to do it effectively. The card-sort, points-of-view procedure will be expanded upon (see below) to make this necessary involvement of various constituencies even easier and more attractive to the principal.

4. Most schools have some sort of innovative project of an instructional nature under way. Since innovative programs particularly need evaluation, the primary aims of the KIT will meet a real need of the principals.

5. Principals are "cautious" in their attitudes about standardized tests. For this reason, they utilize tests less than optimally. The KIT will continue and expand its efforts to make test results more useful for everyday decision making by the principal.

6. Most tests employed in schools are mandated by the district or by the state. There is still room for decisions by principals, however, and this room may be in the evaluation of special programs of the schools. For this reason, alone, the inclusion of the MEAN test evaluations is justified.

7. Scores of standardized tests are not frequently used for program or school evaluation. The principal's needs for instruction and the need for the development of procedures for program assessment using published tests are evident. The KIT will continue to stress the additional values inherent in such evaluation devices and will develop improved methods for utilizing the tests for program and school evaluation.

8. Principals feel that teacher and guidance personnel attitudes towards standardized tests are fairly positive. This perceived positive attitude bodes well for the KIT's continued stress on their utilization for program evaluation. The comparatively lower attitudes of the students reflect most of the tests' relatively poor showing on the examinee appropriateness dimension of the test evaluations.

9. The principals do not have much confidence in using national norms for published tests. They want school norms and expressed the desire for differentiated school norms. Provision for some differentiated school norms and for procedures for estimating such norms will be made in the published version of the KIT. The Center is continuing to exert pressure on test publishers to further investigate the utilization of differentiated school norms.

10. The goals (as printed on the sorting cards) seem to most principals and teachers to be fairly exhaustive and reasonably organized. With the expansion of some particular behaviors in the goal descriptions, the goal cards will remain essentially as they were field tested.

11. The vocabulary on the goal cards was difficult, especially for most parents and community members. The goal cards will undergo one more field test, this time with lower-middle class parents, with the intent of soliciting their advice on translating the vocabulary to a simpler level, while maintaining the intended meanings. It is expected that this will result in cards and goals that can be understood by a larger spectrum of the population.

12. While half of the field-test participants desired the goals to be stated at a more detailed level, the other half wished them at a more global level. A compromise will be struck by leaving the goals at the level of their field testing.

13. The goal-sorting procedure was found to be easy and not odious to the participants. The card-sort procedure will be maintained, with some changes noted above and below.

14. Ten decks of cards did not seem sufficient for the principal to efficiently sample from his selected constituencies. The published KIT will have more decks included in the package (number undetermined) and the publisher will be urged to make available, under separate order, additional decks of goal-sort cards.

15. Many participants experienced difficulty in the card-sorting procedure when asked to consider "children in general." Instructions in Booklet II will be revised so that the card-sort can be done for a child at any particular grade level. This will eliminate much of the confusion expressed by teachers and parents.

16. The introduction to the card-sort procedure should not have been left solely in the hands of the principal. New illustrated and more detailed printed instructions to the card-sort procedure will be included in the published version of the KIT, which will minimize the confusion caused by lack of clarity on the part of the principal as he introduces the card-sort procedure.

17. The tallying process, based upon the card-sort, was found to be tedious and difficult. Two alternatives are being prepared for inclusion in the KIT which will minimize the difficulty and tediousness of the tallying procedure. First, the tally sheets will not be number-coded by goals, but will list the goals in alphabetical order, so that the card-tally sheet transfer is a one-step operation rather than a two-step operation. Second, the procedure utilized by the innovative principal in School B of the case-study sample, in which the teachers did the tallying in a group, exchanging ideas and opinions (which the project team found to be most stimulating for all concerned) will be provided as an option for sampling of teachers. This necessitates that the KIT's approach to the card-sort procedure will be trichotomized, approaches for the principal, for teachers, and for parents (see next item).

18. The return and completion of parents' card decks was disappointingly low. Principals found it difficult to sample well from the

parent groups and then to get the parents who did cooperate to complete the card-sort. To alleviate this problem, the goal-rating procedure will be expanded to a simple rating form questionnaire, so that the principal can mail out self-instructional questionnaires to all the parents, with the expectancy that his returns will be much greater. The questionnaires will be highly graphic and interesting to the parent and will be available in quantity from the publisher, under separate order, according to the plan.

19. Most principals could correctly employ the MEAN ratings to select the best tests for their use. The test evaluation format will remain as it was field tested.

20. Most of the principals exhibited complete surface understanding of the four MEAN criteria. The test evaluations will not be altered in order to simplify things for the principal; if most can understand it at the level provided, we will maintain the same level of detail as in the field test.

21. The test evaluation section was found to be clear and usable. The expectations of confusion on the part of the typical principal did not materialize; the appendix will remain as in the field-test version.

22. The test-administration-ordering section was considered well-packaged by the principals and thought of as providing information in a useful form, even though the information was not novel to them. The sections referred to will remain as in the field-test version.

23. Most principals do not favor sampled-system assessment, but prefer the less efficient (but more information-providing) student-system assessment method. The perceived (but not completely veridical) favoring of a sampled-system assessment by the Center will be eliminated. Since both methods have distinct advantages, both will be given equal attention, with the advantages of both discussed.

24. The discussion of decision models and decision rules was judged to be very clear by the principals. Counter to the Program's expectations, these sections were not too difficult for the users, so they will not be written down to a simpler (and less informative) level.

25. Most principals want greater explanation of the numbers in the utility and value tables and want greater explanation of the derivations of the procedures. A slight expansion of these sections will be accomplished and included in the published version of the KIT. It is apparent that we aimed a bit too low in this section, being too cautious about overwhelming the principal, when, in fact, the principal needs some documentation so that he can have a ground for the confidence he needs in order to utilize the product.

26. While the leadership qualities of the principal appear to be important, the informal social structure among the teachers does not appear to be important to the successful implementation of the KIT. The KIT will continue to be addressed to the principal, and no provision will be made at this time for organizational problems within the school. In an effort to minimize the degree to which the KIT rests on the unpredictable leadership talents of elementary school principals, the KIT's directions will be made much more extensive, directive, and specific. While this may limit the creative ways in which the KIT might be used, more explicit directions should reduce the variability of the KIT's introduction. These revisions will give detailed instructions on how to introduce the KIT, a timetable for use of the KIT, and a more comprehensive introduction to the design of the evaluation KIT.

DESCRIPTION OF THE KIT

School administrators are faced more and more with situations which require that accountable decisions be made on the basis of very limited information. Since these decisions relate directly to the effectiveness of the school, it is vital that procedures be developed for selecting, collecting, analyzing, and providing information that will be of use to principals in making educational decisions. The information contained in published research studies, however, certainly does not include the entire range of school dimensions that school principals must consider in making their decisions; and the form of such reports is not readily amenable to utilization by decision makers.

The School Evaluation Program was designed to meet this need of decision makers. The Program has designed a portion of a do-it-yourself information system for elementary school administrators to obtain information about student performance and the variables by which it is influenced. The system provides this information to the principal in a manner that will enable him to use it effectively in making decisions. The principal is seen as the prime user of the system since he has to make most of the major daily decisions concerning school policy and procedures. The present trend toward decentralization is certainly increasing his responsibility in this respect.

Though the information system is being designed specifically for the principal and assumes very little in the way of evaluation or measurement skills, it could also be useful to others interested in the output of schools, such as congressmen, parents, school superintendents, and teachers. A superintendent, for instance, could use it to examine the relative strengths and weaknesses of student performance (adjusted for input) at the different schools in his district.

In preparation for constructing this system, the Program has reviewed existing data, evaluation techniques, and assessment measures; and where necessary, has collected additional information, modified methods, and developed innovative procedures. The resulting products are intended to provide the school principal with an efficient self-help information system which will help him to assess the needs of his students, indicate what he might do to fulfill those needs and to encourage higher levels of student performance, and enable him to select and then plan and evaluate instructional programs having the maximum likelihood of success in filling the needs. Past phases of the Program have provided preliminary research; and pilot studies have led to the development of the first module of the information system, the field testing of the system prototype, and research directed at system refinement, revision and extension.

The primary objective of the School Evaluation Program is the efficient production of a large number of trained evaluators capable of

carrying out evaluations of their local educational programs and facilities in a rational and objective manner. It is commonly accepted that one way of effective improvement in education is through just such valid and meaningful evaluation. This belief is exemplified by the evaluation requirements mandated in many of the federally-sponsored educational endeavors. These mandates, and others like them at the state and municipal levels, provide for external evaluations of the educational system. But internal evaluations, providing self-knowledge, may be the more dramatic way to effect improvement that will be internalized and implemented.

Careful consideration of the urgent national need for trained evaluators and of the necessarily limited numbers of formalized programs of instruction or training workshops--limitations that can be surmounted by self-instructional packages--has led the Program to the conclusion that every effort should be made to make available current and valid evaluation procedures and methods to as many of the decision makers in education as possible. Although the role of the educational decision maker is distinct from that of the evaluator, in actual practice this separation of roles at the local level is at best improbable. A do-it-yourself, self-instructional guide (KIT) for doing educational evaluation was early decided upon as the vehicle by which this need could best be met on a massive scale.

Before general release of the self-instructional materials to principals in the nation, the Program demanded that both intensive and extensive study be made of their appropriateness for untrained school administrators, effectiveness as an instructional device, and impact in altering and improving attitudes and practices in school and program evaluations. The present report is in response to this demand.

The vehicle developed to achieve the goal of rapidly producing an adequate supply of trained educational evaluators has taken the form of a series of KIT's: self-instructional packages which will enable a person functioning in the evaluator's role to understand the procedures, methods, and underlying bases of educational evaluation, and then to carry out evaluations in a rigorous and efficient manner. The first KIT, like the KITs to follow, has been directed to the target population of

school principals. It assumes no particular knowledge or experience in measurement or evaluation, yet its step-by-step approach will enable the novice to make valid evaluations.

The first product developed and field tested in this self-instructional approach to the training of education evaluators is the Elementary School Evaluation KIT: Needs Assessment. This KIT guides the principal step-by-step through a school's assessment of educational needs, using examples, problems, and discussions pertinent to characteristics of the elementary school. The five booklets and supporting materials comprising the KIT can be optimally studied and utilized in about seven months.

The materials of the KIT attack problems such as (1) how the principal can select the information he needs regarding student performance that will reflect the views of parents, teachers, and school board members, (2) how the principal can select the tests that will give him the kinds of information he needs; tests keyed to the student and school needs he has previously determined to be of importance; (3) how the principal can effectively collect the needed test information and then interpret the test data in light of his school's particular and unique characteristics; and (4) how the principal can decide where to place his resources to get the greatest improvement in his school in the future, considering the importance of the subject area, the value of given improvements in achievement, and the probable amount of improvement he can expect.

THE NEED FOR FIELD TESTING OF EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTS

From the point of view of accountability, any educational product released on a large scale and purporting to address a critical issue should be adequately, if not exhaustively, pretested to ensure that it will result in more good than harm. This is particularly the case when the issue being addressed has an (undeservedly) obscure nature about it, where the reader or user cannot be expected to muster knowledgeable criticism of the product himself due to his real or imagined limitations. When the product addresses the issue of educational evaluation, where inadequacies are acutely felt, such is truly the case.

During the first two years of its development, the Elementary School Evaluation KIT: Needs Assessment has undergone initial field testing at the components level with large groups of educators at various national meetings and more extensively with 23 principals and superintendents throughout the State of California. The California educators worked with the Program through the auspices of the California Elementary School Administrators Association, under the direction of Dr. Edward W. Beaubier. The initial pilot testing resulted in an edition of the KIT that was deemed ready for major field testing.

THE FIELD TEST STRATEGIES

The field testing of the Elementary School Evaluation KIT: Needs Assessment was conducted as the last stage of the formal try-out of the product in order to determine its strengths and to remedy its weaknesses before it is made available to the educational public via a commercial publishing organization. The primary goal of the field test was to determine the usefulness and viability of the prototype KIT in an environment that was not necessarily completely receptive, but was characteristic of the environment for which the KIT is intended. An additional goal was to measure the extent to which the KIT was implemented in the school and the cost of this implementation; and to estimate the effectiveness, endurance, and potential of the KIT in the school environment.

The specific objectives of the field-test instruments used to collect data from the principals were: (1) to determine whether various procedures contained in the KIT had been implemented by the principal; (2) to determine any changes that had occurred in the following areas that could have resulted from use of the KIT--(a) the attitude of the principal and his staff toward evaluation, (b) the methods used to make decisions relative to the instructional program of the school, (c) the understanding of the principal and his staff of the evaluation principles on which the KIT is based; and (3) to determine the subjective opinion of the principal and his staff toward the contents of the KIT.

Originally the field-testing plan envisioned a national representative sample that might to some degree slight representation of California, the state in which all of the initial pilot testings and trials were undertaken. However, due to the opportunity to utilize the California schools once again, and in a manner that would increase our knowledge about possible variations for the implementation of the KIT into schools, a separate sample of California schools was added to the planned national sample.

The National Sampling

Word of the availability of the KIT was spread through several mechanisms. In April, 1970, Dr. Stephen Klein presented a summary of the plans for the KIT to a meeting of the National Association of Elementary School Principals in Philadelphia. Many of the principals and superintendents in attendance consequently wrote to express interest in learning more about the KIT or in becoming part of the field-testing program. These letters were responded to with the notification that interested schools and districts would be put on a list of schools to be considered in the national field testing. At the same time, Evaluation Comment and numerous technical research reports emanating from the Center referred to the KIT. These references brought additional interested responses which were handled in a similar manner. The Network of Schools, a network established by the IOX project when it was part of the Center, also expressed interest in maintaining a relationship with the Center through field testing of the KIT. It is important to keep in mind that all of these 94 schools and districts mentioned above, the majority of the population from which the national sample was chosen, voluntarily joined the field testing and had positive interest in it.

Early in Fall of 1971, the schools and districts that had previously expressed interest were contacted with an offer to become a part of the field-test sample, if they qualified. The schools were to complete a questionnaire that would give the Center the information needed to gain representativeness. When the questionnaires were returned with most of the schools still expressing strong interest in participating in the field tesing, it was noted that several geographic areas were not represented in the population. These areas were the southeastern, the south central, and the northwestern regions of the country. In telephone calls and follow-up letters to sister U.S.O.E. Regional Laboratories, commitments to aid in the recruitment of additional applicants were made by Dr. L. D. Fish of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Dr. K. W. Tidwell of the Southeastern Educational Laboratory, and Dr. J. L. Olivero of the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory. In addition, similar requests were made of Dr.

R. L. Bright at Baylor University, and Dr. S. S. Youngerman, Jr., of the Boise (Idaho) School District. From these contacts, a number of schools and districts responded to help gain greater geographic representativeness.

The population of schools at this point in time numbered 108, with some heavy concentration in the Mid-Atlantic region (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and metropolitan Connecticut) and in Illinois. Final selection of a sample to number 79 was then made on the basis of geographical area, racial-ethnic composition of students, and socio-economic level of school neighborhood. Six school districts in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Illinois had accounted for 42 schools applying for admission to the field testing. These schools were predominantly in higher socio-economic level neighborhoods (professionals and white collar workers) and most of the schools contained a student population of over 90 percent white students. Twenty-nine of these schools were eliminated from the sample. The remaining 13 schools represented all six districts and allowed for maximum diversification in socio-economic status of neighborhood served and student racial-ethnic mix.

The California Sampling

The California sample was arranged through the California Elementary School Administrators' Association (now a part of the Association of California School Administrators), through which much of the initial pilot testing had been arranged. Dr. Edward W. Beaubier, Director of the Association, proposed a statewide sample of schools that would be a part of the Association's evaluation component. Dr. Beaubier further proposed that the Association employ various techniques in the implementation of the KIT. Specifically, the Association was to "ride herd" on the implementation, and would install evaluation leaders for satellite schools throughout the state. The novel approach to this implementation promised considerable additional information on how the KIT could be employed, and so the Center agreed to include 100 schools (the actual number included was 103) in a California sample. These schools were selected by Dr. Beaubier from members of his evaluation component.

The schools of the evaluation component contracted with CESAA and paid $1000 per year for inclusion as evaluation component schools (the Center received no portion of this payment). This detracted from the diversity of the component schools (only schools who could afford the "fee" could be involved) and this was reflected in the California field-test sample for the KIT which was chosen by Dr. Beaubier from the component schools.

Whereas the distribution of the booklets of the KIT for the national sample was handled by the Center staff, Dr. Beaubier's staff handled the actual distribution of materials to the California sample schools. He also served as a "middleman" in the collection of relevant KIT data (returning questionnaires, tally sheets), forwarding such materials to the Center for evaluation and analysis. The procedure used in the distribution of booklets and accompanying accessory materials and the questionnaires to be returned involved sending the necessary materials and booklet to the participating school and upon receipt of the completed questionnaire for that booklet, to send the next booklet with its accessories (if any).

The Case-Study Field Testing

A third strategy in field testing of the KIT was an intensive case study of its implementation in several schools. Discussion of this approach is delayed for a later section, as the procedures and methods were considerably different from the two field-test approaches described above.

Description of the National Sample

The average starting grade taught in the schools in the national sample (with kindergarten equal to zero) was .61, the average highest grade taught was 5.97. Fifty-four percent of the schools were K-6 schools, eleven percent were K-8, 20 percent were K-5, and 15 percent used other grade organization patterns. The mean approximate pupil enrollment (September, 1970) was 492.5 with a standard deviation of 43.2 pupils. Thirteen percent of the schools had a pupil population of 300 or less, 61 percent ranged between 301 and 600, and 26 percent had an enrollment greater than 600.

Appendix A exhibits the school characteristics questionnaire from which demographic data were collected. The neighborhoods served by the schools were described by the principals as follows:

Rural area	12 percent
Residential suburb	42 percent
Industrial suburb	1 percent
Small town (5,000 or less)	12 percent
City of 5,000 to 50,000	16 percent
Residential area of a large city (50,000+)	13 percent
Inner part of a large city (50,000+)	3 percent

The mean racial-ethnic breakdown of the student body of all schools was:

American Indian	2.96 percent
Mexican-American	2.12 percent
Negro	6.68 percent
Oriental	.14 percent
Puerto Rican	.14 percent
White	87.59 percent
"Other"	.36 percent

Four percent of the schools had an American-Indian student population of greater than 20 percent, 9 percent were more than 30 percent black, 67 percent were more than 90 percent white, and 20 percent had a mixed distribution (such as 80 percent white, 20 percent minority).

The mean socio-economic composition in the neighborhoods served by the sample was:

Professionals and managers	22.90 percent
White collar workers	29.06 percent
Skilled workers	31.12 percent
Unskilled workers	17.07 percent

Twenty-four percent of the sample had a composition with more than 25 percent professionals and managers, 18 percent contained more than 40 percent white collar workers, 23 percent were more than 40 percent blue collar workers, 14 percent contained more than 25 percent unskilled workers, and 21 percent could be described as "mixed" (not falling into the previous categories) in distribution.

Twenty-nine percent of the sample was from the Northeastern region of the country, 26 percent from the Southeast, 16 percent from the North

Central region, 13 percent from the South Central region, 13 percent from the Rocky Mountain region, and 3 percent from the Pacific region.

Description of the California Sample.

The average starting grade taught in the schools in the California sample was .33, the average highest grade taught was 6.?2. Sixty-four percent of the schools were K-6 schools, 12 percent were K-8, 8 percent were K-5, and 16 percent had other organizational patterns. The mean approximate enrollment (September, 1970) was 605.37 pupils with a standard deviation of 58.1 pupils. Three percent of the schools had a pupil population of 300 or less, 49 percent ranged between 301 and 600, and 48 percent had an enrollment greater than 600.

The neighborhood served by each school was described as:

Rural area	7 percent
Residential suburb	41 percent
Industrial suburb	0 percent
Small town (5,000 or less)	9 percent
City of 5,000 to 50,000	13 percent
Residential area of a large city (50,000 +)	27 percent
Inner part of a large city (50,000 +)	3 percent

The mean racial-ethnic breakdown of the student body of all schools was:

American Indian	.37 percent
Mexican-American	12.79 percent
Negro	3.98 percent
Oriental	1.53 percent
Puerto Rican	.09 percent
White	80.41 percent
Other	.10 percent

Sixteen percent of the schools had a Mexican-American student population of greater than 30 percent, 4 percent were more than 30 percent black, 58 percent were more than 90 percent white, and 22 percent had a mixed distribution.

The mean socio-economic composition in the neighborhoods served for the sample was:

Professionals and managers	25.59 percent
White collar workers	28.22 percent
Skilled workers	29.21 percent
Unskilled workers	16.98 percent

Twenty-nine percent of the sample had a composition with more than 25 percent professionals and managers, 22 percent contained more than 40 percent white collar workers, 26 percent were more than 40 percent blue collar workers, 21 percent contained more than 25 percent unskilled workers, and 2 percent could be described as "mixed" in distribution.

RESULTS OF THE LARGE-SCALE FIELD TESTS

National Sample--Results of Questionnaire #1.

Ten schools in the sample of 79 schools did not return Questionnaire #1. Six of these schools were in three of the districts in which the Center had selected only some of the schools which the district had offered for participation in the field testing. Another school was given to understand by a higher level in its district's hierarchy of administration that the field test would not take place until next year (a misunderstanding which was not clarified until it was too late for the school to participate in the field testing). The eighth school sent a letter of apology stating that circumstances within the school and the district made it impossible for them to implement the KIT this year (the circumstances were not specified). The ninth and tenth schools did not reply to the Center's repeated efforts (by letters and postcards) to ascertain the state of the KIT's implementation. One of these two schools which ceased to participate in the field test was a last-minute entry to the field testing. The sample which completed and returned Questionnaire #1 consisted of 69 schools from all parts of the country (an 87.3 percent return). Questionnaire #1 can be found as Appendix B.

The responses of the sample to planning and decision-making procedures in the school relative to the instructional program, budget, and teacher assignment were as follows (percent of sample responding affirmatively in each cell in the matrix):

	planning is done at school level; decision to implement is made at school level.	planning is done at school level; decision to implement is made at district level.	plans and decisions are made at district level.
Instructional program	45%	58%	23%
Budget	14%	72%	22%
Teacher assignment	33%	55%	20%

The majority of schools responded that the planning is done at the school level and the decision to implement is made at the district level in all three areas of concern: instructional programs, budget, and teacher assignment. Almost half of the districts reported that the instructional program planning and the decision to implement it were made at the school level. Budgeting and teacher assignment showed greater degrees of district control than instructional program processes.

The following matrix relates to the same three areas as above. It indicates who within the school is involved in the processes of planning and/or decision making when that process occurs at the school level (percent of sample responding affirmatively in each cell in the matrix).

	Planning			Decision-making		
	Prin.	teachers	parents	Prin.	teachers	parents
Instructional program	91%	93%	35%	81%	71%	9%
Budget	83%	75%	4%	65%	26%	0%
Teacher assignment	86%	46%	1%	70%	16%	3%

In most schools, teachers are involved in planning of the instructional program. In many schools they are involved in decisions to implement the instructional program and planning the budget. A lesser number of schools involve them in planning teacher assignment. Teachers are much less involved in the decision-making processes in schools than in the planning processes. Parents are only involved in one-third of the schools in the planning of the instructional program, and rarely in any other facet of planning or decision-making in the school areas of concern.

Thirty-four percent of the principals responded that their immediate superior was the superintendent of schools, 29 percent that he was the elementary director, 28 percent that he was the assistant, division, or deputy superintendent, and 9 percent used other titles for their immediate superiors.

Using a scale of 1 for most pressure to 4 for a blank or little pressure, the top three groups that place the most pressure upon the principal to institute educational reforms and/or new programs were: district administrators, 1.72; teacher organizations, 2.72; and parent-teacher associations, 3.14. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents indicated considerable pressure from district administrators, 68 percent from teacher organizations, and 56 percent from parent-teacher associations. Other groups indicated, and their pressure scores, were: other professional groups, 3.52; student groups, 3.74; business organizations, 3.90; women's groups, 3.90; property owners association, 3.90; church or religious groups, 3.91; veteran's organizations, 3.96.

Most principals responded that less than half of the families of their students are represented at a typical meeting of the PTA or similar parent groups: 4 percent indicated that they had no parents' organization, 28 percent that only a few families were represented at meetings, 41 percent that less than half are represented, 17 percent that about half are present, 7 percent that over half show up, and 3 percent that almost all of them are there.

The normal procedures for learning of the attitudes of the principal's teaching staff toward a particular issue regarding the instructional program (change in schedule, new materials, etc.) were to call a meeting of teachers (by 91 percent of the principals) and to contact the teachers individually (84 percent of the principals). Only 10 percent contact teacher organization representatives.

The normal procedures for the principals to learn of their school community's attitude toward a particular issue regarding the school's instructional program were bringing it up at a meeting of the PTA or similar parent organization (noted by 64 percent of the principals), checking with teachers (65 percent of the principals) and contacting a few parents (62 percent of the principals). Only 4 percent of the principals indicated that the occasion does not arise where any of this is necessary.

In the past two years 88 percent of the schools have implemented at least one experimental or innovative project; 17 percent of the schools have implemented only one project in which the desire to implement had been initiated by the school itself. Twenty-nine percent implemented two such projects, 16 percent three projects, 16 percent four projects, 9 percent five projects, and 12 percent had no such projects. The mean was 2.3 projects per school. In the same period

of time 30 percent of the schools have implemented one such project where the implementation was initiated and desired by the school district. Eleven percent implemented two such projects, two percent implemented four projects, and 56 percent had no such projects. The mean was 0.6 projects per school. Few (11 percent) of these schools had any form of parental participation and fewer (2 percent) had pupil participation in the initiation or origination of projects. Eighty-two percent of the schools had teacher participation in the initiation or origination of the projects, and in 64 percent of the schools the projects were initiated or originated by the principal himself.

Using a scale of 1 for most important to 5 for least important, the principals ranked in order of importance the considerations relative to deciding on the allocation of funds for the next year's programs in their schools. Student needs as observed by teachers received a mean rating of 1.93 and was most important, followed by local board of education mandates with a mean rating of 2.39. State mandates received a 3.48, student needs as indicated by standardized tests a 3.51, and suggestions from parents were deemed least important with a mean rating of 4.49.

If the principal were suddenly given $500 to spend on any one instructional area in his school, he would decide how to spend the money in most schools equally on the basis of his own felt desires and in consultation with his teachers. Only a very few principals would involve either parents or pupils in this matter, and most would not take up this question with the district office.

Principals were asked to list by name the standardized tests administered last year to first graders, third graders, fifth graders, and sixth graders. The tests most frequently listed by principals for the first grade were:

Metropolitan Readiness Test 38%
Stanford Achievement Test 15%
Primary Mental Abilities 9%

On the third grade level they were:

Stanford Achievement Test 33%
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills 20%
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests 12%

On the fifth grade level they were:

Stanford Achievement Test 32%
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills 24%
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests 14%
California Test of Mental Maturity 11%
Metropolitan Achievement Test 10%

On the sixth grade level they were:

Stanford Achievement Test 37%
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills 18%
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test 9%

The pattern of test "popularity" or preference for the most frequently cited tests does not change from grades three to six.

The rationale used for selection of the majority of the tests used in the first grade was: they were district mandated (45 percent of the principals checked this choice); the test measures an area desired to be measured (39 percent); this is what the school has always done (7 percent); the price is right (1 percent); this is what other schools are doing (1 percent). The rationale for test selection for the third grade was: they were district mandated (42 percent); the test measures an area desired to be measured (36 percent); this is what the school has always done (10 percent); they were state mandated (7 percent). The rationale for fifth grade was: they were district mandated (44 percent); the test measures an area desired to be measured (35 percent); this is what the school has always done (10 percent); they were state mandated (1 percent); the price is right (1 percent). The rationale for the sixth grade was: they were district mandated (45 percent); the test measures an area desired to be measured (30 percent); this is what the school has always done (9 percent); they were state mandated (4 percent). The pattern to the rationale is extremely similar in all four grade levels. District mandating of a test is the most frequent reason for using a particular test. This is followed by a feeling that the test measures what is desired to be measured and that this is what the school has always done.

The primary use (application) for the scores from the tests on any of the four grade levels was in student counseling and diagnosis (indicated as a use in 68 percent of the schools averaged over all four grade levels). The next most frequently indicated applications for the scores (means over all four grade levels) were for pupil grouping (54 percent) and for staff curriculum-planning sessions (45 percent). The scores were used in comparisons among

schools in 23 percent of the schools, for teacher evaluation in 16 percent of the schools, and in pupil grading in 6 percent of the schools.

The principal was asked to indicate what he thought the attitudes of teachers, guidance personnel, pupils, and principals were toward the standarized testing program in his school. The following matrix indicates the principals's responses in percentage of total sample principals indicating a particular cell of the matrix as an accurate assessment of attitude.

Attitude	teachers	guidance personnel	pupils	principals
provides necessary information	46%	62%	4%	57%
it is required that the tests be given	39%	7%	62%	20%
good measure of pupil progress	28%	14%	13%	28%
good measure of curriculum success	22%	9%	3%	22%
a good way of judging teacher competence	1%	1%		6%
forces teacher to teach to test	4%	1%		6%
a waste of time; is harmful	9%	0%	3%	4%

A majority of the principals felt that guidance personnel and principals perceive standardized tests as providing necessary information. Almost half of the principals felt that teachers also believed this. A majority of the principals felt that pupils perceive the tests as something that just had to be given. Principals believed that the other main attitudes teachers and principals hold toward standardized tests are that they are required to be given and are a

good measure of pupil progress and a good measure of curriculum success. (The patterns believed by teachers and principals was quite similar.) Few principals felt that many believed that standardized tests were a good way of judging teacher competence, force a teacher to teach to a test, or are a waste of time and are harmful.

When asked to elaborate on their own attitude toward the use of standardized tests in their schools, 22 percent of the principals indicated that they were useful for student assessment and diagnosis, 18 percent said that they can indicate curriculum strengths and weaknesses but should not control instruction, 18 percent felt that tests are not optimally used due to staff limitations, and 13 percent said that they were only one source of pupil and program assessment.

Principals tended to favor standardized tests as recognizable educational instruments but seemed to withhold great enthusiasm and were cautious of placing too much faith in standardized tests. When asked to explain the hypothetical phenomenon that the average score on a standardized math achievement test given to all their third graders was extremely low in comparison to what they had expected, most (84 percent) of the principals indicated that they would have to examine the test with their third-grade teachers before they could explain this result, 12 percent indicated that the test didn't measure what was taught, 1 percent indicated that the result indicated a shift in the school community to a lower socio-economic status, and 7 percent believed other explanations were important.

When asked to specify the statement which best reflected their own attitude toward national norms on standardized tests, 25 percent indicated that they were good only for rough comparisons and guidelines. Eighteen percent felt that state, local, school, or classroom norms were better, and fourteen percent believed that they were not helpful or relevant. Twelve percent asked what national norms are, 9 percent believed that they were valuable but not infallible, 7 percent indicated that national norms are always better than state or local norms for making decisions relative to the instructional program, 6 percent said that national norms are always more reliable, 6 percent believed that they make schools look too good (or bad), and 1 percent indicated that the advantage of national norms is that they are based solely on schools like their own.

California Sample--Results of Questionnaire #1.

There were 12 schools in the California sample that were sent Booklet I but never returned the questionnaire, even after being sent reminders of their negligence. With the cooperation of the CESAA Project Evaluation Office it was possible to determine the reasons why these 12 schools were such early drop-outs.

Unknown to us, five of these schools had chosen to implement another component of the CESAA Project Evaluation model instead of the KIT. It was thought at the beginning of the field testing that the 103 schools in the California sample had already chosen to field test the KIT, but apparently this was not the case.

Another five of the schools never returned the questionnaire for Booklet I because they had dropped out of the CESAA Project Evaluation. Since the members of the Project had to pay to belong, it is not surprising that a few schools dropped out completely, probably due to a lack of funds. Of the remaining two schools, no information could be obtained regarding their reasons for dropping out. It is suspected that in one of the schools there was a change in principals during the year, but this was not confirmed. The sample which completed and returned Questionnaire #1 consisted of 91 schools from the state (an 88.4 percent return.)

The responses of the sample to planning and decision-making procedures in the school relative to the instructional program, budget, and teacher assignment were as follows (percent of sample responding affirmatively in each cell in the matrix):

	planning is done at school level; decision to implement is made at school level.	planning is done at school level; decision to implement is made at district level.	plans and decisions are made at district level.
Instructional program	62%	45%	16%
Budget	27%	37%	47%
Teacher assignment	34%	47%	31%

The majority of schools responded that the planning and the decision to implement are done at the school level in the area of instructional programs. Almost half reported that plans and decisions on budget were made at the district level and that the planning was done at the school level and the decision to implement was done at the district level in the area of teacher assignments and some instructional programs. Budgeting and teacher assignment showed greater degrees of district control than instructional program processes.

The following matrix relates to the same three areas as above. It indicates who within the school is involved in the processes of planning and/or decision making when the process occurs at the school level (percent of sample responding affirmatively in each cell in the matrix).

	Planning			Decision-making		
	Prin.	teachers	parents	Prin.	teachers	parents
Instructional program	97%	97%	35%	88%	79%	11%
Budget	70%	66%	5%	65%	47%	1%
Teacher assignment	79%	55%	2%	73%	34%	1%

In most schools, teachers are involved in planning of the instructional program. In many schools they are involved in decisions to implement the instructional program, and in a lesser number in planning the budget and teacher assignment. They are considerably less involved in the decision-making processes than in the planning processes. Parents are only involved in one-third of the schools in the planning of the instructional program, and rarely in any other facet of planning or decision making in the school areas of concern.

Forty-three percent of the principals responded that their immediate superior was the superintendent of schools, 34 percent that he was the assistant, associate, or deputy superintendent, 15 percent that he was called the director of elementary education, and 8 percent used other titles for their immediate superiors.

Using a scale of 1 for most pressure to 4 for a blank or little pressure, the top three groups that place the most pressure upon the principal to institute educational reforms and/or new programs were: district administrators, 1.64; teacher organizations, 2.52; and parent-teacher organizations, 3.05. Ninety percent of the respondents indicated considerable pressure from district administrators, 75 percent from teacher organizations, and 63 percent from parent-teacher associations. Other groups indicated and their pressure scores were: student groups, 3.52; other professional groups, 3.69; property owners' association, 3.79; church or religious groups, 3.85; women's groups, 3.88; veteran's organizations, 3.89; business organizations, 3.90.

Most principals responded that less than half of the families of their students are represented at a typical meeting of the PTA or similar parent groups: 2 percent indicated that they had no parents' organization, 27 percent that only a few families were represented at meetings, 51 percent that less than half are represented, 7 percent that about half are present, 11 percent that over half show up, and 1 percent that almost all of them are there.

The normal procedures for learning of the attitudes of the principal's teaching staff toward a particular issue regarding the instructional program (change in schedule, new materials, etc.) were to call a meeting of teachers (by 91 percent of the principals) and to contact the teachers individually (87 percent of the principals). Only 11 percent contact teacher organization representatives.

The normal procedures for the principals to learn of their school community's attitude toward a particular issue regarding the school's instructional program were bringing it up at a meeting of the PTA or similar parent organization (by 78 percent of the principals), contacting a few parents (74 percent of the principals), and checking with teachers (64 percent of the principals). Only 4 percent of the principals indicated that the occasion does not arise where any of this is necessary.

In the past two years 18 percent of the schools have implemented one experimental or innovative project in which the desire to implement had been initiated by the school itself. Twenty-four percent implemented two such projects, 23 percent three projects, 11 percent four projects, 12 percent five projects, and 12 percent had no such projects. The mean was 2.4 projects per school. In the

same period of time 21 percent of the schools have implemented one such project where the implementation was initiated and desired by the school district. Ten percent implemented two such projects and 8 percent implemented three projects, while 61 percent had no such projects. The mean was 0.6 projects per school. Few (14 percent) of these schools had pupil participation and fewer (12 percent) had any form of parental participation in the initiation and origination of the project. Seventy-seven percent of the schools had teacher participation in the initiation or origination of the projects, and in 67 percent of the schools the projects were initiated or originated by the principal himself.

Using a scale of 1 for most important to 5 for least important the principals ranked in order of importance the considerations relative to deciding on the allocation of funds for the next year's programs in their schools. Student needs as observed by teachers received a mean rating of 2.14 and was the most important factor, followed by local Board of Education mandates with a mean rating of 2.46. Student needs as indicated by standardized tests received a 2.98, state mandates a 3.41, and suggestions from parents were deemed as least important with a mean rating of 4.20

If the principal were suddenly given $500 to spend on any one instructional area in his school he would decide how to spend the money in most schools primarily on the basis of consultation with his teachers and secondarily on the basis of his own felt desires. Less than a fifth of the principals would involve either parents or pupils in this matter, and most would not take up this question with the district office.

Principals were asked to list by name the standardized tests administered last year to first graders, third graders, fifth graders, and sixth graders. The most frequently listed tests for the first grade were:

Cooperative Primary Reading Test 78%
Harper-Row Reading Readiness Tests 16%
Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test 13%

On the third grade level they were:

Stanford Reading Test 47%
Stanford Achievement Test 37%
California Test of Mental Maturity 13%
Harper-Row Reading Achievement Test 11%
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test 10%

On the fifth grade level they were:

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills 19%
Stanford Achievement Test 12%
California Achievement Test 11%

On the sixth grade level they were:

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills 73%
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests 69%
Stanford Achievement Test 12%

The pattern of test "popularity" or preference for the most frequently cited test changed over the grade levels, due to different state mandates.

The rationale used for selection of the majority of the tests used in the first grade was: they were state mandated (80 percent of the principals checked this choice); they were district mandated (23 percent); the test measures an area desired to be measured (20 percent); this is what other schools are doing (1 percent); and this is what the school has always done (1 percent). The rationale for test selection for the third grade was: they were state mandated (77 percent); they were district mandated (32 percent); the test measures an area desired to be measured (23 percent); this is what the school has always done (3 percent); and this is what other schools are doing (2 percent). The rationale for the fifth grade was: they were district mandated (30 percent); the test measures an area desired to be measured (25 percent); the tests were state mandated (16 percent); this is what the school has always done (4 percent); the price is right (1 percent); and this is what other schools are doing (1 percent). The rationale for the sixth grade was: they were state mandated (76 percent); they were district mandated (29 percent); the test measures an area desired to be measured (16 percent); this is what the school has always done (3 percent); and this is what other schools are doing (3 percent). The pattern to the rationale of test selection is alike in grades one, three and six as might be expected from the state mandated testing system in California for these grades. State mandating of a test is by far the most frequent reason for using a particular test. This is followed by district mandate and the feeling that the test measures what is desired to be measured. In grade five the pattern differs with much less stress on state mandates, and more on selecting a test which measures an area desired to be measured.

The use (application) of the scores from the tests does not differ very much for grades one, three and six. The primary applications (mean percentages for all three grade levels) were in student counseling and diagnosis (indicated as a use in 69 percent of the schools), pupil grouping (61 percent), and staff curriculum-planning sessions (53 percent). The scores were used in comparisons among schools in 34 percent of the schools, for teacher evaluation in 18 percent of the schools, and in pupil grading in 4 percent of the schools. The pattern of use did not differ much in the fifth grade though the percentage of the schools reporting a particular use did. The primary uses were in student counseling and diagnosis (53 percent), pupil grouping (43 percent) and staff curriculum-planning sessions (42 percent). These were followed by comparisons among schools (15 percent), teacher evaluation (12 percent), and pupil grading (4 percent).

The principal was asked to indicate what he thought the attitudes of teachers, guidance personnel, pupils, and principals were toward the standardized testing program in his school. The following matrix indicates the principal's responses in percentage of total sample principals indicating a particular cell of the matrix as an accurate assessment of attitude.

Attitude	teachers	guidance personnel	pupils	principals
provides necessary information	45%	52%	9%	51%
it is required that the tests be given	48%	22%	68%	38%
good measure of pupil progress	20%	13%	10%	15%
good measure of curriculum success	4%	7%	1%	14%
a good way of judging teacher competence	2%	0%	0%	3%
forces teacher to teach to test	4%	3%	1%	7%
a waste of time; is harmful	5%	5%	3%	5%

A majority of the principals felt that guidance personnel and principals perceive standardized tests as providing necessary information. Almost half the principals felt that teachers also believed this. A majority of the

principals believed that pupils looked upon the test as something that just had to be given. Almost half of the principals indicated that teachers felt this way, and over one-third indicated that principals maintained this view also. A fifth of the principals noted that teachers believed standardized tests to be good measures of pupil progress and that counselors believed that the tests were required to be given. Few principals felt that many saw standardized tests as a good way of judging teacher competence, force a teacher to teach to a test, or are a waste of time (and harmful).

When asked to elaborate on their own attitude toward the use of standardized tests in their school, 27 percent indicated that they are not valuable, are duplicative, of no help or irrelevant. Twenty-five percent felt that the tests were useful for student assessment and diagnosis, 19 percent expressed generally positive attitudes, 18 percent believed that these tests can indicate curriculum strengths and weaknesses but should not control instruction, and 9 percent indicated that the tests are only one source of pupil and program assessment.

Principals tended to favor standardized tests as recognizable educational instruments but seemed to withhold great enthusiasm and to be cautious of placing too much faith in standardized tests. When asked to explain the hypothetical phenomenon that the average score on a standardized math achievement test given to all their third graders was extremely low in comparison to what they had expected, most (88 percent) of the principals indicated that they would have to examine the test with their third-grade teachers before they could explain this result, 11 percent indicated that the test didn't measure what was taught, 2 percent said that they really didn't know how to explain it, and 7 percent believed other explanations were important.

When asked to specify the statement which best reflected their own attitude toward national norms on standardized tests, 32 percent asked what national norms were. Twenty-two percent felt that national norms were not helpful and were irrelevant, whereas 8 percent believed that they were valuable but not infallible. Seven percent believed that state, local, school, and classroom norms are better, 7 percent thought that national norms were good only for rough comparisons and guidelines, 4 percent indicated that national norms are always more reliable, and 1 percent said

that national norms are always better than state or local norms for making decisions relative to the instructional program.

National Sample - Results of Questionnaire #2

There were 79 schools in the original sample, of which 69 returned Questionnaire #1 and 46 returned Questionnaire #2. This attrition caused minor changes in the geographic composition of the sample; suburban schools and North Central schools tended to persist and made up a larger proportion of the dwindling sample. Small cities and the Southeast and Rocky Mountain states became less represented in the sample as schools in those areas dropped out. However,the attrition in the sample did not alter the racial, socio-economic, or geographic composition of the sample in any significant way.

	Original Sample	Respondents to Questionnaire #2
	Percentage	Percentage
Rural area	12	11
Residential suburb	42	39
Industrial suburb	1	0
Small town (5,000 or less)	12	15
City of 5,000 to 50,000	16	11
Residential area of a large city (50,000 +)	13	20
Inner part of a large city (50,000 +)	3	4
American Indian	3	4
Mexican-American	2	2
Negro	7	6
Oriental	less than 1	less than 1
Puerto Rican	less than 1	0
White	88	87
Other	less than 1	less than 1
Professionals and managers	23	21
White collar workers	29	29
Skilled workers	31	32
Unskilled workers	17	17
Northeast	29	30
Southeast	26	17
North Central	16	22
South Central	13	17
Rocky Mountain	13	9
Far West	3	5

The second booklet of the KIT provides a system for parents, teachers, principals and others to decide which of the school's goals are of greatest importance. For this purpose a list of goals is provided and a step-by-step process of information - gathering is described. Questionnaire #2, dealing with this booklet, can be found in Appendix C.

The school principals responding to Questionnaire #2 offered 25 suggestions for student performance goals to be added to the list provided by the KIT. Among the 25 are 20 different suggestions, including 9 which are nearly identical to goals already on the KIT's list. Two other important suggestions (ecology and drug awareness) are subsumed in objectives already on the KIT's list. They will, however, be explicitly incorporated into the goal descriptions.

Most of the other suggestions are concerned with the affective domain and may be subsumed under existing goals in the KIT's list. Words describing affect tend to be value-laden, imprecise, and poor tools for communication; causing implication and inference to fail to match. For example, a school principal may list "self-discipline" as a new goal, not realizing that it is part of goal 2A, Dependence - Independence. Another school principal may list "inquiring, humanistic approach" as a new goal; while we feel that this goal is too broad and vague, if it were better defined, it would fit into one or more of the categories on the KIT's list. Another principal may list "independence," feeling that his concept is not the same as our concept of Dependence - Independence; in this case we have <u>both</u> of the problems given above: semantic differences <u>and</u> different levels of generality.

Some of the suggestions in the affective domain were:

self-discipline
attitudes
responsibility vs. duty
rights vs. privileges
dignity
independence
inquiring, humanistic approach
understands his mastery level

There were two other suggestions. One school principal suggested typing and another suggested work experience. The list of goals provided by the KIT does not include provision for either of these suggested goals.

Twenty suggestions were made for goals other than student performance goals. Several of these were staff development goals:

staff participation in evaluation
improved guidance skills
improved evaluation skills
improved personnel relations
teacher training and self-esteem

Many suggestions involved better communications with the community, with greater community involvement by teachers and greater school involvement by parents. One principal suggested as a goal, "Recapture true values," but did not define which values are true; and another principal suggested the goal of increasing use of the school plant. Finally, seven respondents volunteered their opposition to the use of goals which are not student - performance goals. These additional suggestions are outside the domain of student outputs, and therefore will not be incorporated into the KIT.

Only six respondents felt that there was too much similarity among the goals. The greatest areas of concern were science (named by three respondents) and the concept of independent application of skills.

Seventy-four percent of the respondents felt that the goals were organized in a manner appropriate for their schools. Only one felt that the goals and the organization of goals are not appropriate for a wide variety of schools and types of students. Some criticism of the organization of goals was expressed: that some goals were too advanced for their schools, that the vocabulary of the cards was too difficult, or that the cards did not represent adequately unitary concepts. There were two objections to the organization of religious goals and one to the organization of foreign language goals. There was no objection to, or even mention of, the organization of affective goals.

When asked to indicate preference for change to more general goals or more specific goals, 46 percent called for more specific and numerous goals, while 41 percent called for more general and less numerous goals.

Respondent schools were asked to list all of the additional student-performance goals suggested by any person involved in the card-sort technique, including teachers, parents, school board members and/or others. There were 70 suggestions overall, including 45 different suggestions.

Many of the suggested new goals are part of existing goals; for example, environmental effects (39B), drug education (23B), foreign language comprehension (11). race understanding (40A), library use (14A), and logic (8). Many of the suggested goals (listed below) are in the affective area, and may be subordinate or superordinate categories of the existing list.

enthusiasm
cooperation
humanistic approach
free and whole individual
enjoyment of school
interpersonal relationships
understanding beliefs of others
feeling of acceptance
self-control
self-discipline
personal goal setting and motivation
efficient use of time
obedience

There are a number of suggestions which should be seriously considered as additions to the list:

morals and ethics
lifelong learning
Trachtenberg mathematics
homemaking
child care
typing
drama

Among the suggested goals not dealing with student performance were:

individualize
library freedom
systematic reasoning in relationship between parent, child, and teacher
community resource use
character education: teach children to live in the present rather than always emphasizing the future

School principals felt that the system of rating goals was easy for themselves (89 percent), easy for the teachers (93 percent), and to a lesser extent easy for the parents (70 percent). Several difficulties of the goal-rating process were named. Six principals said that parents had trouble understanding the cards and five principals noted that parents had trouble with the directions for sorting. There were five

references to excessive time-consumption for the card-sort process, and three respondents specifically referred to delays in getting parents to return the cards. Two principals would like to have more card sets to speed up the process. There were five references to difficulties in tallying or understanding the directions for tallying.

Only one school principal indicated that he would prefer some other way of rating the goals; parents in his school cannot understand the cards, so he felt that an interview technique would be better. Another respondent liked the system, but would prefer the cards not be shuffled before the card-sort. The other 44 respondents had no recommendation for change in the goal-rating system.

Most respondents (87 percent) felt that the goals which they identified as "most important" by this method would also be chosen with other methods. Two respondents disagreed, and five others were not sure.

Most principals report that using this method changed their knowledge of how teachers and parents value educational goals. The following observations were noted by principals as being new or different or stronger than they had thought would be the case:

Observations	# of Princioal
That teachers value attitudinal goals (higher than content goals)	10
That parents value attitude above content	8
That parents value content above attitude	3
That teachers and principal agree	4
That teachers and principal disagree	5
That parents and principal agree	5
That parents and principal disagree	1
That teachers and parents agree	6
That teachers and parents disagree	2
That individuals in a single group vary widely in their rating of a given goal	3
That individuals do not vary widely	3
That ratings were low for music	4
That ratings were low for foreign language	2
That rating were low for art	1
That rating were low for social studies	1
That parents (except for a vocal minority) approve of sex education	1

Ninety-five percent of respondents found that the instructions for the collective viewpoints were understandable; 93 percent could follow the procedure, and 85% found the computations easy. Seventy-four percent felt the results were commensurate with the effort expended; those that felt that it was not worth the effort complained not about the results, but about the lengthy computations without clerical assistance. One respondent suggested the use of IBM scoring sheets, and two others asked for reports on the overall results of the study.

Thirty-nine percent of respondents claimed that they tried to combine various viewpoints to get one set of goals. Three respondents took the ten top-rated goals from each list and made judgments from that data, and one respondent used the Delphi technique. The others used an average or weighted average of combined data from all groups: teachers, parents and principal.

Random sampling of parents was attempted by 70 percent of the schools. Many of them (39 percent of the entire sample) noted problems in random sampling, although most of them found it easy (50 percent) and worth the effort (54 percent). The greatest problem noted was getting returns from the parents. Two respondents noted specifically that parents had trouble understanding the method, and it may be assumed that this factor contributed to the poor rate of return of information in other schools.

Stratified sampling was attempted by only 4 schools: three noted problems, one found it easy, and three felt it was worth-while. Problems mentioned were low returns, particularly from lower socio-economic groups; lack of a census of the community and problems in selection procedure; and use of the random number chart.

The general reaction of teachers to the process of goal rating, as reported by school principals, was favorable (80 percent) or mixed (10 percent), with 10 percent of the principals making no comment about teacher reactions. No principals reported that the teachers had negative attitudes toward the process.

Parent attitudes, as reported by school principals, were 70 percent favorable and 20 percent mixed; again 10 percent of the principals offered no report on parent attitudes.

The overall reaction of the respondents to Booklet II was 75 percent favorable, 11 percent mixed, and 4 percent unfavorable; while 6 percent had no comment. Some of the negative reactions were:

> There are built-in prejudices, albeit small.
> Goals should be consolidated.
> Sampling methods are too sophisticated.
> Confusing only at first.

Eighty-two percent of the respondents would recommend the procedures contained in Booklet II to other principals. Two percent (1 respondent) would not, because he felt that it requires a "more basic background before there can be a real value..." Six percent did not respond to this question and 8 percent indicated that they would recommend the procedure with reservations.

Additional comments were offered by many school principals. Some of these were laudatory, and some reiterated points made in earlier comments. Other comments are given below:

> "I had hoped to find new directions for our school but instead found that our present areas of emphasis are those given high priorities by both parents and teachers. Maybe this is a good indication, but couldn't it also mean that what we are doing is right because we are doing it?"
>
> "Parents were all college trained people which might be considered a stratified study, however, this would be a typical sampling of our community."
>
> "Couldn't figure out how to use coral and yellow tally sheets." (note--many respondents used the wrong sheets.)
>
> "Judging from my past experience with parents the instructions on the green sheet given to parents should be simplified and different from the ones for teachers. The cover letter for parents (page 21) needs some additions, the exact wording of which would depend on each principal's degree of rapport and personal contact with his community. Principals should be given an outline of the letter and instructed to adapt it to their own situation."

California Sample - Results of Questionnaire #2.

The original sample in California numbered 103 schools, of which 91 returned the first questionnaire and 63 returned the second. The changes

in the geographic, racial-ethnic and socioeconomic composition of the sample due to this attrition were quite minor: there were slight increases in the representation of small town and inner-city schools, minority students, and children of unskilled workers.

	Original Sample	Respondents to Questionnaire #2.
	Percentage	Percentage
Rural area	7	5
Residential suburb	41	40
Small Town (5,000 or less)	9	11
City of 5,000 to 50,000	13	14
Residential area of a large city (50,000 +)	27	25
Inner part of a large city (50,000 +)	3	5
American Indian	1	1
Mexican-American	13	14
Negro	4	5
Oriental	2	2
White	80	78
Professionals and managers	26	25
White collar workers	28	27
Skilled workers	29	29
Unskilled workers	17	19

California principals offer numerous additions to the list of student-performance goals offered by the KIT. Many of them are restatements or reorganizations of the existing goals, but many do not fit into the KIT's list. Suggestions worthy of note include:

Oral language in dialect
Student government
Need for rest
Use of basic hand tools
Sense of humor
Recognizes own strengths and weaknesses
Develops own goals and means to achieve these goals
Natural curiosity
Decision-making (thinking skills, generalized problem-solving ability)
Courtesy
Ability to resolve disagreements
Sensitivity to others (empathy, understanding of human differences, etc.)

One principal suggested that "the child develop ability to adapt to different learning environments," rather than the converse of adapting learning environments to the child. Several principles indicated that the list was comprehensive enough, but one commented, "It is long enough."

Respondents from California were much more prolific than those in the national sample in suggesting goals other than student-performance goals. The Californians were concerned with the problems mentioned by the national sample (community involvement in schools, teacher involvement in community, communications among all groups), but were also concerned with many other areas. Among the goals suggested were:

Flexible physical plant
Flexible scheduling
Schools as teacher-training institutes
Decentralized school organization
School finance
Federal aid
Voucher system
Teacher commitment to work in minority schools
Positive learning atmosphere in the homes
Student pride in school
Principal efficiency
Principal delegation of responsibility to staff
Staff acceptance of individual differences
Control of students
Participation
Morale
Competence
Inter-relations
Self-direction and motivation
Attitudes to children
Skill in evaluating individual pupil progress

Twenty-seven percent of the respondents found similarities in the KIT goals. They listed 54 different sets of similarities, involving almost every goal in one set or another. The greatest concentrations of similar goals were in the areas of Arts and Crafts; Health, Education and Safety; Geometry and Measurement; Foreign Language; and Science.

California school principals were even more adamant than the national sample, that the number of goals be reduced. Seventy percent favored fewer and more general goals, while 22 percent called for more specific and more numerous goals; 8 percent offered no opinion. There was considerable sentiment that the wording on the cards was too difficult or ambiguous,

particularly for parents. There were other suggestions to improve the organization of goals:

Do not shuffle cards
Translate cards into Spanish
Include more goals relevant to practical living experiences

Principals were asked to list new student performance goals suggested by teachers or parents in their schools. Suggestions not previously listed in this report are given below:

What to wear at proper times
Use of leisure time
Criticizes constructively
Money and handling thereof
Typing
Exposure to state and local laws
Study habits
Religious tolerance
Ownership (?)
Attitude toward welfare and military service
Winning-failing
Release emotional feelings freely

Goals other than student-performance goals which were suggested by teachers or parents (not previously listed) were:

Make education responsive to parents
Disseminate knowledge of public and Catholic high schools in area, courses available, and cost.

California principals found the system of rating goals to be easy for themselves (84 percent) and for teachers (82 percent), but only 65 percent of the principals report that the system was easy for parents. Various difficulties were cited specifically by the California principals. They were less concerned than was the national sample about the time-consuming tabulations, but they were much more concerned about the difficulty parents had had with the vocabulary of the cards. One principal noted that the words "Ideational," "Aural," and "Spatial" were not generally understood.

Other problems cited were:

Finding teacher time
Not enough cards
Goals too simple (!)

Some goals were inappropriate
Goals interpreted differently by different groups
Prefer process to output goals

Seventeen percent of California respondents would prefer some other way of rating the goals. Some were merely reiterating their feeling that fewer goals should be used. One suggested a questionnaire rather than a card-sort; another suggested a tally-sheet format. One requested an outline of the 145 goals to be given out before goal selection. Another felt that the process was "too traditional - where does individualization fit in?" Another principal objected to the criterion for determining importance; he suggested, "Use as a criteria 'those goals for which the school should accept full responsibility should be rated 5, etc.'"

When asked if other rating methods would yield a different set of "most important" goals, 14 percent responded "yes" and another 21 percent responded with a partial or conditional yes. Few seemed to feel that a different system would be superior; more often they commented on perceived flaws in other systems:

> "If goals had been selected without aid of Goal Cards, more emphasis on academic areas as 'Most Important' may have resulted."
>
> "Yes. If choices were different, results would be different."
>
> "Only if principal influenced selections via his introductory comments."
>
> "Yes. If a questionnaire were used, a 'pattern of responses' may develop, i.e., the rating of one item is related to sequence in which they are typed."

Most California principals (84 percent) indicated that the rating method provided them with some useful information which confirmed their perceptions or taught them something about teachers' and parents' values. This information was about the same for the California sample as for the national sample. All data given below are observations by the principals relative to their own previous perceptions.

Observations	# of Principal
That teachers value affective areas higher than expected	14
That teachers value cognitive areas higher	4
That parents value affective areas higher	15
That parents value cognitive areas higher	7
That teachers and parents agree more than expected	7
That teachers and parents agree less than expected	0
That differences in values among teachers are small	3
That differences in values among teachers are large	5
That ratings were low for art	2
That rating were low for sex education	1
That parents in a parochial school given low importance to religion	1

The principals indicated that the instructions for the card-sort were understandable for themselves (95 percent) and the procedure was easy to follow (92 percent). The computation was easy for 78 percent and the results were commensurate with the effort expended for 71 percent. Those principals who felt that the effort was not worthwhile listed 18 reasons why:

Tallying too time consuming	10
Too many goals	4
Need larger number of respondents, too hard to get them and do tallying	2
Need less respondents	1
Small print in format is hard to tabulate, too many items on one page	1

Thirty-six respondents (57 percent of the sample) indicated that they had attempted to combine the viewpoints of various groups into one set of goals for the school. Twenty-five of these respondents specified a particular method of combining viewpoints:

Average or weighted average	13
Committee	4
Comparing top ten for each group	4
Ranking	2
Judgment	2

Random sampling was done by 59 percent of the school principals. It was easy for 37 percent (of the entire sample) and considered worthwhile by 48 percent (again, of the entire sample). Some of the problems encountered were parent availability (cited by 5 principals), getting returns from parents (2), parent understanding of directions (2),

too few subjects (2), lack of cooperation (2), and that only one socioeconomic group was represented (1). One principal noted that parents were selected by the principal; he misunderstood either the question or the meaning of "random sampling."

Stratified sampling was reported to have been done by 19 percent of the sample (12 schools), each of whom found it worthwhile and three-fourths of whom found it easy. Three problems were noted by the respondents: time, high transience, and lack of stratification in the community.

Principals were asked to indicate the overall reaction of teachers to involvement in Booklet II procedures. Sixty-eight percent of the principals reported favorable reactions; 22 percent reported mixed reactions from teachers, and 3 percent reported that the teachers were threatened and frustrated by the procedures. Seven percent did not offer any indication of teacher reactions.

Seventy-three percent of the principals reported favorable reactions from the parents, 19 percent indicated that parents had mixed reactions, and one principal noted only negative reactions from the parents. Six percent of the principals did not offer any report on parent reactions to Booklet II.

The principals reported their own reaction to Booklet II as favorable (73 percent), mixed (16 percent), or negative (2 percent: only one principal). Nine percent did not respond to this question. Seventy-seven percent of the principals acknowledged that they would recommend the procedures in Booklet II to other principals. Several noted that they had already done so.

There were several additional comments from principals in the California sample:

> Include some suggestions on developing consensus
> Too many different colored tally sheets
> Need instruction index
> Need wider range of ratings

National Sample - Results of Questionnaire #3

Attrition in the national sample reduced the number of schools to 34.

The loss was greatest from the Northeastern states, and was least among children of unskilled workers. Otherwise the attrition was evenly distributed and had little effect on the proportions of ethnic and socio-economic groups or regional and residential origins.

	Original Sample	Respondents to Questionnaire #3.
	Percentage	Percentage
Rural area	12	12
Residential suburb	42	38
Small Town (5,000 or less)	12	15
City of 5,000 to 50,000	16	9
Residential area of a large city (50,000 +)	14	21
Inner part of a large city (50,000 +)	13	6
American Indian	3	3
Mexican-American	2	3
Negro	7	6
Oriental	less than 1	0
Puerto Rican	less than 1	0
White	88	88
Other	less than 1	0
Professionals and managers	23	20
White collar workers	29	27
Skilled workers	31	31
Unskilled workers	17	22
Northeast	29	24
Southeast	26	18
North Central	16	26
South Central	13	21
Rocky Mountain	13	6
Far West	3	6

Principals in the national sample who responded to the questionnaire (see Appendix D for Questionnaire #3) had a favorable reaction to the first section of Booklet III (Test Selection Procedure). Most principals rated this section above average on all criteria:

Criterion	Ratings	Percentage
Clarity	Very good	44
	Good	38
	Average	18
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0

Criterion	Ratings	Percentage
Organization	Very good	59
	Good	38
	Average	3
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0
Appropriateness	Very good	56
	Good	41
	Average	3
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0
Usefulness	Very good	38
	Good	50
	Average	12
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0
Length	Very Good	21
	Good	44
	Average	33
	Poor	3
	Very Poor	0

There were 11 respondents who felt that the length of the section was just average or worse; of these, 8 prefer a shorter section and 3 prefer a longer one.

The principals were given an exercise to measure their ability to pick out the best test in categories ranked high in their schools. Each principal listed four categories and chose the best test in each. There were a total of 132 responses. In certain categories, there are no tests or only one test listed, so there is no problem of choice involved. On this exercise, there were 114 responses in which choice was required. There was a total of 19 errors by 12 different principals. The overall percentage of right responses relative to total responses was 85.6 percent, and the percentage of right responses relative to responses involving choice was 83.3. A perfect score was obtained by 67.6 percent of the school principals.

A further exercise measuring the same skill was given, and in each test category about 88 percent of the principals correctly named the best test. There was one item, Recognition of Word Meanings in grade 1, that had a higher incidence of errors. The correct answer in that

category was Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, which is an individually administered test. It may have been deliberate choice rather than error which caused 44 percent of the principals to choose other tests: tests more suitable for group administration.

The usefulness of Booklet III is limited in schools which have no control over the selection of tests. Seven principals (21 percent of the sample) indicate that they could not change to a test which they deem more appropriate for their schools, because all tests are selected by district-level personnel. Twenty-five principals (74 percent of the sample) indicate that they have the freedom to choose (some) tests.

All of the respondents think that Booklet III would help them in presenting a case for a new test to be used in their school districts.

The principals were asked to state the criteria they would use to determine the suitability of a test for their schools.

94 percent named Measurement Validity
65 percent named Examinee Appropriateness
65 percent named Administrative Usability
68 percent named Normed Technical Excellence

36 percent named all four
33 percent named three of the four
24 percent named two
6 percent named one
3 percent named none

The concept of Examinee Appropriateness seems to be understood by 94 percent of the school principals in the national sample. Sixty-five percent understand the concept of Normed Technical Excellence, while 91 percent understand Administrative Usability and 82 percent understand Measurement Validity.

The reactions of the school principals to Appendix A were quite favorable:

Criterion	Ratings	Percentage
Clarity	Very Good	50
	Good	44
	Average	3
	Poor	3
	Very Poor	0

Criterion	Ratings	Percentage
Usability	Very Good	44
	Good	50
	Average	6
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0
Organization	Very Good	68
	Good	30
	Average	0
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	3
Time	Very Good	59
	Good	27
	Average	12
	Poor	3
	Very Poor	0

The reactions of the principals to Booklet III, overall, were quite positive. They were asked if they consider that Booklet III

	Percentage "Yes"	Percentage "No"
is useful	100	0
fills a need in their school	97	3
is complicated	15	85
is too long	6	94
is overly sophisticated	6	94
is what is needed after Booklet II	85	15
is too much effort for too little return	6	94

The opportunity to make comments giving overall reactions to Booklet III produced 28 favorable reactions (82 percent of the sample), 5 mixed reactions (15 percent), and one very negative reaction (3 percent). The procedures in Booklet III would be recommended to others by all but two of the principals. One of these is the principal with the generally negative reaction to Booklet III, and the other would not recommend the procedures because Booklets II and III showed him that "the areas of greatest need or importance seem to be untestable."

California Sample -- Results of Questionnaire #3

The California sample continued to have a high rate of attrition, as Questionnaire #3 was returned by 39 schools. Among these 39 schools was a reduced proportion of rural and inner-city schools and of children from professional and managerial-class homes. There was an increase in the proportion of small town and small city schools, of Mexican-Americans, and of skilled and unskilled labor-class homes.

	Original Sample	Respondents to Questionnaire #3
	Percentage	Percentage
Rural area	7	3
Residential suburb	41	34
Small town (5,000 or less)	9	16
City of 5,000 to 50,000	13	16
Residential area of a large city (50,000 +)	27	29
Inner part of a large city (50,000 +)	3	3
American Indian	1	1
Mexican-American	13	17
Negro	4	4
Oriental	2	2
White	80	76
Professionals and Managers	26	21
White collar workers	28	27
Skilled workers	29	31
Unskilled workers	17	20

Principals from California schools had generally favorable reactions to the Booklet III section on Test Selection Procedure.

Criterion	Ratings	Percentage
Clarity	Very Good	44
	Good	38
	Average	13
	Poor	5
	Very Poor	0
	No response	3
Organization	Very Good	54
	Good	36
	Average	8
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0
	No response	3

Criterion	Ratings	Percentage
Appropriateness	Very Good	54
	Good	38
	Average	5
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0
	No response	3
Usefulness	Very Good	49
	Good	43
	Average	5
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0
	No response	3
Length	Very Good	31
	Good	57
	Average	8
	Poor	0
	Very Poor	0
	No response	5

All of the respondents who objected to the length of the section indicated that they felt the section was too long.

The California sample scored about as well as the national sample in ability to choose the best test in categories ranked high in their schools. There were 150 responses, 102 of which involved choice among 2 or more tests. The California sample had 20 errors by 14 different principals. The correct responses were 87 percent of total responses or 82 percent of responses involving choice. Sixty-four percent of the principals obtained perfect scores on this exercise.

On the second exercise of the same type, in each test category about 90 percent of the principals picked the best test. As with the national sample, there were more errors on Recognition of Word Meanings, grade 1.

The principal has the ability to change to a test he considers more appropriate at 79 percent of the schools; in the other 21 percent of schools, tests are selected at the district level. In the California sample as well as the national sample, 100 percent of the respondents feel that Booklet III would help in presenting a case for a new test to be used in their school district; several reported having done so.

When the principals were asked to state the criteria they would use to determine the suitability of a test for their schools,

92 percent named Measurement Validity
82 percent named Examinee Appropriateness
82 percent named Administrative Usability
68 percent named Normed Technical Excellence

53 percent named all four
23 percent named three of the four
11 percent named two
13 percent named one

The concept of Examinee Appropriateness seems to be understood by 94 percent of the respondents in the California sample. Seventy-nine percent understand Normed Technical Excellence, 100 percent understand Administrative Usability, and 86 percent understand Measurement Validity.

The reactions of the California school principals to Appendix A were:

Criterion	Rating	Percentage
Clarity	Very Good	52
	Good	34
	Average	13
	Poor	3
	Very Poor	0
Usability	Very Good	44
	Good	44
	Average	10
	Poor	3
	Very Poor	0
Organization	Very Good	69
	Good	25
	Average	3
	Poor	3
	Very Poor	0
Time	Very Good	52
	Good	38
	Average	8
	Poor	3
	Very Poor	0

The overall reaction of the California sample to the entire Booklet III was similar to the national sample's response: it was favorable.

The principals were asked if they consider that Booklet III

	Percentage "Yes"	Percentage "No"
is useful	100	0
fills a need in their school	100	0
is complicated	26	74
is too long	15	85
is overly sophisticated	18	82
is what is needed after Booklet II	81	19
is too much effort for too little return	6	94

The opportunity to respond subjectively to Booklet III produced 84 percent favorable comments, 16 percent mixed comments, no purely unfavorable comments, and one blank. One of the principals suggested "(1) listing tests in order of their suitability (2) cutting down on length of explanation and (3) using effective nickel size words instead of the two-bit ones when possible."

National Sample - Results of Questionnaire #4.

In the national sample, there was no attrition from Questionnaire 3 to Questionnaire 4. Appendix E exhibits Questionnaire #4.

Booklet IV is divided into four sections: Procuring Instruments, General Guidelines for Test Administration, Test Sampling Procedures, and Using Norms. The school principals responding to the questionnaire felt that most of the information in these sections was not new to them, but many acknowledged that the old information was packaged in a convenient form.

In regard to the section on Procuring Instruments, the principals indicated how valuable each part of the section was for them:

Section	Rating	Percentage
Ordering tests	Very valuable	15
	Somewhat	67
	Not at all	18
	Eliminate	0
Types of tests	Very valuable	18
	Somewhat	58
	Not at all	24
	Eliminate	0

Section	Rating	Percentage
Scoring Services	Very valuable	18
	Somewhat	62
	Not at all	18
	Eliminate	0
Machine Scorable Answer Sheets	Very valuable	26
	Somewhat	65
	Not at all	9
	Eliminate	0

Two respondents noted the absence of comparative cost data, especially on comparative costs of scoring services.

The section on General Guidelines was considered by the principals to be:

very useful	3 percent
useful enough to include in booklet	69 percent
not useful; include anyway	22 percent
useless; leave it out	6 percent

Ninety-four percent of the sample said that there were no problems in their testing programs which might have been prevented by use of the information in Booklet IV. Only one principal cited an area of concern which was left out of this section: the origin of national norms.

The predominant Test Sampling Procedure for schools in the sample is student-system assessment (73 percent). The other schools use a mixture of student-system and sampled-system assessment, usually relying more heavily on the former (24 percent) than on the latter (3 percent). Most principals (91 percent) are aware of the advantages of sampled-system assessment, and most (97 percent) are aware of CSE's preference for sampled-system assessment, but only 79 percent agree with CSE. Those who disagree feel that the purpose of testing is not system assessment but individual assessment and reporting to all parents. When asked if they intend to implement sampled-system assessment in their schools, most principals replied with a polite "no":

yes, by all means	3 percent
yes, if possible	71 percent
no, by no means	23 percent
blank	3 percent

A school or program evaluation has been performed by 62 percent of the principals in the sample, and all of those 62 percent used norms as part of the evaluation. Twelve percent used national norms for this evaluation, 18 percent used state and/or local norms, and 9 percent used school norms; others did not specify the type of norm used.

Sixty-two percent of the sample claim to have seen tests with tables of school norms; but many cite as examples tests which have no school norms: Stanford, Iowa Silent Reading, Metropolitan, California Achievement, California Test of Mental Maturity, Otis, and S.R.A. Achievement Tests. Thirty-three percent of the sample list the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, which does have school norms; several of the Kansas schools refer to a particular set of school norms for the Stanford Achievement Test, devised for their district. Finally, none of the principals list the Cooperative SCAT or STEP, which also have school norms.

The national sample is in unanimous agreement that test publishers should be encouraged to provide school norms.

In regard to this section on using norms, 3 percent of the sample felt that it contained too much information, 79 percent felt that it was about right, and 18 percent felt that it left out information, specifically about how to develop school norms, percentile scores, and the averaging of percentile scores.

Respondents in the national sample had widely varied opinions about national norms:

What are they?	15 percent
How valid are they?	21 percent
They are better than state and local norms.	3 percent
They are worse than state and local norms.	15 percent
They are a means of comparison.	29 percent
They are not satisfactory.	12 percent
They are always more reliable.	6 percent

The concept of "differentiated school norms" is considered "very important" by 65 percent of the sample and "somewhat important" by 32 percent. The remaining 3 percent had no comment.

Overall, Booklet IV found favor with 68 percent of the respondents and drew mixed reactions from 26 percent. There were unfavorable comments

from 2 respondents (6 percent of the sample). Those who made comments, other than laudatory comments, asked for less explanation of the sort of thing covered in test manuals, and a better explanation of the material (sampled-system, school norms) not already generally known by school principals.

California Sample - Results of Questionnaire #4.

Attrition continued to thin the ranks of the California sample. The 30 respondents to Questionnaire IV included no rural schools and a larger proportion of schools in residential areas of large cities.

	Original Sample	Respondents to Questionnaire #4
	Percentage	Percentage
Rural area	7	0
Residential suburb	41	31
Small Town (5,000 or less)	9	13
City of 5,000 to 50,000	13	16
Residential area of a large city (50,000 +)	27	38
Inner part of a large city (50,000 +)	3	3
American Indian	1	1
Mexican-American	13	16
Negro	4	3
Oriental	2	1
White	80	79
Professionals and Managers	26	24
White collar workers	28	27
Skilled workers	29	31
Unskilled workers	17	18

The respondents indicated how valuable various parts of the "Procuring Instruments" section was to them:

Section	Rating	Percentage
Ordering Tests	Very valuable	22
	Somewhat	72
	Not at all	6
	Eliminate	0

Section	Rating	Percentage
Types of Tests	Very valuable	38
	Somewhat	59
	Not at all	3
	Eliminate	0
Scoring Services	Very valuable	25
	Somewhat	59
	Not at all	16
	Eliminate	0
Machine Scorable Answer Sheets	Very valuable	31
	Somewhat	56
	Not at all	12
	Eliminate	0

The section on General Guidelines for Test Administration was considered by the respondents to be:

very useful	16 percent
useful enough to include in booklet	59 percent
not useful; include anyway	22 percent
useless; leave it out	3 percent

Thirty-four percent of the sample replied that they could have prevented problems in their testing programs if they had had the information contained in Booklet IV.

The California school principals describe their testing programs as "always student-system assessment" in 72 percent of schools, and "more student-system than sampled-system assessment" in the other 28 percent. Nine percent of the principals intend to implement sampled-system assessment; 78 percent will do so, if possible, and 9 percent will not use sampled-system at all. Three percent did not reply to this question.

Eighty-eight percent of the principals are aware of the advantages of sampled-system assessment, 97 percent are aware of CSE's preference for it, and 66 percent agree with CSE. Those who feel that a sampled-system assessment is not preferable to a student-system assessment cite problems of individual diagnosis, small school size, and lack of confidence in the reliability of the sampling technique.

A school or program evaluation has been attempted in 72 percent of the schools and has been actually performed in 66 percent of the schools. Fifty-six percent of the total sample used test norms as part of this

evaluation. These norms were national norms in 31 percent of the schools (in the whole sample), state and local norms in 12 percent of the schools, and school norms in 3 percent.

As in the national sample, the California teachers (56 percent of them) claim to have seen school norms, but cite as examples tests which have no school norms: Survey of Primary Reading Development, California Achievement Test, Stanford, Lorge-Thorndike, M.T.A., Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, and S.R.A. Ninety-one percent of the principals in the California sample feel that test publishers should be encouraged to provide school norms; the other 9 percent do not think so.

Most (88 percent) of the respondents felt that the section on Using Norms contained about the right amount of information; 3 percent felt there was too much information, and 9 percent felt there was not enough, particularly in the areas of stanines, percentile bands, school norms, and the interpretation of norms.

Attitudes of the respondents to national norms was varied:

What are they?	31 percent
They are better than state or local norms.	9 percent
They are helpful as an addition to state and local norms.	9 percent
They are not as valuable as state and local norms.	3 percent
They are of no consequence.	6 percent
They are not useful for program planning.	9 percent
They are better because they are based on schools like mine.	3 percent
They are always more reliable.	6 percent
How good is the sampling for them?	6 percent
They are useful for comparison purposes.	13 percent

Differentiated school norms are considered "very important" by 78 percent of the California respondents, "somewhat important" by 12 percent, "not important" by 3 percent, and 6 percent had no comment.

Favorable reactions to Booklet IV as a whole were recorded by 56 percent of the sample, mixed reactions were recorded by 31 percent, and distinctly unfavorable comments were given by 6 percent, while 6 percent had no comment.

National Sample - Results of Questionnaire #5.

Summarized in the table below are the demographic characteristics of the schools responding to the five questionnaires.

	Original Sample	Respondents to Questionnaire II	III & IV	V
Number of respondents	79	46	34	26
		Percentages		
Rural area	12	11	12	15
Residential suburb	42	39	38	33
Small town (5,000 or less)	12	15	15	11
City of (5,000 to 50,000)	16	11	9	11
Residential area of a large city (50,000 +)	13	20	21	26
Inner part of a large city (50,000 +)	3	4	6	4
American Indian	3	4	3	0
Mexican-American	2	2	3	3
Negro	7	6	6	7
White	88	87	88	90
Professionals and Managers	23	21	20	16
White collar workers	29	29	27	28
Skilled workers	31	32	31	34
Unskilled	17	17	22	22
Northeastern	29	30	24	26
Southeast	26	17	18	22
North Central	16	22	26	15
South Central	13	17	21	22
Rocky Mountain	13	9	6	8
Far West	3	5	6	8

Questionnaire #5 appears in Appendix F. The respondents in the national sample all indicate that they understand what is meant by models and decision rules. There is general affirmation that the explanation of decision models and rules should be kept in the booklet, as 96 percent of the principals found the explanation to be useful or very useful.

The principals were asked if it had be made clear what the outcome of implementing Booklet V would be. Eighteen percent indicated that it was definitely clear to them; 71 percent think that it was clear; and 11 percent were not sure.

The section on extraneous decision rules is considered very pertinent by 41 percent, useful by 78 percent, and irrelevant by only 15 percent. This section on extraneous decision rules was useful to understanding of the Booklet's decision rule by 85 percent of the respondents. Eleven percent suggested that the section was not useful to them, but should be left in the Booklet anyway.

The Booklet's explanations of the variables in the decision rule were adequate for all but one of the respondents, but two respondents called for a better explanation of the variable "probability of improving performance," and two were slightly confused about the variable "typical level of student performance."

There were no worthwhile additional variables for the decision model suggested by the national sample. One principal suggested adding an index of school organization and/or continuous progress to the decision model; those concerns are important but not relevant to this decision model. Another principal suggested "probability of implementing the decision model."

Eighty-nine percent of the respondents felt that the review of procedures for computing priority values was valuable. Four respondents reported they had difficulty in following the procedures for computing priority values. Two of them specified the section on "probable increase in utility" as the center of difficulty.

Difficulty in using Appendix 1 was reported by three respondents. They itemized their difficulties thus:

Getting a roster of scores	2
Obtaining a mean raw score	2
Finding the appropriate table in the test manual to convert raw scores to pupil percentiles	0
Converting mean raw score to a pupil percentile score	1
Using Table 4 to convert the pupil percentile to a school percentile	1

In the national sample, 41 percent of the respondents express interest in the derivation of Appendix 1. There is also sentiment for explaining the derivation of the numbers in Tables 1,2, and 3:

11 percent feel explanation is necessary.
59 percent feel it would be interesting and helpful.
15 percent feel it would be confusing.
8 percent feel it is not necessary.
8 percent have no opinion.

Only 6 respondents (24 percent of the sample) actually computed priority values for any goal areas. Five of them made no errors in recording "Probable Increase in Utility" from the appropriate table. Three of them made no errors in computing "Priority Value," and three had no errors in ranking the goals. Another principal went through the process of computing priority values, but did not provide data to be checked. Of the total of 7 principals who actually computed priority values, 5 agreed that the goal area selected by the decision rule was indeed the most critical goal, and that they could not have determined the importance of this goal without the rule. One principal indicated that he could pick the goal without any rule, and that the rule picked the wrong goal anyway. Another principal indicated that he could not pick the most important goal without the decision rule, but that the rule caused the wrong goal to be chosen "most important." There were eight principals who felt that they could determine the top-priority goals without going through the Booklet V procedures. Of these, only one actually went through the computation procedure.

Overall reactions to Booklet V were that it

is useful	89 percent
fills a need in my school	48 percent
is complicated	59 percent
is too long	15 percent
is overly sophisticated	18 percent
is what is needed to complete a needs assessment	56 percent
is too much effort for too little return	22 percent
would be recommended to other principals	71 percent

Those principals indicating that they would not recommend Booklet V to other principals gave several reasons:

It requires too much effort for the results.
Principals would need a workshop first.
Standardized tests equal standardized children.

Booklet is too complicated.
Experienced principals don't need the Booklet.
District has no money for any testing.

California Sample - Results of Questionnaire #5.

Demographic characteristics of the samples responding to the various questionnaires are summarized below. Attrition from the sample may also be noted.

	Original Sample	Respondents to Questionnaire			
		II	III	IV	V
Number of Respondents	103	63	38	30	16
	Percentages				
Rural area	7	5	3	0	0
Residential suburb	41	40	34	31	37
Small town (5,000 or less)	9	11	16	13	18
City of 5,000 to 50,000	13	14	16	16	12
Residential area of a large city (50,000 +)	27	25	29	38	32
Inner part of a large city (50,000 +)	3	5	3	3	0
American Indian	1	1	1	1	1
Mexican-American	13	14	17	16	13
Negro	4	5	4	3	0
Oriental	2	2	2	1	1
White	80	78	76	79	85
Professionals and managers	26	25	21	24	20
White collar workers	28	27	27	27	31
Skilled workers	29	29	31	31	33
Unskilled workers	17	19	20	18	15

All of the respondents in the California sample indicate that they know what models and decision rules are. The respondents say that the outcome of implementing Booklet V is explained clearly by the Booklet: 44 percent say "most definitely," 50 percent say "I think so" and 6 percent say " most definitely not". The explanation and examples of decision rules were very useful to 50 percent, 44 percent feel that they were useful enough to be retained in Booklet V, and 6 percent feel they were not very useful.

The section on extraneous decision rules was called very pertinent by 32 percent, useful by 56 percent, and irrelevant by 12 percent. All but

one of the respondents indicate that the section was useful to their understanding of the Booklet's decision model and rule.

The variables in the decision rule were explained adequately to 94 percent of the California sample. The remaining 6 percent represents 1 respondent, who asked that all variables be explained further.

Two principals suggested the same additional variables for the decision model: staff interest, background, and ability.

The Booklet's repetition of the procedures for computing priority values was valuable to all the principals. Actual computation of the priority values presented difficulties to 19 percent of the sample. Only one respondent specified where his difficulties lay; he listed column 1 (listing the names of the goal areas for which priorities were desired) and column 2 (entering the percentile rank of current level of student performance in the goal area).

Two respondents had difficulty using Appendix 1 to obtain a school percentile score. They specifically had problems in the areas of getting a roster of scores, obtaining the mean raw score, and converting the mean raw score to a pupil percentile score.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents in the California sample felt that it would be worthwhile to them to learn how the table in Appendix 1 was derived. An explanation of the origin of the numbers in Tables 1, 2, and 3 is necessary, according to 25 percent, and would be interesting and helpful to another 56 percent.

Six respondents say they actually computed priority values; four sent in their results. Of these four, three had no errors in their computations, and the other made an error in ranking goal areas. Five respondents who made the computations agree that the Booklet's procedure identified the goal area which is indeed the most critical; one respondent disagreed with the computed priorities.

Half the respondents felt that they could identify the critical goal areas without going through the procedures described in the Booklet. Thirty-one percent felt that they could not, and the other 19 percent did not respond to this question.

Overall, the principals in the California sample indicate that Booklet V

is useful	68 percent
fills a need in their schools	56 percent
is complicated	62 percent
is too long	6 percent
is overly sophisticated	12 percent
is what is needed to complete a needs assessment	44 percent
is too much effort for too little return	18 percent
would be recommended to other principals	75 percent

National Sample - Reaction to the Complete KIT

Part of Questionnaire #5 deals with the complete KIT rather than just Booklet V. The respondents to this questionnaire are those 26 principals who have completed all 5 booklets. They felt that the entire KIT:

is useful	85 percent
fills a need in their schools	41 percent
is complicated	22 percent
is too long	11 percent
is overly sophisticated	11 percent
is too much effort for too little return	8 percent
would be recommended to other principals	82 percent
is better than needs - assessment procedures they used previously	92 percent

Compared to other needs - assessment procedures they have heard about, the KIT is:

much better	29 percent
better	33 percent
about as good	0 percent
not as good	0 percent
(don't know any other procedure)	22 percent
no comment	15 percent

Most of the principals went through the KIT without assistance, aside from the normal and necessary involvement of teachers, parents, and pupils in Booklet II. A group of 4 principals worked through the KIT together; another worked with other principals; two worked with their staff throughout the KIT; one worked with his school psychologist on Booklet II; and one worked with his District Director of Curriculum on Booklet II.

Respondents were asked which groups place most pressure on them to institute new programs or reforms. According to them, district administrators exert the greatest pressure, with teacher organizations and the PTA exerting the next greatest pressure.

Pressure Groups Ranked by Respondents

	Most Pressure	2nd	3rd
District Administrators	17	2	2
PTA	2	9	8
Teacher organizations	3	7	5
Student groups		1	2
Professional groups		1	2
Property owners			1
Church, business, women's, veterans' groups			0

The allocation of funds for next year's programs in the schools is determined by several considerations:

State mandates are of primary importance in some schools and are unimportant in others.
Local Board of Education mandates are among the most important influences in most schools.
Student needs as indicated by standardized tests is not an important influence.
Student needs as observed by teachers is the strongest influence in over half the schools, and is a strong influence in most.
Suggestions from parents is the weakest influence of the five suggested here.

The principals were asked to imagine that they had $500 to spend on any one goal area. They were asked to describe <u>how</u> they would decide how to spend the $500. Unfortunately, many of the respondents missed the point of the question; they told how they would spend the money and failed to describe any decision process. Of those who did describe a decision process, half specified the KIT. Most of the others said they would decide in discussion with their staffs.

Tests are district mandated in 52 percent of the schools in the national sample responding to Questionnaire V. Twenty-six percent of the schools will choose tests for next year because the tests are appropriate and valid for their purposes. The other 22 percent of schools did not

indicate on what basis tests will be chosen for the coming year.

Principals in the respondent schools gather data on teacher attitudes in these ways:

contact teachers individually	74 percent
call meeting of teachers	63 percent
contact teacher organization representative	8 percent
occasion does not arise	0 percent
other (small teacher groups, questionnaire, standing committee)	18 percent

Data on community attitudes are gathered by principals through the following means:

PTA	56 percent
teachers	41 percent
contact with parents	56 percent
occasion does not arise	4 percent
other (questionnaire, standing committee, students, open meeting, coffee hour).	22 percent

California Sample - Reaction to the Complete KIT

The 16 principals in the California Sample who completed all five Booklets of the KIT feel that the KIT:

is useful	88 percent
fills a need in their schools	62 percent
is complicated	32 percent
is too long	12 percent
is overly sophisticated	18 percent
requires too much effort for too little return	12 percent
would be recommended to other principals	100 percent
is better than needs-assessment procedures previously used	100 percent

Relative to other needs assessment procedures they have heard about, the principals consider the KIT to be:

much better	25 percent
better	44 percent
about the same	6 percent
worse	0 percent
(don't know any other procedure)	12 percent
no comment	12 percent

Principals in the California sample, like those nation-wide, went through the KIT largely unaided. One principal cited assistance from

the district pupil personnel director, while another listed the School Counselor and Director of Research as helpers.

California principals receive pressure to institute reforms from the same kinds of sources that influence principals across the country. This California sample includes one church-affiliated school; for them, pressure from church groups is paramount. The pressure exerted by professional organizations on the California sample appears greater than on the national sample; this may be due to non-random sampling, as the principals in the California sample are among the active members of the C.E.S.A.A.

Pressure Groups Ranked by Respondents

	Most pressure	2nd	3rd
District administrators	10	3	
Teacher organizations	1	5	2
Professional organizations	2	3	2
PTA	1	4	6
Church groups	1		
Women's groups			1
Businessmen, Veterans, Property owners, Student			1

The allocation of funds for next year's programs follows the same pattern in the California sample as in the national sample.

The California sample did a better job than the national sample of describing the decision process they would use in an actual situation; that is, more of them described the process and not just the decision. Of those who described a decision process, 54 percent would use the KIT and 72 percent would use staff meetings; some would use both.

The majority of the tests used in next year's testing program will be selected by

state mandate	38 percent
district mandate	19 percent
school on basis of appropriateness	25 percent
no comment	18 percent

Principals gather data on teacher attitudes through

individual teacher contacts	88 percent
teacher meetings	82 percent
contact with teacher organizations	12 percent
other (small groups, questionnaires, random sampling)	44 percent

Data on community attitudes toward the school's instructional program are gathered by principals through

PTA	75 percent
teachers	56 percent
contact with parents	62 percent
other (questionnaire, small group meetings, random sampling)	50 percent

THE CASE-STUDY FIELD TESTS

The results of the large-scale field tests will no doubt provide the School Evaluation Program with information concerning the activities and considered judgments of principals who have read the materials and tried out the activities of the KIT; such impressions will be useful. However, the Program staff realized that this data will provide few insights into the dynamics of the process of introducing the KIT into elementary schools. In an attempt to assess this dynamic dimension, the Center contracted to have a series of case studies conducted in schools that had agreed to try out the KIT. Originally, three case studies were to be conducted; however, because of the complicating circumstances described below, only two case studies were completed.

Design of the Case Studies

There were several characteristics of elementary schools that were chosen for examination in these case studies:

The Principal's Perceived Leadership. The KIT's designers assigned the school principal a dominant role in introducing the KIT into the school. Thus it was thought that teachers' opinions of the principal's leadership qualities would be an important variable in determining the potential acceptance of the KIT in the school. For example, if the teachers did not have confidence in the principal's leadership, this lack of confidence might be reflected in teacher negativism toward using the KIT or toward the KIT itself.

In an effort to measure the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior, the teachers were asked to complete the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII, LBDQ XII.[1]

The Informal Structure of the School. Each elementary school, as all organizations, has its own informal social structure. Certain teachers tend to associate with each other in cliques. Some teachers are

[1]Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University, Cloumbus, Ohio, 1962.

regarded by their colleagues as opinion leaders; as such, these teachers have considerable influence over events in the school. We hypothesized that the opinion held toward the KIT by those who were identified as influential in the school might have a significant impact on the KIT's reception in the school.

The identification of faculty cliques and influential teachers was made through an interview with the principal, and by analysis of a sociometric device that was completed by the teachers. (See Appendix G)

Procedures for Introducing the KIT. While the booklets of the KIT describe ways in which they might be introduced into the schools, the instructions give the principal considerable leeway in deciding on the specific way he will introduce and use the KIT. We hypothesized that the way in which the KIT was introduced might make a difference in the faculty's understanding of the KIT's activities. We sought answers to such questions as: Was the principal enthusiastic in introducing the KIT? Were his instructions clear? Did he follow the directions outlined in the appropriate booklet?

An observer was present on each occasion when the principal presented the KIT to the teaching staff, and on some occasions when the principal made a presentation to other groups such as parents and school board members. Also, teachers and parents were interviewed at the end of the school year.

Planning and Implementation. Each of the schools in the case studies had volunteered for the original field testing of the KIT. We were unsure as to how these schools learned about the KIT and the principal's motivation for joining in this effort. We hypothesized that the way in which the school became involved might prove to be an important factor. Did the principal decide independently to join this testing or was it "forced upon him" by his superordinates? This might influence his enthusiasm and the amount of time and effort he put into the field testing.

Once the principal decided to participate, we were interested in learning how he planned to implement the KIT? What problems did he foresee? What strategies did he plan to use to counter anticipated

obstacles? What was his timetable? Would it be possible to identify characteristics common to the organization and functioning of most elementary schools that cause problems in implementing the KIT, and are there changes that could be made in the KIT booklets which would help the user to anticipate and overcome persistent obstacles?

In addition, would it be possible to identify characteristics unique to specific schools that could influence the KIT's introduction. Examples of such characteristics are the school population's socio-economic and racial status, the size of the staff, the age and experience of the teachers, the number of years the principal had been at the school, the immediate history of the school.

These data were gathered from a questionnaire that was completed by the principal (see Appendix H), and from interviews with the principal before and after the introduction of the KIT into the school (see Appendix I).

The Case Studies

Three schools were selected originally for inclusion in the case studies. These schools were selected from a list submitted by Dr. Edward Beaubier of the California Elementary School Administrators Association (CESAA), which is now part of the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA). (CESAA assisted the Center with the California sample.) Several factors were considered when selecting the schools: socio-economic status of the community, racial composition of the students enrolled in the school, proximity to UCLA. A key factor, of course, was the principal's willingness to participate in the case studies. The three original schools selected were:

School A. School A is a K-6 elementary school located in a large nearby community. The school enrollment is 538. The parent population is primarily upper-middle-class professionals (80 percent), with the remainder of parents being white collar and skilled laborers. Ninety percent of the students are white. At an initial interview, the principal expressed enthusiastic support for the project. Just prior to the beginning of the case study, however, the principal suffered an accident

that caused him to be bedridden for several weeks. Apparently because of this mishap, the principal decided after two months that he would not be able to participate in the case study.

School B. School B is a K-6 elementary school located in a community adjacent to Los Angeles. The total student enrollment is 510. The community is predominantly white middle-class skilled laborers and white collar workers. The school has a small but growing percentage of students with Spanish surnames. (A more detailed analysis of School B appears later in this report.)

School C. The remaining school in the original sample of three schools is located in a large metropolitan school district. It is a K-6 elementary school with an enrollment of 650 students. The parents are primarily lower- and middle-class unskilled and skilled workers. Fifty percent of the pupils have Spanish surnames and 50 percent are Anglo.

The principal first heard about the KIT through the CESAA project. He was enthusiastic about the KIT, particularly in comparison with some of the other CESAA systems analysis and evaluation projects. He was attracted to what he considered the KIT's practical usefulness. He intended to use the KIT with teachers, with a community advisory board, and with other selected parents and community leaders.

After three months we had not yet received his questionnaire from Booklet I. In a telephone conversation, he said the delay was caused by his being too busy with other matters but that he would return the booklet soon after Christmas vacation.

After 4 1/2 months, the principal still had not returned Booklet I. In a telephone conversation, the principal indicated that he might have to drop out of the project because of administrative difficulties. He did not indicate the cause of the trouble, except to say that it had nothing to do with the KIT.

Even though we had not received Booklet I and it was late in the year, we were anxious to continue the case study in this school because (1) the school differed somewhat from the other schools in terms of socio-economic and racial characteristics; (2) there appeared to be a

major difference of opinion among the school staff regarding the goals of the educational program. We wanted to see if the different views on educational goals were reflected in the card-sorting. We were interested in knowing if the KIT could help the principal and teachers identify and resolve their differences of opinion.

We continued to hope that the case study would proceed in this school. However, after six more weeks we were notified by the principal that the school would be unable to participate in the study.

Thus, very late in the year, we lost one of the initial case-study schools.

School D. With the loss of School A, we sought to conduct a case study in School D, a multi-racial school in a nearby district that had undergone court-ordered racial integration. Because of the potential goal-conflicts that one might anticipate in schools that are going through substantial change in a short period of time, we were anxious to conduct a case study in this school. It would have been interesting to see if the KIT were useful in resolving the goal-conflicts.

We were informed in early December that the school did not wish to participate in the proposed case study.

School E. In early winter, 1971, School E agreed to participate in the case study. School E is a K-8 school with a pupil enrollment of 881. Seventy-five percent of its parents are skilled laborers and white collar workers. Approximately 66 percent of the parents are Anglo, almost all the remaining parents have Spanish surnames. The school is located in a community that adjoins Los Angeles. (A more detailed description of School E is included in the next section of this report.)

In summary, only one of the original three schools was included in these case studies. School E was added at a later time. Thus, the remaining report is centered on case studies conducted in Schools B and E.

School B

School B is a K-6 elementary school with a student enrollment of 510 and a certified staff of 18 full-time teachers and one half-time EMR teacher. The school is part of a K-12 unified school district with

an enrollment of 15,183. The school services an attendance area that is characterized as predominately white middle-class. The majority of parents are white collar supervisors, managers, and hourly workers. There has been little pupil turnover, and the size of the school has remained constant during the past three years. The school's educational program, as described by the principal, is traditional.

The pupils are typical for such a community. Data on intelligence tests indicate a normal distribution. There does not appear to be an unusually large number of retarded, or disruptive, or brilliant pupils.

All but one of the teachers are women. Two-thirds of the teachers have taught for five years or more. One teacher does not have an A.B. degree. The principal holds the only advanced degree. Four of the teachers live in the district. There is very little teacher involvement with the community. The principal reports a division in the faculty between older and younger teachers (8 teachers under 30, 8 over thirty). The older teachers have tended to be very influential on the school in the past. Because of large turnover during the past few years (retirement), there is a shift toward a younger teaching staff.

A sociometric device was administered to determine if any decided cliques or influential teachers could be identified. (This device is reproduced in Appendix G.) A decided difference was noted among primary (K-2) and upper elementary (3-6) levels. That is, the primary teachers tended to interact with one another, and the upper elementary teachers interacted with one another. Five teachers were identified, through use of the sociometric device, as being influential and three teachers were identified by the principal as influential.

The principal is in his second year as principal of this school. He came to the school from previous experience as a principal in another school in the district. As is often the case, the new principal had to spend a considerable amount of time in adjusting the faculty and staff to his style of leadership, which was somewhat different from that of his predecessor. He encountered a number of difficulties in doing this but by the end of the first year he felt that the faculty and staff had grown accustomed to his leadership.

In summary, School B seems in many ways to be a rather typical middle-class elementary school. Its student population is stable and unmarked by any unusual characteristics. The educational program is traditional. The faculty is predominately female with some difference of opinion existing between younger and older teachers. Influential teachers can be identified. The school had undergone a change in leadership. However, by the time of data collection, the problems normally attendant with such a change appeared to have abated.

Implementation of the KIT. The principal first heard of the CSE Elementary School Evaluation KIT through CESAA activities. The KIT was the only CESAA project that made much sense to him as a practical tool for determining the school goals. He and a principal of another school presented their plans for using the KIT in their schools to the school board and superordinates. They received enthusiastic support.

Originally, the card-sort was to be completed by all teachers in School B and a "representative sample" of parents. The teachers were to be introduced to the KIT at a faculty meeting, and they were to schedule a "minimum day" at a later date in order to complete the card-sort. The parents were to be sent the Q-Sort cards by mail, and they were to return the cards at their convenience.

In November, the principal anticipated that the KIT might have either a polarizing or unifying effect on the faculty. His prediction was that the faculty would draw closer together as a result of using the KIT. The principal asked one of the teacher leaders to assist him with the implementation of the KIT.

In January, the principal introduced the CESAA project and the KIT to the teachers. He briefly explained the range of activities in which CESAA is engaged, then he discussed the CSE project. He stated that the cards would be sorted into envelopes by all teachers in the school and a randomly selected sample of parents. The question was raised as to whether the goals were to be sorted on a grade or school basis. They were told to sort on a school basis. The principal explained that it would take two years to complete the entire KIT activities.

The faculty card-sort took place in March. The principal had duplicated the card deck so that each teacher had his own deck. The principal explained the KIT briefly and gave oral instructions as to how the cards were to be sorted. Several general questions were asked. The most critical one centered on what reference the teachers were to use when sorting the cards, i.e., in terms of a particular grade or for the entire school. The principal answered, "You are to think of the school, its whole program for K-6."

The teachers sorted for about 40 minutes (some going to other rooms, some staying in meeting room). They all returned to the meeting room where the principal explained the tally procedure. The card-sorters serialized the cards in each pile from 1-A through whatever number in the stack. When they were gathered together, one person read off column 1, 1-A to 41-C. Each person with a card in column 1 would raise his hand when the appropriate number was called off. The hands were counted and recorded. This was done for each of the 5 columns. The tally was completed in about one hour. The entire card-sorting, including the tallying took two hours. A summary of the teachers' total tally was prepared and sent to all members of the faculty.

In early April, eight parents on the PTA board of directors completed the card-sort at a PTA board meeting. These parents were not randomly selected.

Teacher Interviews. In May, interviews were held with eight teachers who participated in the card-sort. (See Appendix J) The following is a summary of their answers to questions they were asked during the interview:

1. Seven of the eight teachers initially learned of the KIT at the January faculty meeting. The teacher who had been asked to assist the principal with the implementation of the KIT had heard of the KIT prior to the faculty meeting.

2. There was considerable difference of opinion about the purpose of the card-sort. Two teachers had "no idea" of the objectives of the card-sort; two thought it was the first step in "writing a new curriculum"; two thought the card-sort was to identify differences between teachers and parents; one thought the KIT was to identify the teachers' goals; and one thought it was to identify the most and least important "behavioral objectives."

3. Five of the teachers were satisfied with the way the KIT was introduced. Two felt they were somewhat unprepared to adequately complete the card-sort, and they would have appreciated having an opportunity to become acquainted with the cards before they began the sorting; one experienced teacher recommended that the cards sorted by experienced teachers should be given more attention than those of new teachers.

4. Two teachers had no further questions about the KIT (largely from lack of interest); two teachers have no idea of what is to happen next; two teachers thought this was a UCLA research project and that we were collecting data for UCLA; and two were confused as to whether they should have sorted on a grade or school-wide basis.

5. All of them had received the tally sheet of the total faculty card-sort. Three wondered how the parent Q-Sort had turned out (this was not tallied and distributed to the teachers).

6. None of the teachers was aware of any plans for using the results of the card-sort in their school. Participation in the project had not really had much of an effect on the school. There had been no resulting formal or informal discussion of the KIT.

7. Several teachers expressed concern over their ability to sort the cards on a school-wide basis. They felt they were "locked in" to their grade level, and they tended to respond on a grade rather than school-wide basis, even though they tried to be more general in their responses.

8. Two teachers questioned the appropriateness of some items for elementary schools. One suggested there should be a greater number of items on drug education.

Principal Interview. In general, the principal was pleased with progress thus far in using the KIT in the school. He plans to appoint a faculty steering committee to help him with the next steps. The possible faculty divisions that he mentioned in an earlier interview did not materialize, although he suspects that they might have developed had they attempted the card-sort during the preceding year. (The other district school that participated in the card-sort experienced a very similar reaction from the faculty.)

The principal was disappointed with the parent participation. He felt it was difficult to find parents who had the time to complete the card sort.

A district-wide PPBS Needs Assessment Steering Committee has been formed to modify the goals in Booklet II of the KIT for use throughout

the district. The committee had the following reservations about the KIT:

1. The cards are hard to understand. Some of the items are too long and complex and the vocabulary is confusing, especially for lay people.

2. There are too many items and the resulting tediousness limits the effectiveness of the KIT.

3. The card sort and resulting tallying is unnecessarily complicated. They prefer a straight questionnaire.

As a result, the district will be revising the cards into a questionnaire that will be distributed in an attempt to determine district goals.

Parent Interviews. Four of the eight parents who completed the card-sort were interviewed. Their comments can be summarized as follows:

1. The instructions for the KIT were clear; however, they found it difficult to sort the cards on a school-wide basis, even though it was their understanding that that was what they were to do. Instead, they tended to sort in terms of their particular child, the grade he was in, and his unique characteristics. Those parents with more than one child in the school had considerable difficulty in sorting some cards.

2. Although they found the exercise to be interesting, they did not understand some of the terms on the cards.

3. They felt unaware of how the KIT was to be used in the future. They felt a general questionnaire sent to the homes might afford a greater number of parents an opportunity to express their ideas about the goals of the schools.

School E

School E is a K-8 elementary school with a student enrollment of approximately 900, and a certified staff of 29 full-time teachers. The school is part of an elementary school district with a total enrollment of 9,039 pupils.

The school's attendance area is in a state of transition. Originally rather affluent, the area now has considerable diversity in terms of socio-economic level and ethnic background. The principal estimates that about 50 percent are white collar, about 35 percent are skilled

workers, and 15 percent are unskilled laborers. There is a decided shift recently toward an increase in the percentage of unskilled workers. About two-thirds of the parents are Anglo, about one-third have Spanish surnames. There are few Blacks, Orientals, and American Indians in the community. The percentage of Spanish surname families is rising steadily. The principal reports that there is no visible parent unrest regarding the school.

There is a continuing increase in the percentage of student turnover with the current rate standing at almost 25 percent each year. The size of the pupil population has remained quite constant over the past three years.

In terms of academic ability, the student body has essentially a normal distribution; however, this distribution appears to be changing. The principal reports that the school's mean I.Q. score has been dropping about 2 points per year during the past three years. The principal attributes this change to the difficulty children with Spanish surnames have on intelligence tests that are written in English. Consequently, as the percentage of Spanish surname pupils increases, the average I.Q. score tends to decline.

Until funds ran out in 1970-71 academic year, the school was an ESEA target school. The local Headstart program was located in the school building.

Of the 29 certified teachers, 10 are men, 19 are women. One-third of the teachers are over 50 years of age, one-third are in the 31-50 year age bracket, with the remaining third in the 21-30 year age group. All of the teachers have a minimum of an A.B. degree, approximately one-half have earned the Master's degree, and one teacher has earned a doctorate. The principal is in his sixth year as principal of the school.

A sociometric device was administered to assess the informal structure of the school. Only one-half of the instruments were returned; therefore, it is difficult to develop any comprehensive picture of the school's informal system. From the sociogram, it appears that the upper

elementary and 7th and 8th grade teachers form a loose-knit clique. This is consistent with the principal's observations. Five teachers were identified through the sociometric device as being influential; the principal identified only one of them as being influential.

In summary, School E is located in a transitional residential area. There does not appear to be any serious effort on the part of the school staff to assess the implications the changed pupil population might have for the educational program. There does not seem to be any serious split in the faculty except perhaps that the 7th and 8th grade teachers are considered more liberal in educational matters. Several influential teachers were identified. The principal's leadership seems managerial rather than curriculum oriented.

Implementation of the KIT. The principal was asked by the associate superintendent for curriculum to participate in the CSE evaluation project. It was not until early January, that the principal first heard of our interest in conducting a case study. Thus he started somewhat behind the other case-study school.

In an interview in late January, the principal's plans were as follows: In February, the school board, all K-6 teachers (optional for 7th-8th grade teachers), 30-40 parents selected by the principal on a stratified basis (socio-economic), and approximately 50 pupils were to sort the cards. The card-sort was to be completed by the end of February. The entire school board would complete the card-sort, the teachers would be split into two groups, and several small groups of parents and pupils would complete the card-sort. An administrative aide was to tabulate the teachers' cards; a parent group was to tabulate the parent and pupil cards. He was going to introduce the KIT to the teachers at a separate meeting before they completed the card-sort. He did not elaborate on how he would introduce the KIT to the school board, parents, and pupils. He indicated that the cards would have to be translated into Spanish in order for some parents to complete the card sort. He planned to complete the entire KIT project by the middle of June.

In early February, the principal presented the KIT to the school board. He reviewed the CSE project and its relationship to CESAA. The observers, who had talked with the principal prior to the board meeting and who were familiar with the KIT, could follow his presentation. However, it appeared that not everyone on the board was entirely clear as to the KIT's purpose and design. The board members were each given a set of cards and they were asked to complete the card-sort sometime during the following two weeks. Several procedural questions were asked by board members. Two board members expressed concern that the goals might not reflect the needs of some minority students, e.g., English as a second language. The board members were instructed to use the blank yellow cards to indicate such items. At the close of this case study (five months later) no tabulation has been made of the board members' card-sort.

In late February, the principal met with 19 teachers and 2 parents for the purpose of introducing the KIT to them. He explained CSE and the KIT, and the school's involvement in the field testing. He was asked on several occasions if the teachers were to sort on a school or grade level. He answered that their uppermost concern should be what is best for "the kids," and what they think a 6th grader should be like. Their card-sort should reflect those concerns. His presentation was not entirely clear. Several teachers picked up a packet of materials to begin their sorting. Upon completing the sorting, the teachers were to return the packet to the central office where it was to be distributed to another teacher.

Only one teacher completed the card-sort at that time. In June, 10 teachers were asked to complete the card-sort that evening and to be available for an interview with "someone from UCLA" on the next day. Those selected teachers completed the sort as requested, returned the tally sheets, and appeared for the aforementioned interviews. No tabulation has been made of the card-sorts nor has the principal articulated his plan for having the other teachers complete the sort. The principal says he intends to have the other teachers complete the sort "as soon as possible."

Similarly, five parents were phoned during the first week in June, 1971, and were asked to complete the card-sort and be available for some UCLA interviews. The parents selected are on the PTA Board. Three of the members completed the sort; one other member had her husband complete the sort. No tabulation had been completed of the parents' sort. The principal still plans to have "many parents" complete the sort sometime this summer. However, he was not specific as to when and how this was to be done.

Teacher Interviews. During the second week of June, nine teachers who participated in the card-sorting were interviewed. The following is a summary of their answers to questions about the KIT.

1. Six teachers first heard of the KIT at the faculty meeting held for that purpose; one teacher was sure she had completed this card-sort sometime the year before--but she could not elaborate; two teachers who missed that meeting heard about it from fellow teachers the next day during a coffee break; and one teacher first heard about the KIT when she was asked to do the card-sort.

2. The seven teachers who had attended the principal's presentation thought the purpose of the KIT was to identify the goals of the school as they relate to curriculum development. The two who missed the principal's explanation had no idea as to why they completed the card-sort.

3. One teacher thought the principal's introduction was sufficiently clear. The remaining five teachers were unsure of the KIT's purpose. All of the teachers were unclear about how long to take in completing the card-sort. Several felt there had been too long a time delay between the introduction and the actual card-sort.

4. Three teachers expressed concern over what will happen next. Five teachers were unsure about whether they were to consider goals that were appropriate for the average sixth grader, or for children at the grade level at which they teach. They felt that it was difficult to sort for some hypothetical average child. This point was mentioned repeatedly during the interviews.

5. None of the teachers had received any feedback of the results, although several expressed an interest in such information.

6. None of the teachers knew of any plans for using the results of the card-sort in the schools.

7. A number of teachers commented on the inappropriateness of the wording of Category 5. They could not find items that were "unimportant or irrelevant." Several teachers found the card-sorting forced them to think through some of their assumptions about schooling and felt that the card-sorting activity was useful. One stated he would be interested in completing the card-sort again when he had more time. They all seriously questioned whether the KIT will have any impact on their school because of lack of clarity as to the purpose, and the unsystematic scheduling and introduction of the card-sort.

Principal Interview. As of the second week of June, the principal still plans to have all the teachers complete the card-sort. He did not elaborate how this would be done by the end of the school year. Five of 50 parents have completed the card-sort, he plans to have the remainder complete the sort this summer. Four of the school board members have completed the card-sort, one still has not returned the cards. Although this sort was scheduled in early February, no summary has been completed of the results of their sort. The principal intends to have the students complete the sort this summer, although none had done so as of June. He plans to complete the implementation of the KIT during the next year.

Based on discussions with faculty members, the principal feels some of the items on the cards are too long and confusing. In conversations with the principal, the faculty expressed considerable skepticism regarding the usefulness of the KIT. The limited communications system in the school, occasioned by the grade organization, seriously limits the potential for using the KIT in the school.

Part of the reason for the considerable delay in completing the card-sort, according to the principal, is the limited number of card sets he was given. Had he been given at least 15 sets, he feels he could have completed the card sort much sooner.

It will be necessary for him to translate the cards into Spanish in order for some parents to complete the card sort. He feels that some of the cards will be difficult for some parents; he suggests we convene a group of parents to help rewrite the cards into a more acceptable form.

Parent Interviews. Four of the 5 parents who had completed the card-sort were interviewed. Two of the parents had been present when the principal made his presentation to the faculty; two of them first heard about the card-sort when they were handed the deck of cards. All of them saw the purpose of the KIT as that of helping the school and community assess its goals and curriculum. All of them found the instructions reasonably clear; three parents felt the vocabularly in some cards was difficult. All of them seemed to think the card-sort is an interesting idea; however, they were unaware of how or if they would be informed of the results of their sort and the teachers' sort. They knew of no plans to implement any change in the school as a result of the card-sort.

All of the parents felt that they had learned something as a result of the card-sorting. Some were surprised at the amount of value they gave the affective items. They found it difficult to sort for "an average sixth grader." They tended to think of their children when sorting and responded accordingly.

Results

The first part of this section is organized around the various dimensions of the schools that were examined. Schools B and E are compared and, in as much as it is possible, conclusions are reached from such comparisons.

The second part of the summary lists some general conclusions about the use of the KIT in the schools. (There is a great risk, of course, in trying to reach any broad conclusions from so limited a sample; nonetheless, such conclusions, coupled with the larger data collection effort, may provide useful insights for refining the KIT.)

The Principals Perceived Leadership. The LBDQ XII (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire) was administered to 16 of the 18 teachers in

School B and 16 of the 29 teachers in School E. The low rate of returned instruments in School E (55 percent) severely limits any statistical analysis of the data. A two-tailed t-test was made of the mean leadership score of the two principals in the two schools and the resulting differences were matched with our observations about the differences in their leadership styles.

The teachers perception of the leadership behavior of the principal of School B (Principal B) was found to differ significantly from that of the principal of School E (Principal E) on Dimension 5 (Initiation of Structure). Principal B scored higher than Principal E on 11 of the 12 leadership dimensions. These data tended to confirm our observations.

Based on the LBDQ XII, and our observations, it appears that the principal's leadership is indeed a very important variable in determining the success of the KIT's implementation in the school.

Informal Structure of the School. The sociometric devices indicated that there were identifiable and influential teacher cliques in the schools. In these two studies, however, it appears that these cliques and influential teachers had little or no impact upon the implementation of the KIT. The reason for this is that the KIT was not of sufficient interest that it was a topic of teacher discussion. Thus the informal structure was not called into play. It is entirely possible, however, that as schools move further into the implementation phase, i.e., when controversial curricular decisions are made, that the informal structure of a school may well come to the foreground. It was evident in our interviews that younger and older teachers tended to view each other with some suspicion. As their differences become manifest, the informal system could become very important in influencing the implementation of the KIT.

It was apparent in School B that there is an historical dimension to be considered when examining the implementation of the KIT. If the principal of School B had attempted to introduce the KIT last year, it is reasonable to speculate that he would have had a great deal of difficulty. For a variety of complex reasons, the informal system may

have reacted vigorously to oppose the principal's efforts to introduce the KIT. (Likewise, School C might well have rejected any attempt to introduce the KIT at this time.) It appears that there has to be a threshold of cooperation and tranquility in a school and community before the KIT will have much of a chance of being implemented.

Implementation of the KIT. Both principals had similar plans for implementing the KIT. Principal B made some progress (completed Booklets II and III); Principal E made little headway (no Booklets completed).

Principal B's presentation of the KIT to the faculty was far clearer than that of Principal E, and this difference showed up in the interviews with the teachers, that is, the teachers in School B were more knowledgeable about the KIT's purposes and design. It appears, however, that the time lapse between the meeting in which Booklet II of the KIT was introduced and the actual card-sort (a little over a month in School B; approximately 3.5 months in School E) was excessive and tended to minimize the teachers' knowledge about and enthusiasm for the card-sort.

The procedures for the actual card-sort in School B were far superior to those used in School E, and one suspects this made a considerable difference in the effort the teachers put into the card-sort. Principal B completed the card-sort in such a way that it was looked on by the teachers as a positive experience. The teachers had enough time to complete the sort and the means he used to tabulate the cards stimulated the teachers interest in the project. In addition, he was able to give the teachers some feedback within a reasonable period of time. The teachers in School E tended to view the card-sort with some annoyance. In several instances, it was because they felt frustrated by having to complete the sort during the last week of school and with only a faint idea as to why they were being asked to do it. It is likely that the sorting of some or all of these teachers was very perfunctory.

Neither principal was very successful in securing any kind of comprehensive parent involvement in the project. It is still not clear as to why this is the case. Either the principals had little contact with parents or they were reluctant to ask parents to take

time to complete the sorting, or they simply did not know how to proceed with this task. The parents seemed interested in the card-sort and they did not express the opinion that the sorting was a heavy imposition on their time. Several parents stated that the items were too long and the language was a little too difficult. Neither of the principals had tabulated the results of the parent card-sorts.

General Comments. At this early stage, the KIT has had very little impact on either school. The teachers and parents were cooperative and moderately interested in the project but none of them had really done any serious thinking about the KIT. None of them viewed the card-sort as the first in a series of events that will help the school more precisely define and attain educational goals. Their lack of knowledge about the KIT coupled with the decision to take two years to complete the project limits considerably the likelihood that the KIT will have any lasting impact upon these schools. This isn't to say that the potential interest isn't there. Several parents and teachers commented that the Q-Sort helped them clarify their thinking about educational goals. This potential interest just wasn't utilized.

It appears that these principals were not very effective disseminators of the KIT. One was quite skilled at performing the Q-Sort efficiently, the other was not so skilled. Neither was sufficiently enthusiastic to excite the faculty and parents about the project. This may have been a result of their lack of understanding of the design and purpose of the KIT.

Neither principal made any serious attempt to use the Q-Sort to assess community interest. The parents selected were either school board members or members of the PTA executive board. While the opinions of these citizens are important, they do not begin to represent the opinions of any community of diverse socio-economic or racial composition.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

MAIL TO:
Dr. Ralph Hoepfner, Director
School Evaluation Project
Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA
Room 145, Moore Hall
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

Formal Application for Inclusion in Field Implementation Sample
Elementary School Evaluation Project
Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA

School name* _____

School address _____

ZIP _____

Name of school district _____

School Descriptive Information

1. Grade span of school _____

2. Approximate pupil enrollment (Sept. 1970) _____

3. Which one of the following categories best describes the neighborhood served by your school?

____a. rural area
____b. residential suburb
____c. industrial suburb
____d. small town (5,000 or less)
____e. city of 5,000 to 50,000
____f. residential area of a large city (50,000+)
____g. inner part of a large city (50,000+)

4. Racial-ethnic characteristics of student body (approx. percentages).

	%
(a) American Indian. . . .	
(b) Mexican-American . . .	
(c) Negro.	
(d) Oriental	
(e) Puerto Rican	
(f) White.	
(g) Other (specify). . . .	
Total	100%

5. About what % of the pupils served by the school fall into each of the categories listed in the chart below:

	Occupational Category	%
a.	children of professionals and managers (doctors, lawyers, engineers, executives, etc.)	
b.	children of white collar workers other than those in (a) above (proprietors, salesmen, clerks, etc.)	
c.	children of skilled workers (electricians, carpenters, repair men, factory workers, etc.)	
d.	children of unskilled (laborers, janitors, dishwashers, etc.)	
	TOTAL	100%

*Note: If applying for district participation, please include school description for all schools to be included.

On the reverse side of this sheet please include a statement relative to why inclusion of this school in the field implementation is being sought. Include any characteristics of the school and/or community that might support the application.

_____
Name and Title of individual submitting application

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EVALUATION KIT

Field Implementation QUESTIONNAIRE #1

To be completed by school principal

This questionnaire must be completed and returned to CSE before the next Booklet in the KIT can be sent.

The questions below are being asked in order to learn more about the environment in which the Elementary School Evaluation KIT is being implemented. No information will be released by the School Evaluation Project in any form that would allow identification of any particular school.

1. Please check the appropriate choices below relative to planning and decision-making procedures in your school:

	planning is done at school level; decision to implement is made at school level.	planning is done at school level; decision to implement is made at district level.	plans and decisions are made at district level.
Instructional program			
Budget			
Teacher assignment			

2. In those areas above where planning and/or decision-making occur at the school level, who is involved in the process? (check all that apply)

	Planning			Decision-making		
	Prin.	teachers	parents	Prin.	teachers	parents
Instructional program						
Budget						
Teacher assignment						

3. What is the title of your immediate superior?

_____

4. Using the numbers 1, 2, & 3, indicate on the following list the top three groups that place the most pressure upon you to institute educational reforms and/or new programs: (1 = most pressure)

Church or religious groups _____
Business organizations _____
Women's groups _____
Other professional groups _____
Veteran's organizations _____
Property owners' association _____
Teacher organizations _____
Student groups _____
District administrators _____
Parent-Teacher Associations _____

5. How many families of your students are represented at a typical meeting of the PTA or similar parent groups? (check one)

_____ We have no parents' organization
_____ Only a few
_____ Less than half
_____ About half
_____ Over half
_____ Almost all of them

6. When you are interested in learning of the attitudes of your teachers toward a particular issue regarding the instructional program (change in schedule, new materials, etc.), what is your normal procedure? (check all that apply)

_____ contact teachers individually
_____ call meeting of teachers
_____ contact teacher organization(s) representative(s)
_____ Occasion does not arise where this is necessary.
_____ other (please specify)_____
_____.

7. When you want to learn of your school community's attitude toward a particular issue regarding your school's instructional program, what is your usual procedure? (check all that apply)

_____ bring up at meeting of PTA or similar parent organization
_____ check with teachers
_____ contact a few parents
_____ occasion does not arise where this is necessary
_____ other (please specify.) _____
_____.

have been implemented in your school during the past two years. For each project, briefly indicate where the idea for the project originated (teacher suggestion, school curriculum committee, district office, etc.) and the reason the project was initiated (low achievement scores in math, too many accidents on playground, just wanted to try out new program, etc.)

Experimental or Innovative Projects	Where idea originated	Reason project was initiated

9. Please rank in order of importance the following considerations relative to deciding on the allocation funds for next year's programs in your school. (1 = most important)

_____ State mandates
_____ Local Board of Education mandates
_____ student needs as indicated by standardized tests
_____ student needs as observed by teachers
_____ suggestions from parents

10. You are suddenly given $500 to spend on any one instructional area in your school. Please describe briefly how you would decide where to spend the money.

The following questions pertain to your standardized testing program. Information is requested for grades 1, 3, 5, and 6. If your school does not contain one or more of the grades, place a large "X" over that box.

First grade

11. Please list by name the standardized tests administered last year to your first graders. For each test, indicate the area of the instructional program being measured.

Title of test	Instructional area being measured

12. How were the majority of the above-named first-grade tests selected? (check one)

_____ state mandated
_____ district mandated
_____ price
_____ what other schools are doing
_____ what the school has always done
_____ the test measures an area we want measured

13. The scores from these first-grade tests were actually used in: (check all that apply)

_____ staff curriculum-planning sessions
_____ student counseling and diagnosis
_____ pupil grouping
_____ teacher evaluation
_____ comparisons among schools
_____ pupil grading

Third grade

14. Please list by name the standardized tests administered last year to your third graders. For each test, indicate the area of the instructional program being measured.

Title of test	Instructional area being measured

15. How were the majority of the above-named third-grade tests selected? (check one)

_____ state mandated
_____ district mandated
_____ price
_____ what other schools are doing
_____ what the school has always done
_____ the test measures an area we want measured

16. The scores from these third grade tests were actually used in: (check all that apply)

_____ staff curriculum-planning sessions
_____ student counseling and diagnosis
_____ pupil grouping
_____ teacher evaluation
_____ comparisons among schools
_____ pupil grading

Fifth grade

17. Please list by name the standardized tests administered last year to your fifth graders. For each test, indicate the area of the instructional program being measured.

Title of test	Instructional area being measured

18. How were the majority of the above-named fifth-grade tests selected? (check one)

_____ state mandated
_____ district mandated
_____ price
_____ what other schools are doing
_____ what the school has always done
_____ the test measures an area we want measured

19. The scores from these fifth grade tests were actually used in: (check all that apply)

_____ staff curriculum-planning sessions
_____ student counseling and diagnosis
_____ pupil grouping
_____ teacher evaluation
_____ comparisons among schools
_____ pupil grading

Sixth grade

20. Please list by name the standardized tests administered last year to your sixth graders. For each test, indicate the area of the instructional program being measured.

Title of test	Instructional area being measured

21. How were the majority of the above-named sixth-grade tests selected? (check one)

_____ state mandated
_____ district mandated
_____ price
_____ what other schools are doing
_____ what the school has always done
_____ the test measures an area we want measured

22. The scores from these sixth grade tests were actually used in: (check all that apply)

_____ staff curriculum-planning sessions
_____ student counseling and diagnosis
_____ pupil grouping
_____ teacher evaluation
_____ comparisons among schools
_____ pupil grading

23. What do you think is the attitude of the following people toward the standardized testing program in your school? (check one in each column)

Attitude	teachers	guidance personnel	pupils	principals
provides necessary information				
it is required that the tests be given				
good measure of pupil progress				
good measure of curriculum success				
a good way of judging teacher competence				
forces teacher to teach to test				
a waste of time; is harmful				

24. Please elaborate on your own attitude toward the use of standardized tests in your school.

_____

_____

_____

25. You have just learned that the average score on a standardized math achievement test given to all your third graders last May was extremely low (in comparison to what you expected). How would you explain this phenomenon? (check one)

_____ really don't know how to explain it
_____ test didn't measure what was taught
_____ indicates a shift in my school community to a lower socioeconomic status
_____ would have to examine the test with my third grade teachers before I could explain it
_____ other (please specify) _____

26. Check one of the following statements that best reflects your attitude toward national norms on standardized tests:

_____ what are national norms?
_____ national norms are always better than state or local norms for making decisions relative to the instructional program
_____ the advantage of national norms is that they are based solely on schools like my own.
_____ national norms are always more reliable.
_____ other (please specify) _____

APPENDIX C

School _____

District _____

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EVALUATION KIT

Field Implementation QUESTIONNAIRE #2

To be completed by school principal

This questionnaire must be completed and returned to CSE before Booklet III: Selecting Tests can be sent.

The questions below are being asked in order to enable CSE to evaluate the present edition of the Elementary School Evaluation KIT. No information will be released by CSE in any form that would allow identification of any particular school.

DIRECTIONS: Read Booklet II and examine the contents of the box of goal card sets. Study the procedures for the Collective Viewpoints Approach (Method 2, page 11) and administer the procedures to yourself twice with a two week period in between the administrations. Record your ratings in the table at the end of this questionnaire and then answer questions 1-7 below.

1. List any student performance goals that you would like to see added to the list.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. List any goals other than student performance goals that you would like to see added to the list (i.e., goals pertaining to staff performance, school operation, community involvement, etc.). Please list specific goals.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Were there any goals (as stated on the cards or in Appendix A) that seemed to be too similar to one another? _____.
Which ones? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Were the goals organized in a manner appropriate for your school? _____.
How would you improve them? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Would you have preferred the goals to be: (check one)

_____ more specific and more numerous?

_____ more general and fewer in number?

6. Do you feel that the goals and the organization of the goals are appropriate for a wide variety of schools and types of students?

yes ☐ no ☐

DIRECTIONS: Please read the remaining questions in this questionnaire and then administer the Collective Viewpoints Approach (Method 2, page 11) to at least 10 teachers and 10 parents. Record each group's average rating in the table at the end of this questionnaire and then answer questions 8-20 in this questionnaire. Save the pink Tally Sheets and please return them with the questionnaire.

7. List any student performance goals that your raters added by using the yellow blank cards. Also indicate the rating (1-5) given each "write-in" goal.

Goal	Rating

8. List any goals other than student performance goals that your raters added (i.e., goals pertaining to staff performance, school operation, community involvement, etc.). Also indicate the rating (1-5) given each "write-in" goal.

Goal	Rating

9. Was the system of rating goals contained in Method 2 easy for you? _____ For your teachers? _____ For your parents? ___. List any difficulties that were encountered?

10. Would you, the teachers, or the parents have preferred some other way of rating the relative importance of goals? _____. If so, briefly describe it. _____

11. Do you think other goals would have been chosen as "most important" if you, the teachers, or the parents had used a method other than the one recommended?

Why? _____

12. In using the "Collective Viewpoints" method, did you learn anything new about the views of Teachers? _____ What? _____

Parents? _____ What? _____

13. Did it confirm feelings you had about the viewpoints of Teachers? _____
What? _____

_____

Parents? _____ What? _____

_____

14. Were the instructions understandable for the collective viewpoints method? _____ Could you follow the procedure given? _____
Could you do the computations easily? _____ Were the results commensurate with the effort expended? _____ If not, why not? _____

_____

_____

15. Did you try to combine the various viewpoints to get one set of goals? _____ What method did you use? _____

_____

_____

_____

16. Did you do the random sampling of parents? _____ What problems in random sampling occurred in your context? _____

_____

Is it easy? _____

Is it worth the effort? _____

17. Did you do the stratified sampling of parents? _____
What problems in stratified sampling occurred in your context? _____

_____

Is it easy? _____

Is it worth the effort? _____

18. Briefly describe the reaction of the teachers and parents to being involved. (e.g., enthusiastic, threatened, frustrated, etc.).

_____

_____

_____

_____

19. What is your overall reaction to Booklet II? _____

20. Would you recommend procedures contained in Booklet II to other principals? _____ If not, why? _____

21. Other comments on Booklet II.

Please fill out the table below.

No. of teachers involved _____.
No. of parents involved _____.

Note: Please return all tally sheets (pink) with this questionnaire (don't worry about them being messy).

Educational Goals	Your Own Ratings			Teachers' Average Rating	Parents' Average Rating
	1st rating	2nd rating	Average		
Shyness-Boldness					
Neuroticism-Adjustment					
General Activity-Lethargy					
Dependence-Independence					
Hostility-Friendliness					
Socialization-Rebelliousness					
School Orientation					
Self-Esteem					
Need Achievement					
Interest Areas					
Appreciation of Arts and Crafts					
Involvement in Arts and Crafts					
Representational Skill in Arts and Crafts					
Expressive Skill in Arts and Crafts					
Arts and Crafts Comprehension					
Developmental Understanding of Arts and Crafts					
Classificatory Reasoning					
Relational-Implicational Reasoning					
Systematic Reasoning					
Spatial Reasoning					
Creative Flexibility					
Creative Fluency					

Educational Goals	Your Own Ratings			Teachers' Average Rating	Par... Aver... Rat...
	1st rating	2nd rating	Average		
10A. Span and Serial Memory					
10B. Meaningful Memory					
10C. Spatial Memory					
11A. Reading Comprehension of a Foreign Language					
11B. Oral Comprehension of a Foreign Language					
11C. Speaking Fluency in a Foreign Language					
11D. Writing Fluency in a Foreign Language					
12A. Cultural Insight through a Foreign Language					
12B. Interest in and Application of a Foreign Language					
13A. Spelling					
13B. Punctuation					
13C. Capitalization					
13D. Grammar and Usage					
13E. Penmanship					
13F. Written Expression					
13G. Independent Application of Writing Skills					
14A. Use of Data Sources as Reference Skill					
14B. Summarizing Information for Reference					
15A. Comprehension of Numbers and Sets in Mathematics					
15B. Comprehension of Positional Notation in Math.					
15C. Comprehension of Equations and Inequalities					
15D. Comprehension of Number Principles					
16A. Operations with Integers					
16B. Operations with Fractions					
16C. Operations with Decimals and Percents					
17A. Mathematical Problem Solving					
17B. Independent Application of Mathematical Skills					

Educational Goals	Your Own Ratings			Teachers' Average Rating	Parents' Average Rating
	1st rating	2nd rating	Average		
Geometric Facility					
Geometric Vocabulary					
Measurement Reading and Making					
Statistics					
Music Appreciation					
Music Interest and Enjoyment					
Singing					
Musical Instrument Playing					
Dance (Rhythmic Response)					
Aural Identification of Music					
Music Knowledge					
Practicing Health and Safety Principles					
Understanding Health and Safety Principles					
Sex Education					
Muscle Control (Physical Education)					
Physical Development and Well-Being (Phys. Ed.)					
Group Activity - Sportsmanship					
Interest & Indepndt. Partcptn. in Sports and Games					
Undrstndg. Rules & Strategies of Sports & Games					
Knowledge of Phys-Ed. Apparatus and Equipment					
Listening Reaction and Response to Reading					
Speaking					
Phonetic Recognition					
Structural Recognition					
Oral Reading					
Silent Reading Efficiency					

Educational Goals	Your Own Ratings			Teachers' Average Rating	Pare... Aver... Rati...
	1st rating	2nd rating	Average		
30A. Recognition of Word Meanings					
30B. Understanding Ideational Complexes					
30C. Remembering Information Read					
31A. Inference Making from Reading Selections					
31B. Recognition of Literary Devices					
31C. Critical Reading					
32A. Attitude toward Reading					
32B. Attitude and Behavior Modification from Reading					
32C. Familiarity with Standard Children's Literature					
33. Religious Knowledge					
34. Religious Belief					
35A. Observation and Description in Science					
35B. Use of Numbers and Measures in Science					
35C. Classification and Generalization in Science					
35D. Hypothesis Formation in Science					
35E. Operational Definitions in Science					
35F. Experimentation in Science					
35G. Formulation of Generalized Conclusions in Sci.					
36A. Knowledge of Scientific Facts & Terminology					
36B. The Nature and Purpose of Science					
37A. Science Interest and Application					
37B. Application of Scientific Methods to Life					
38A. Knowledge of History					
38B. Knowledge of Governments					
39A. Knowledge of Physical Geography					
39B. Knowledge of Socio-Economic Geography					
40A. Cultural Knowledge					
40B. Social Organization Knowledge					
41A. Research Skills in Social Sciences					
41B. Citizenship					

APPENDIX D

School _____

City and State _____

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EVALUATION KIT

Field Implementation QUESTIONNAIRE #3

To be completed by school principal

This questionnaire must be completed and returned before Booklet IV: Collecting information can be sent.

The questions below are being asked in order to learn more about the environment in which the Elementary School Evaluation KIT is being implemented. No information will be released by the School Evaluation Project in any form that would allow identification of any particular school.

DIRECTIONS I: Read the first section of Booklet III (pages 3-12) and examine briefly Appendixes A and B. Please answer questions 1-5 which are designed to check on how well this section is written.

In regard to the first section of Booklet III (pages 3-12), please circle the appropriate number in each item below:

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	VERY POOR
1. CLARITY					
Was the section clear and easy to understand?	1	2	3	4	5
2. ORGANIZATION					
Was the section well organized?	1	2	3	4	5
3. APPROPRIATENESS					
Did the section include appropriate consideration in choosing tests?	1	2	3	4	5
4. LENGTH					
Was the length of this section about right or was it too long or too short?	1	2	3*	4*	5*

*For this item only, if 3, 4, or 5 is circled, please check one of the following:

____ too short

____ too long

5. USEFULNESS					
Can you use the information contained in the section?	1	2	3	4	5

DIRECTIONS II: Study Appendix A of Booklet III rather thoroughly, then answer questions 6-13.

6. List below the top two goals as rated by your sample of teachers used in connection with procedures in Booklet II. For each goal, select the best test (using Appendix A of Booklet III) to use in assessing student performance relative to that goal in grade 3.

goal	test

7. List below the top two goals as rated by your sample of parents used in connection with procedures in Booklet II. For each goal, select the best test to use in assessing student performance relative to that goal in grade 5.

goal	test

8. Let's pretend that you are visiting with a school official from a nearby school district. During the conversation, he mentions that he thinks a certain test is an excellent test and that you should consider using it in your school. What questions would you ask him at that point (other than asking him to give you the exact name of the test), in order to determine if you would use the test in your school?

_____

_____

_____

9. Using Appendix A of Booklet III, select what you think is the best test available for assessing student performance for each of the nine goals and grade levels listed below.

goal and grade level	name of test
Recognition of Word Meanings, grade 6	_____
Inference Making from Reading Selections, grade 6	_____
Attitude Toward Reading, grade 3	_____
Reading Comprehension, grade 5	_____
Reading Comprehension, grade 3	_____
Recognition of Word Meanings, grade 1	_____
Mathematical Applications, grade 6	_____
Arithmetic Operations, grade 1	_____
Operations with Integers, grade 3	_____

In regard to your use of Appendix A, please circle the appropriate number in each item below:

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	VERY POOR
10. CLARITY Could you find the information you wanted easily?	1	2	3	4	5
11. USABILITY After you found the information, was it in a form that you could use?	1	2	3	4	5
12. ORGANIZATION How well was Appendix A organized?	1	2	3	4	5
13. TIME Could you locate the information quickly?	1	2	3	4	5

DIRECTIONS III: The following questions pertain to Booklet III taken as a whole.

14. Overall, would you consider Booklet III: (please check)

	Yes	No
Useful?.....	___	___
Fills a need in your school?.....	___	___
Complicated?.....	___	___
Too long?.....	___	___
Overly sophisticated?.....	___	___
What is needed after using Booklet II?.....	___	___
Too much effort for too little return?.....	___	___

15. If you found that you were now using a test that was not suited to your school's particular assessment needs, would you be able to change to a more appropriate test?

___Yes ___No If not, why?_____

_____

_____

16. Do you think Booklet III would help you in presenting a case for a new test to be used in your school district? ___Yes ___No. If not, why?

_____

_____

_____

17. If you are most interested in a test that kids can understand, you would choose tests on the basis of

___Measurement Validity
___Examinee Appropriateness
___Administrative Usability
___Normed Technical Excellence

18. If you are most interested in a test which will differentiate high ability pupils from low ability pupils you would choose on the basis of

___Measurement Validity
___Examinee Appropriateness
___Administrative Usability
___Normed Technical Excellence

19. If you are most interested in a test which teachers can give and score easily, you would choose tests on the basis of

___Measurement Validity
___Examinee Appropriateness
___Administrative Usability
___Normed Technical Excellence

20. If you are most interested in a test which really measures what it claims to measure, you would choose tests on the basis of

___Measurement Validity
___Examinee Appropriateness
___Administrative Usability
___Normed Technical Excellence

21. What is your overall reaction to Booklet III?

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. Would you recommend procedures contained in Booklet III to other principals? _____ Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX E

School _____

City and State _____

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EVALUATION KIT

Field Implementation QUESTIONNAIRE #4

To be completed by school principal

This questionnaire must be completed and returned before Booklet V: Selecting Critical Need Areas can be sent.

These questions are being asked in order to learn more about the environment in which the Elementary School Evaluation KIT is being implemented. No information will be released by the School Evaluation Project in any form that would allow identification of any particular school.

DIRECTIONS I: Read the main text of Booklet IV (pages 1-24) and answer questions 1-19 which relate to pages 1-24 of the booklet.

In regard to the section on PROCURING INSTRUMENTS (pages 2-7):

1. Please indicate how *valuable* each part of this section was to you:

	Very	Somewhat	Not at all	Eliminate
Ordering Test	___	___	___	___
Type of test	___	___	___	___
Scoring service	___	___	___	___
Machine scorable answer sheets	___	___	___	___

2. Were any areas of concern to you left out? YES ___ NO ___
   If yes, please specify _____

   _____

In regard to the section on GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR TEST ADMINISTRATION (pages 8-10):

3. Have you had problems in your testing program that would have been prevented if you had this information? YES ___ NO ___

4. How useful will this section be in helping you with your testing programs?

   ___ very useful
   ___ useful; should be left in booklet
   ___ not very useful, but probably should be left in
   ___ no value; probably should be eliminated

5. Were any areas of concern to you left out? YES ___ NO ___
   If yes, please specify _____

   _____

In regard to the section on TEST SAMPLING PROCEDURES (pages 10-14):

6. How would you characterize your testing program?

   ___ always student-system assessment
   ___ more student-system assessment than sampled-system assessment
   ___ more sampled-system assessment than student-system assessment
   ___ always sampled-system assessment

7. Do you think that you will implement a sampled-system assessment program in the future?

___ yes, by all means
___ yes, if possible
___ no, by no means

8. What advantage does a sampled-system assessment have over a student-system assessment? _____

_____

_____

9. If you were interested in using a sampled-system assessment approach, do you think this section provides enough information for you to use this method in your school? YES ___ NO ___. If no, what kind of information would you like to see added? _____

_____

_____

10. Is it clear to you that we think a sampled-system assessment is preferred to a student-system assessment for school evaluation? YES ___ NO ___. Do you agree? YES ___ NO ___. If no, why? _____

_____

_____

In regard to the section on USING NORMS (pages 14-16):

11. Have you ever attempted to perform a school or program evaluation? YES ___ NO ___.

12. Have you ever performed a school or program evaluation? YES ___ NO ___. If yes, did you use test norms as part of the evaluation? YES ___ NO ___. What kind of test norms? _____

_____

13. Has the unavailability of school norms ever prevented you from performing a school or program evaluation? YES ___ NO ___.

14. Have you ever seen a table of school norms? YES ___ NO ___. If yes, for what test? _____

15. Do you think test publishers should be encouraged to provide school norms?
YES ___ NO ___

16. In regard to the subject of using norms, did this section:

____ contain too much information
____ contain about the right amount of information
____ left out information on the following subjects:

_____

_____

_____

17. Check one of the following statements that best reflects your attitude toward national norms on standardized tests:

____ what are national norms?
____ national norms are always better than state or local norms for making decisions relative to the instructional program.
____ the advantage of national norms is that they are based solely on schools like my own.
____ national norms are always more reliable.
____ other (please specify) _____

_____

Atlas of Scores

This section of Booklet IV is being revised and the changes will appear in the final version under the heading "Differentiated School Norms." The ideas expressed in the first two paragraphs of this section (page 17) remain the same; the changes take place in the way we are attempting to operationalize these ideas. We have discarded the notion of an "atlas of scores" which would be a supplement to regular norm tables. Thus, Appendix A will be dropped from the booklet and replaced by our substitute system.

This system would be similar to the norm tables in most technical manuals, but the important difference is that there would be different norm tables for different "types" of schools, and these tables would contain school norms instead of pupil norms. Thus, if we are successful in our endeavor, it would be possible for you to find out how your school compares with other schools that are "similar" in terms of some as yet unknown characteristics. This comparison is likely to be stated in terms of a percentile rank, such as: the performance of your third graders in science fell at the 83rd percentile when compared to third graders in similar schools. Such a system of "differentiated school norms" would be an important development in improving school evaluation and school accountability.

18. Taking into account what is presented above as well as what is presented on pages 16 and 17 in Booklet IV, how important for school evaluation do you think the development of "differentiated school norms" is?

___ very important
___ somewhat important
___ not important
___ no comment

Change Scores

Our own review of this section has led us to conclude that it is inappropriate for a needs assessment evaluation. We clearly had program evaluation in mind when we wrote it, and this material will appear in a more appropriate booklet. Therefore, there are no questions about change scores.

Communicating Evaluation Results

Again, our review of Booklet IV has shown that this section is slightly misplaced. We are keenly aware that this is a very important topic in this day of community involvement. However, the needs assessment evaluation has not yet been concluded in Booklet IV, so it is premature to talk about communicating evaluation results at this phase. Instead, we will place this section at the end of Booklet V, the last booklet in the Elementary School Evaluation KIT: Needs Assessment. Therefore, there are no questions about communicating evaluation results, at this time.

The following question pertains to Booklet IV as a whole.

19. What is your overall reaction to Booklet IV?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

DIRECTIONS II:

The developers of this KIT, the School Evaluation Project of the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, are continuing the research needed for the development and refinement of future booklets related to the Elementary School Evaluation KIT series. Your assistance in this research process is being sought at this point. The attached questionnaire has been developed to provide valuable information to the School Evaluation Project regarding how elementary school principals view test results. Please follow the directions contained in the questionnaire and return the completed questionnaire with your Booklet IV Questionnaire. Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX F

School _____

City and State _____

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EVALUATION KIT

Field Implementation QUESTIONNAIRE #5

To be completed by school principal

These questions are being asked in order to learn more about [illegible] Elementary School Evaluation Kit is being implemented [illegible] will be helpful. No information will be released by the School Evaluation Project in any form that would allow identification of any particular school.

In regard to the section on Methods and Rules for Selecting Critical Need Areas (pages 2-8):

1. I understand what is meant by models and decision rules (check one).

Yes _____ No _____

2. Did pages - make it clear what the outcome of implementing Booklet V is?

_____ most definitely
_____ I think so
_____ I am not sure
_____ most definitely not

3. Was it valuable to have an explanation of and examples of decision models and rules (pages -)?

_____ very useful
_____ useful, should be left in booklet
_____ not very useful, but probably should be left in booklet
_____ not useful, [illegible] should be eliminated

4. Would you consider the section on alternative decision rules (check one):

		Yes	No
Very poignant	- It indicates the need to have meaningful decision models	___	___
Useful	- It was a good reminder of the pitfalls into which a principal might fall	___	___
Irrelevant	- It added nothing to my understanding of decision models and rules	___	___
Insultingly foolish	-	___	___

5. How useful was this section to your understanding of the Booklet's decision model and rule (check one)?

_____ useful, leave it where it is
_____ useful, but should be put into an Appendix
_____ not very useful, but probably should be left in
_____ not useful, probably should be eliminated

In regard to the section on Using a Decision Model (pages 6-15):

6. Did the booklet give an adequate explanation of the variables in the decision model (pages ~)?

Yes _____ No _____

If No, which variable(s) was (were) not explained adequately?

_____

_____

_____

7. Do you think that there are some important variables which should be included in the decision model but are not?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, what are the variables that you think should be included.

_____

_____

_____

In regard to the section on Implementing the Decision Model (pages 15-23):

8. Was it valuable to have the procedures for computing priority values repeated for you?

Yes _____ No _____

9. Did you have difficulties in following the procedures for computing priority values?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, for which of the following columns did you have trouble, and what was the nature of the difficulty?

_____ Column 1 _____
_____ Column 2 _____
_____ Column 3 _____
_____ Column 4 _____
_____ Column 5 _____
_____ Column 6 _____
_____ Other difficulties (please specify) _____

_____

10. Did you have any difficulties in using Appendix 1 to obtain a school percentile score?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, which of the following were involved (check all that apply)?

_____ Getting a roster of scores
_____ Obtaining the mean raw score
_____ Finding the appropriate table in the test manual to convert raw scores to pupil percentile scores
_____ Converting the mean raw score to a pupil percentile score
_____ Using Table 4 to convert the pupil percentile to a school percentile
_____ Other (please specify) _____

_____

11. Would it be of any value to you if it were explained how the table in Appendix 1 was derived?

Yes _____ No _____

12. Would it be of any value to you if it were explained where the numbers in Tables 1, 2, and 3 were from (check one)?

_____ Yes, it is necessary
_____ Yes, it would be interesting and helpful
_____ No, it would be confusing
_____ No, the numbers stand by themselves

13. Did you actually compute priority values for any goal areas?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, please fill in the following table, or send a copy of Form B

Goal	School Type	School Percentile	Rated Importance	Probable Increase in Utility	Priority Value	Rank

[illegible] section on Booklet [illegible] (page 21 #7):

[illegible] the level for [illegible] and a [illegible] certain goal areas (since [illegible] this decision rule made [illegible] to [illegible] prudent [illegible] [illegible], would you have [illegible] [illegible] priority goal areas [illegible] [illegible] the procedure [illegible] in this booklet?

Yes _____ No _____

If you actually computed priority values for some goal areas, did you agree with the goal area that was selected by the decision rule as the most critical goal area?

Yes _____ No _____

If No, why did you disagree? _____

_____

_____

In regard to Booklet V taken as a whole:

Overall, would you consider Booklet V:

	Yes	No
[illegible]	____	____
[illegible]	____	____
Complicated	____	____
Too long	____	____
[illegible]	____	____
[illegible]	____	____
Too much effort for too little return	____	____

Would you recommend the procedures in Booklet V to other principals?

Yes _____ No _____

If No, why not? _____

_____

_____

If you wish, you may add any comments that have not solicited by items in the questionnaires. _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In regard to the complete ESE KIT: Needs Assessment:

19. Overall, would you consider the KIT:

	Yes	No
Useful	___	___
Fills a need in your school	___	___
Duplicative	___	___
Too Long	___	___
Overly Sophisticated	___	___
Not Much Effort for the Little Return	___	___

20. Would you recommend the KIT to other principals?

Yes _____ No _____

If No, why? _____

_____

_____

21. Would you say that the KIT provides better procedures for needs assessment evaluation than you had been using?

Yes _____ No _____

22. How does the KIT compare to other procedures for needs assessment evaluation that you know about?

_____ much better
_____ better
_____ about the same
_____ poorer
_____ much poorer
_____ don't know about any other procedure
_____ no comment

23. Did you have anyone help you with any of the Booklets?

No	Booklet	Yes	Who
_____	2	_____	_____
_____	3	_____	_____
_____	4	_____	_____
_____	5	_____	_____

The last ... of [illegible] ... do [illegible] the changes that may have occurred since the early [illegible] of the 60's. Please respond as you now see the situation, not as they were then.

24. Using the numbers 1, 2, and 3, indicate on the following list the top three groups that place the most pressure upon you to institute educational reforms and/or new programs (1 = most pressure):

_____ Church or religious groups
_____ Business organizations
_____ Women's groups
_____ Other professional groups
_____ Veteran's organizations
_____ Property owners' association
_____ Teacher organizations
_____ Student groups
_____ District administrators
_____ Parent-teacher associations

25. Please rank in order of importance the following considerations relative to deciding on the allocation of funds for next year's programs in your school (1 = most important):

_____ State mandates
_____ [illegible] district [illegible]
_____ student needs as indicated by standardized tests
_____ student needs as observed by teachers
_____ suggestions from parents

26. You are suddenly given $500.00 to spend on any one instructional area in your school. Please describe briefly how you would decide where to spend the money.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

27. How will the majority of the tests used in next year's testing programs be selected (check one):

_______ state mandated
_______ district mandated
_______ [illegible]
_______ [illegible]
_______ [illegible] has always done
_______ [illegible]

[illegible] about doing this? (check all that apply)

_______ contact teachers individually
_______ call meetings of teachers
_______ contact teacher organization(s) representative(s)
_______ occasion does not arise where this is necessary
_______ other (please specify) ____________________
____

[illegible] in learning of the attitudes of the community toward a particular [illegible] [illegible]

_______ bring up at meeting of PTA or similar parent [illegible]
_______ check with teachers
_______ contact a few parents
_______ occasion does not arise where this is necessary
_______ other (please specify) ____________________
____

APPENDIX G

SOCIOMETRIC DEVICE

Name the three people in the school whose opinion on school problems you most respect.

A.

B.

C.

Name the three people in the school whom you think have the greatest influence on what goes on within the school.

A.

B.

C.

APPENDIX H

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EVALUATION KIT:
NEEDS ASSESSMENT
BASIC CASE STUDY DATA

Date _____

IDENTIFYING DATA

County _____ District _____

School _____ Address _____

Principal _____ Superintendent _____

Immediate Supervisor _____

Chairman, Board of Trustees _____
(Name)

Type of District (circle): unified, elementary

Grades Taught: _____

District Enrollment as of September 30, 1970 _____

A. THE COMMUNITY

1. Population and characteristics.

   a. Population of city or town in 1960 _____ 1970 _____

   b. Population of school district in 1960 _____ 1970 _____

   c. Population of school attendance area 1960 _____ 1970 _____

B. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA

1. Major occupations of parents in school attendance area:

2. Community organizations.

   a. Churches.

      1) Influence: strong ____ moderate ____ negligible ____

      2) Youth programs: many ____ relatively few ____ none ____

b. Service clubs.

1) Influence: strong _____ moderate _____ negligible _____

2) Youth programs: many _____ relatively few _____ none _____

c. Public recreation accessible to school population. (indicate numbers)

1) Playgrounds _____

2) Swimming pools _____

3) Organized athletic leagues _____

4) Other (list):

d. Youth Organizations. (check if available)

1) Youth center _____

2) YMCA _____

3) YWCA _____

4) Scouting Organizations:
Boys _____
Girls _____

5) Other (list):

3. Describe any community groupings or patterns within your school attendance area which in your opinion directly affect your school program. (Economic, social, racial, or religious groupings).

C. BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

The following are included in a series of standards that have been developed jointly by representatives of the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators, as published in the pamphlet, "The School Board Member in Action." All Boards of Trustees should be familiar with these standards and use them as a guide in the performance of their duties. Please check below the term which, in your opinion, most accurately describes the degree to which these principles are followed by all members of your Board of Trustees.

1. The Board distinguishes between its responsibilities as a policy-making body and the superintendent's responsibility as its executive officer.

   yes _____ generally _____ no _____

2. The Board, through its function of local control, guarantees:

   a. Freedom for expression of local ideas.

      yes _____ generally _____ no _____

   b. Freedom for tailoring school programs to fit local needs.

      yes _____ generally _____ no _____

3. Since the laws assign powers, duties and responsibilities to the School Board as a whole, the Board functions as a unit in all matters, rather than assigning responsibilities to individual members.

   yes _____ generally _____ no _____

4. The Board does not limit itself to business and financial affairs, but also considers educational problems and policies brought to it by the superintendent.

   yes _____ generally _____ no _____

5. The Board has established personnel policies wherein:

   a. The superintendent represents the Board in dealing with the staff.

      yes _____ generally _____ no _____

   b. The superintendent makes all personnel recommendations for the Board's consideration, including employment, promotion and dismissal.

      yes _____ generally _____ no _____

6. Board policies provide that problems or complaints from the community or staff members are routed through the proper administrative officers.

yes _____ generally _____ no _____

D. THE CERTIFICATED STAFF IN YOUR SCHOOL:

1. Certificated Personnel (reported in full time equivalents)

	Men	Women	Total
1. Administration			
2. Supervision			
3. Counseling			
4. Health Services			
5. Testing			
6. Student Activities			
7. Instructional Materials			
8. Other Non-teaching Assignments			
9. Home Teaching			
10. Regular Instruction			
11. Special Teachers for Physically Handicapped			
12. Special Teachers for Mentally Retarded			
13. Other			
14. Totals			

2. Credentials by which staff is employed, including administrators. The "years of service" column refers to service within the district. (List by fractions where more than one credential is necessary.)

Years of Service	Provisional	Standard Creden.	Special Sec.	Designated Services	Supervision	Administration	Totals
1							
2							
3							
4							
5 or more							
Totals							

3. How many of your teachers are inexperienced (i.e., first year in teaching)?

Men _____

Women _____

Total _____

4. Distribution of staff by age and sex, including administrators.

Age Bracket	20-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	66-up	Totals
Men											
Women											
Totals											

5. Academic preparation by sex, including administrators.

	No Degree	A.B.	A.B. + 40 (no M.A.)	M.A.	Ph.D. Ed.D.
Men					
Women					

1) What procedure is followed in making teaching assignments?

6. Professional growth data over the last three-year period:

	No. of Teachers		No. of Administrators	
	Attending	Teaching	Attending	Teaching
College Classes				
College Sum. Ses.				
Workshops (2 or more days)				
Extension Courses				
Travel (if credit allowed)				
Work Experience (if credit allowed)				

7. Community participation:

Please comment on the extent of teacher parent interaction. How many teachers live in the school attendance area? To what extent do parents and teachers participate together in community activities?

8. Teacher and administrator memberships in professional organizations:

Organization	No. of Members

E. THE STUDENT POPULATION

1. Data gathered on students:

a. IQ measured by _____
Name of Test

_____ _____
Form Date Given

Low _____ Q1 _____ Median _____ Q3 _____ High _____

b. Reading levels, measured by _____
Name of Test

_____ _____
Form Date Given

Low _____ Q1 _____ Median _____ Q3 _____ High _____

c. Arithmetic levels, measured by _____
Name of Test

_____ _____
Form Date Given

Low _____ Q1 _____ Median _____ Q3 _____ High _____

2. Sociological characteristics of student body:

a. Describe any racial or ethnic groups that are important enough that they must be recognized to understand the operation of the school.

b. Number of students who are transported in school buses _____.

This total represents _____ Percent of the student body.

3. Stability study for past three years:

Class Entering	School Year 1967-1968	School Year 1968-1969	School Year 1969-1970
a. Fall opening enrollment			
b. Transfer in			
c. Add for sub-total			
d. Transfer out			
e. Subtract for sub-total			
f. Spring closing enrollment			

4. Student-teacher ratio:

a. Gross ratio:

Total student body on October Report _____ = STR (Gross)

Total certificated staff _____

b. Actual student-classroom teacher ratio:

Total student body on October Report _____ = STR (Actual)

Teachers engaged in classroom instruction _____

F. SCHOOL FINANCE

1. Assessed valuation of district _____

2. Assessed valuation per student in the district _____

3. Elementary ADA _____

4. Current tax rate _____

5. Bond tax rate _____

6. Bonded indebtedness _____

7. Current expense by budget classifications:

	Total	per ADA
a. Administration	_____	_____
b. 1) Certificated salaries of instruction	_____	_____
2) Other salaries of instruction	_____	_____
3) Other expenses of instruction	_____	_____
c. Auxiliary services	_____	_____
d. Operation of school plant	_____	_____
e. Maintenance of school plant	_____	_____
f. Transportation of students	_____	_____

8. Average current expenditure per student (last three years) _____

9. Materials of instruction - statistics. (Revise listing as necessary to fit local budgetary procedures.)

Materials of Instruction	Expenditure Average per yr. for past 3 yrs.	Expenditure per ADA
Text and Supplementary Books	_____	_____
Periodicals, Library	_____	_____
Library Books	_____	_____
Audio-Visual Materials	_____	_____

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - PRINCIPALS

KIT

1. Why are you participating in this program?

2. What do you plan to do with the KIT?

3. a. What are your strategies for accomplishing this?

KIT (continued)

b. Are there any strategies that you have considered but rejected?

4. What do you expect will be the outcome?

School Setting

1. a. Describe the informal structure of your school.

School Setting (continued)

b. Who are the most influential teachers?

c. Are there recognizable cliques?

d. Do these cliques influence your school in any way?

School Setting (continued)

2. How would you describe your school?

3. Describe the educational program of your school.

Principals

1. What is your view of the KIT?

Principals (continued)

2. Have you ever participated in any such program before?

3. How long have you been principal at this school?

4. Assess your success as a principal in your school.

Principals (continued)

5. What exposure have you had to the KIT?

6. Please comment on the level of district support for your participation in this project.

Parents and Community

1. Please describe the parents who reside in your attendance area.

Parents and Community (continued)

2. What is the community's view of the school?

3. What accounts for this view?

APPENDIX J

CSE Evaluation KIT

Teacher Interviews

Name _____ _____ School _____

1. How did you first become acquainted with the KIT?

2. What do you understand to be the objectives of the KIT?

3. Do you have any comments about the way the KIT was introduced into the school? Were the instructions clearly explained? Are there ways its introduction could have been improved?

4. Do you have any unanswered questions about the KIT?

5. Were the results of your school's participation in the evaluation project explained to you?

6. What, if anything, does the school plan to do as a result of its participation in the CSE Evaluation Project?

7. Did you learn anything from your participation in the evaluation project?

8. What opinions did the other teachers have about the evaluation project?

9. Is there anything we have not discussed upon which you would like to comment?