

THE DEVELOPMENT AND FIELD TESTING OF
EVALUATION WORKSHOP I: AN ORIENTATION

Stephen P. Klein
and
Marc-Andre Nadeau

CSE Report No. 71
September 1971

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

FORWARD

This report describes the development and field testing of Evaluation Workshop I: An Orientation, a product of the Center for the Study of Evaluation (Marvin C. Alkin, Director). The writing and rewriting of this workshop was supported by Center funds. Almost all the field-testing activities, however, were supported by the school districts, state departments of education, regional laboratories, and centers that requested the workshop. Their assistance in this activity along with the aid of many non-program staff at the Center who conducted workshops was, of course, most appreciated and also ensured the realism of the field-test conditions.

The Center staff primarily responsible for writing and editing the workshop were Dr. Stephen Klein (Program Director), Mr. David Churchman, and Mr. James Burry. Professor Marc-Andre Nadeau performed the statistical analyses of the field-test data and Dr. F. K. Heussenstamm was responsible for conducting the impact study. Dr. Eugene Grigsby assisted in writing and presenting the initial version. Dr. Fred Niedermeyer of the Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory provided valuable consultant help in the construction of the workshop materials, tests, and questionnaires. Dr. Rex Hagans of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory also contributed to the workshop's development by coordinating and conducting many of its field tests. Finally, a special note of thanks is due to the 600 people who participated in the 22 field tests and who provided the criticisms and data needed to improve the workshop and validate its effectiveness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iii
Description of Final Version	1
Developmental History	4
Test Results	9
Questionnaire Results	11
Impact Study Results	12
References	20
Tables	
1 Summary of Test Results for Versions #2 and #3	10
2 Summary of Questionnaire Results on Key Items for Versions #2 and #3	13
3 Summary of Results: Impact Study Participants Follow-Up Questionnaire	16
Appendixes	
A 1969 CERA Pre-session Field Test Report	
B San Diego Field Test Report	
C Version #2 Test Results for Each Site	
D Field Test Results Involving Center, USOE and National Science Foundation Personnel	
E Version #3 Test Results for Each Site	
F Version #2 Questionnaire Results for Each Site	
G Version #3 Questionnaire Results for Each Site	
H Version #2 Impact Study Results	
I Version #3 Impact Study Results by Group	
J Independent Follow-Up Study for Seattle I Workshop	

ABSTRACT

The general purpose of Evaluation Workshop I: An Orientation is to orient school and state department of education personnel to the basic principles, procedures, and problems associated with evaluating educational programs; and to the kinds of information an evaluation can provide for educational decision making. The workshop is based on the general evaluation model developed at the Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA. It takes two days to run and is ideally suited for groups of 30-45 participants. The workshop materials consist of an exportable leader's manual, a notebook for each participant, and a set of exercises for each team of three participants. Each module of the workshop involves instruction in some facet of evaluation, practice in solving relevant problems in this area, and feedback and discussion of the correct answers. By the end of the workshop, participants have completed exercises involving the selection, collection, analysis, and reporting of evaluation information for decision making.

The development of the workshop began in January, 1969, as an "opportunity project" within the Center. Three feasibility studies of it were completed between March, 1969, and April, 1970, although there was a nine-month period in which no work was done on its development due to other commitments of the project's staff. A revised version was developed and field tested at five sites with the target audiences during the Spring and early Summer of 1970. Although the results of these and the previous three sessions were quite positive, it was evident that a number of major

changes were still needed before further field testing. These changes were made and the workshop was given two special field trials at the end of August, one involving professional staff from the Center, and the other personnel from the U.S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation. After the necessary revisions were made, the workshop was then given 12 operational field tests throughout the United States between October, 1970 and August, 1971, with the target populations. The results of these field trials and a subsequent follow-up impact study were quite positive.

During the operational field testing, bids were requested for the publication and dissemination of the workshop. CTB/McGraw-Hill of Monterey, California, was subsequently chosen as the winning bidder and they began publication of the final version in August, 1971.

DESCRIPTION

Evaluation Workshop I: An Orientation was developed at the Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA under the direction of Dr. Stephen P. Klein. The workshop is designed to orient school, project, and state department of education personnel to the basic principles, procedures, and problems associated with evaluating educational programs; and to the kinds of information an evaluation can provide for educational decision making. Thus, it is intended to be a comprehensive survey of the major facets of evaluation rather than an in-depth training program in evaluation procedures. (The Center's Training Materials Program is currently developing the latter kind of instructional packages for which Workshop I would serve as an introduction.) Further, the language used in the workshop is appropriate for an audience with little or no background in program evaluation.

The specific goals of the workshop are to train the participants to:

1. Recognize a proper sequencing of major evaluation activities.
2. Know when data selection, collection, analysis, and reporting procedures and evaluation techniques are properly and appropriately used.
3. Know the kinds of information that should be generated by each type of evaluation activity and recognize whether or not reports contain such information.
4. Recognize where and when evaluation information is needed for different kinds of educational decision making.
5. Understand the different responsibilities and roles of the evaluator and project director.
6. Understand the kinds of problems that may result from inadequate program planning as they relate to evaluation activities.

To achieve these goals, the participants are grouped into three-member teams. Each team plays the role of the evaluator in the simulated evaluation of a 10th grade biology-ecology course. Since the workshop is organized in terms of the Center's evaluation model (Alkin, 1969; Klein, Fenstermacher, & Alkin, 1971), the participants are involved in conducting the needs assessment, planning the program and its evaluation, determining whether the program was implemented properly, assessing whether it is making progress towards meeting its objectives and what might be done to improve it, and, finally, assessing and reporting its effectiveness.

The basic instructional procedure for each of the workshop's modules involves receiving instruction in one of the five phases of the Center's evaluation model (such as needs assessment), practice in solving relevant problems in this area via a team exercise (such as determining the relative priorities among potential program objectives), and feedback and discussion of the correct answers. Instruction is provided via pamphlets, lectures, and audio tapes of conversations. Further, by the end of the workshop, participants have completed exercises involving the selection, collection, analysis, and reporting of evaluation information for decision making.

The workshop leader's materials consist of an audio tape and a detailed and exportable manual. The only required training for a leader is previous participation in a workshop; however, the more evaluation experience he has, the better he will be able to answer the participant's questions. The team's exercises and feedback materials are packaged in a rip-off pad so that each team has a copy of the exercises and each participant has a copy of the instructions and feedback materials. Each participant is also given a three-ring looseleaf notebook containing all the instructional and simulation material. Since the exercise instructions and feedback materials are also three-holed punched, the participant can put them in his notebook at the end of

each exercise. Thus, at the conclusion of the workshop, each participant takes home a 100 page guide to general evaluation principles and procedures that can serve as a valuable reference tool.

The workshop takes two days to conduct and is ideally suited for groups of 30-45 participants, although it may easily be run for larger groups. Exclusive rights for the publication and distribution of the workshop have been assigned by the Regents of the University of California to CTB/McGraw-Hill, Del Monte Research Park, Monterey, California 93940.

DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY

Initial Development

In December of 1968, the California Educational Research Association (CERA) requested that the Center conduct a one and one-half day pre-session on evaluation prior to its March, 1969, Convention in Los Angeles. The Center accepted this invitation primarily because it would provide a forum for examining its initial attempts at constructing a general evaluation model. Further, it was felt that this activity would not take a major portion of staff time away from other Center projects since it was believed that an existing training package, the Simulated Evaluation Exercise (Klein, Churchman, & Alkin, 1969), could be modified for the CERA pre-session. On further inspection, however, it became evident that the existing package was too limited in scope relative to the Center's emerging evaluation model and much too time consuming for the needs of the pre-session. It was decided, therefore, that the Center would devote a small portion of its discretionary funds for the development of a new workshop package. This, in turn, led to the construction of the first version of Evaluation Workshop I: An Orientation.

Feasibility Testing - Version #1

The first feasibility study of Version #1 of the workshop was conducted for fifteen participants at the CERA pre-session in March, 1969. Although only subjective participant questionnaire data was obtained regarding the workshop's effectiveness, it was evident that the participants felt that the workshop was worthwhile. It was also evident that a number of changes in content, format, and administrative procedures were needed, such as the deletion of presentations of information via lengthy lectures. Appendix A

contains a discussion of these changes and the results of the first feasibility test. Staff commitments to other projects, however, delayed further development of the workshop until 1970.

During January and February of 1970, many of the changes noted in Appendix A were completed. This activity was stimulated by an invitation from CERA to again hold a one and one-half day pre-session for their convention. Thus, the second feasibility study was conducted in March, 1970, in San Francisco for fifteen participants. Questionnaire results were again quite positive, but it was evident that major changes were still needed. These changes focused upon reducing technical jargon, adjusting the evaluation model (and thus the sequencing of materials) to make it more field relevant, including a post-workshop questionnaire and two forms of a test for pre- and posttesting, developing an exportable leader's manual, and related administrative details (e.g., it was apparent that all team exercises should be printed on a different color paper than the instructional materials given to each participant).

The changes noted above were made in the latter part of March and the third feasibility test was conducted on April 1, 1970. This one day workshop was sponsored by the San Diego PACE Center and involved 75 school administrators. By almost any standard, one must conclude that this feasibility test did not go well. The acoustics of the room and the quality of the tape recordings were poor, the hastily revised exercises had many procedural flaws and misprints, there was not enough time to do all the exercises or read the instructional materials for them, and most of the participants came with the expectation that they would hear a series of lectures rather than be asked to roll up their sleeves and work. Having 75 participants at the beginning of the workshop (one-third left after lunch) further compounded these problems. In short, it was a fiasco as

may be seen from the test and questionnaire results presented in Appendix B. On the positive side, however, it was clear that most of the procedural and content problems could be overcome relatively easily. Two members of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (who observed the San Francisco CERA pre-session and participated in the San Diego workshop) shared this optimism regarding the workshop's potential. Thus, at the Center's invitation, they agreed to help coordinate and conduct further field tests in the states included in the Northwest Region.

Field Testing - Version #2

As noted above, the San Diego feasibility study identified numerous problems in the materials. The necessary changes were made during the spring of 1970 and ranged from the weight and color of the paper used for the exercises to major modifications in the sequencing and content of the workshop's instructional modules. Sample answers also were included in the exercises to help the participants understand what was expected of them. Further, a new questionnaire and three new forms of a test covering the workshop were developed for evaluation purposes. A typical item from one of these tests appears below:

Evaluator A suggests assigning children randomly to the new experimental 5th grade mathematics program and to the old program. He wants a posttest given at the end of the year to determine how much learning took place.

Evaluator B suggests giving the new experimental program to one existing class and the old program to another existing class. He wants a pretest given at the beginning of the year and a posttest given at the end of the year.

On your answer sheet, indicate your opinion as to the relative merits of the two designs in providing the most information about the quality of the new program.

- a. Evaluator A's design is better than B's.
- b. Evaluator B's design is better than A's.
- c. Either A or B; both are very good.
- d. Neither A or B; both are very poor.

A one-day preview of the workshop was held in Portland, Oregon for the 24 people involved in coordinating the activities of NWREL and each of the areas it serves. The purpose of this session was to enlist their aid in obtaining field-test sites for the workshop. As a direct result of this session and the efforts of the NWREL, field tests were eventually conducted in each area.

During June and July of 1970, a total of five field tests of Version #2 were conducted by project staff, representatives of the NWREL, and private agencies. The participants in these sessions were school administrators, project directors, and curriculum supervisors. The results of these field tests were quite positive (see Tables 1 and 2, and Appendices C and F) and instrumental in obtaining a favorable bid for the workshop's publication. These field tests did indicate, however, that a number of important changes were still needed before the workshop could be considered truly exportable. These changes were made during July and August of 1970 and included: a complete revision of the program planning module to reduce reading time and increase participation by having each team member read only one of three instructional booklets prior to a team exercise that involved using the information contained in all three booklets; a total modification of the leader and participant materials so that three-ring loose-leaf notebooks could be used to store all the participant's instructional and simulation information as well as copies of the feedback materials; an expansion of the context of the simulation so that it would have a broader appeal, including a module on reporting evaluation results to lay audiences; and deciding that the workshop needed at least two days to be conducted properly. The change to three-ring binders also essentially eliminated the need for team coordinators, i.e., one leader could now conduct the workshop for over 100 people.

Once these changes were completed, two special field tests were

conducted. These field test differed from the previous ones with school administrators in that they involved individuals with expertise in evaluation. The first of these special field tests was conducted at the Center for its professional staff and the second was held in Washington, D.C. for representatives from the United States Office of Education and the National Science Foundation. As a result of these sessions, some of the exercises and instructional modules were modified to ensure their utility in providing appropriate instruction and realistic practice in solving a broad range of evaluation problems. These changes constituted the last major revisions of the workshop prior to its publication by CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Operational Testing - Version #3

Workshop I was given 12 more field tests between September, 1970, and August, 1971. These sessions were held for the target audiences of school and state department of education personnel throughout the United States. The results of these field tests were again quite positive, especially considering the fact that most of them were not conducted by project staff or even by trained evaluators (see Tables 1 and 2 and Appendices E and G). Concurrent with these field tests, the Center accepted the bid from CTB/McGraw-Hill of Monterey, California, for the publication and diffusion of the workshop. Center staff then worked with CTB/McGraw-Hill in making the final revisions in the materials based on the operational field test results.

During June of 1971, the Center conducted an impact study involving all the people who participated in field tests of Versions #2 and #3 prior to May, 1971. The results of this impact study appear in Table 3 and in Appendices H, I, and J.

Publication of Evaluation Workshop I: An Orientation in August of 1971 by CTB/McGraw-Hill brought to a close the Center's formal responsibility for the workshop's development.

TEST RESULTS

Version #1

Two forms (A and B) of a test covering the workshop's objectives were administered as part of the San Deigo feasibility study. Although a small but statistically significant increase in performance was obtained, the results were not especially encouraging. Appendix B contains a more detailed discussion of the results and an analysis of the test data.

Version #2

Three forms of a 23 item test were constructed to cover the material in Version #2. In order to maintain test security and counterbalance forms within the constraints of administrative feasibility, the following procedures were used: on pretesting, participant A took form A, participant B took form B, and participant C took form C; on posttesting, participant A took form B, B took form C, and C took form A. This meant that at each team's table, three different forms were used for both the pretest and the posttest; and each participant had different forms for pretesting and posttesting. A typical item from these tests appears below:

Which of the following two activities should be done first?

- a. instituting a new program
- b. deciding how the program will be evaluated

The summary test results for Version #2 are presented in Table 1 and more detailed analyses for each field test site are presented in Appendix C. An inspection of these data indicates that there was a very definite increase in performance between pretesting and posttesting at the .01 level. The results of the two special field trials with personnel from the Center, U.S. Office of Education, and the National Science Foundation are presented in Appendix D.

TABLE 1

Summary of Test Results for Versions #2 and #3.

	Version #2 (5 sites)	Version #3 (12 sites)
Mean Pretest Score	14.70	14.69
Mean Posttest Score	16.80	17.15
Mean Change Score	+2.10	+2.46
"t" test Significance Level	4.85 .01	12.67 .001
Number and Percent of participants who:		
Increased	58 (76%)	244 (79%)
Did not change	5 (7%)	21 (7%)
Decreased	14 (17%)	44 (14%)
Total:	77	309

Version #3

The same set of tests and testing procedures were used with Version #3 as were used with Version #2. The major reasons for this were time constraints in getting a more relevant set of measures constructed and the desirability of using a consistent set of assessment instruments across field tests. Since there were many changes between the two versions in both administrative procedures and content, the three test forms constructed for Version #2 were not as congruent with objectives defined for Version #3 as they should have been. Thus, any differences in performance between pretesting and post-testing in the Version #3 studies are conservative estimates of the true increases in performance relative to differences obtained in the Version #2 studies. Despite this conservative bias, the test results with Version #3 were more positive than they were with Version #2. Table 1 contains a summary of these results and Appendix E contains an analysis of the pretest-posttest results for each of the 12 field test sites.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

At the conclusion of each workshop, a questionnaire was administered to the participants so that they could both evaluate the workshop and make suggestions for its improvement. The results of these questionnaire studies were generally quite favorable.

Version #1

Despite the many problems with the various editions of Version #1, the participants generally felt that it was a worthwhile experience. For example, when the 15 participants at the very first workshop were asked the question "Did the workshop improve your understanding of the evaluation process none of them said "none or very little," three said "some," and

12 said "a great deal." Appendices A and B contain more detailed analyses of these early questionnaire results.

Versions #2 and #3

Although slightly different questionnaires were used with the two versions, they were sufficiently alike to make comparisons between them. Table 2 contains the summary results for the two versions for five of the key items in the post-workshop questionnaires. An inspection of this table indicated that both versions of the workshop were considered quite valuable by most of the participants. For example, 88% of the participants indicated that they developed solutions to their evaluation problems at the workshop, 87% said that the overall quality was at least "good," and 94% said that they would recommend it to others.

A comparison of the results between Versions #2 and #3 indicated that the latter had a somewhat more favorable impression on the participants. For example, 97% of those receiving Version #3, compared to 62% receiving Version #2, said that they found at least some solutions to their evaluation problems. It appeared, therefore, that the changes in format and content between the two versions did have a positive effect upon the participants' evaluation of the workshop.

Appendices D, F, and G contain more detailed analyses of the complete questionnaire results from each field test site. Appendix K contains the results of a follow-up questionnaire that was developed, administered, and scored by Dr. M. E. Hickey of the Seattle Public Schools after NWREL ran Version #2 of the workshop in his district.

IMPACT STUDY

In Spring of 1971, a study was initiated to determine the impact of Workshop I on the participants who had taken Version #2 or #3. In order to obtain a sufficient interval between the workshop and the follow-up, the study

TABLE 2

Sample Questionnaire Results

	Version 2	Version 3	Total
	%	%	%
1. Did you develop solutions to your evaluation problems at the workshop?			
Yes	48	284	332
No	30	14	44
	62%	97%	88%
	38%	3%	12%
2. The overall quality of instruction at the workshop was:			
Excellent	35	119	154
Good	29	142	171
Average	10	32	42
Fair	1	2	3
Poor	3	0	3
	45%	40%	87%
	37%	48%	11%
	13%	11%	1%
	1%	1%	1%
	4%	0%	1%
3. If the same workshop was held again, would you recommend that others attend?			
Yes, Strongly recommend.	68	130	198
Recommend.		151	151
No. Not recommend.	10	10	20
Strongly not recommend.		0	0
	87%	45%	94%
		52%	97%
4. In your own job will you use what you have learned in the immediate future?			
Yes	57	227	284
No	5	6	11
Not sure	18	62	80
	71%	77%	76%
	6%	2%	3%
	23%	21%	21%
5. How would you describe the correspondence between what you expected to get out of the workshop and what you actually did get out of the workshop?			
About what I expected.	31	100	131
More than expected.	28	141	169
Less than expected.	16	24	40
	41%	38%	50%
	37%	53%	39%
	22%	9%	11%

was limited to workshop sessions held prior to April, 1971. However, since the test and questionnaire data from the excluded sites (Newport II and III, Texas, and Hawaii) were even more positive than those obtained with the sites included in the impact study, it may be assumed that the limitations noted above would only result in a conservative bias.

A total of 297 questionnaires were mailed out on May 15, 1971. By June 9, 253, or better than 85% were returned. This high percentage was achieved as a result of sending out reminders, making telephone calls, and related follow-up procedures.

Table 3 contains a summary of the results of the impact study and Appendices H, I, and J contain detailed analyses by version and type of participant. These data indicated that both versions of the workshop were considered valuable by most of the participants for whom it was designed. For example, 90% of all the participants who took it indicated that it enhanced their understanding of evaluation problems. Similarly, of the 141 participants who felt the workshop was relevant to their job responsibilities, 90 of them indicated that it helped them use their time, money, or resources more effectively. The workshop was especially well received by participants with job responsibilities primarily in the areas of evaluation and research; 80% of the individuals in this group said that they used their notebook after the workshop.

An inspection of Table 3 also reveals that Version #3 had a somewhat greater impact than Version #2 even though the time between the session and the follow-up was less. For example, 78% of the participants who had Version #2 and 93% of the participants who had Version #3 said that the workshop enhanced their understanding of evaluation.

One indirect but important indication of the workshop's impact was the number of times it was requested to be run for a group by someone who had

observed or participated in a previous workshop. For example, Dr. Mike Hickey of the Seattle Public Schools had it run twice in his district, Dr. James Freda of the Orange County PACE center had it run twice (Santa Ana and Cypress), Mr. Robert Otto of the Newport-Mesa Unified School District sponsored three workshops after his initial contact with the materials during the San Diego workshop, and all the coordinators who attended the preview session at the NWREL arranged for workshops in their areas. A related indication of this type of impact has been the numerous requests by sponsors of Workshop I to field test new workshops and training materials produced by the Center.

TABLE 3
 IMPACT STUDY PARTICIPANTS FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

	Version 2 %	Version 3 %	Total %
1. Have you used the notebook since the workshop?			
a. No	33	23	26
b. Yes	61	76	72
No answer	6	1	2
Sections Referred To:			
a. Needs Assessment	45	54	52
b. Program Planning	47	44	44
c. Implementation Evaluation	17	28	25
d. Progress Evaluation	17	35	30
e. Outcome Evaluation	17	27	25
f. Communications in School	9	19	16
2. Have you discussed or share materials and/or ideas in the workshop with colleagues?			
a. No	31	30	30
b. Yes	63	69	67
No answer	6	1	3
3. Number of participants who described how they discussed and/or shared the workshop's materials and ideas with colleagues.	61	68	66

TABLE 3 Continued

	Version 2 %	Version 3 %	Total %
4. In what ways have you used the workshop's materials or ideas?			
a. Solving evaluation problems and/or setting of procedures for existing projects and programs.	36	56	50
b. Writing proposals and/or formulating new program plans.	47	52	51
c. Specifying information requirements for reports and decisions.	19	27	25
d. Determining the quality of evaluation reports.	20	25	23
e. Other	5	5	5
Specify	31	46	41
Have you read further in the evaluation literature as a direct result of the workshop?			
a. No	53	54	54
b. Yes	44	45	44
No answer	3	1	2
6. To what extent has your understanding of evaluation problems and/or literature been increased or enhanced as a direct result of your participation in the workshop?			
a. Not at all	2	2	1
b. Very little	14	4	7
c. Somewhat	47	51	50
d. A great deal	30	38	36
e. Totally change my way of thinking about the subject	1	4	4
No answer	6	1	2

TABLE 3 Continued

	Version 2 %	Version 3 %	Total %
7. In what way can the workshop be changed or the situation in which it is used be modified so that it might have a greater impact?	76	80	78
8. As a result of the workshop have you been able to use time, money, or resources more effectively in your educational programs?			
a. Not appropriate	36	33	34
b. No	19	23	22
c. Yes	36	39	38
No answer	9	5	6
9. As a result of the workshop, have you been able to avoid potential problems in your educational programs?			
a. Not appropriate	47	31	35
b. No	20	22	21
c. Yes	20	35	31
No answer	13	12	13
10. The Center is planning to construct intensive workshops in each of the areas listed below. In which of these would you be interested in participating?			
a. Needs Assessment	39	50	47
b. Program Planning	53	54	54
c. Implementation Evaluation	27	37	34
d. Progress Evaluation	38	48	45
e. Outcome Evaluation	42	52	49
f. Not Interested	14	10	11
g. I would like the Center to develop workshops in other area(s)	5	17	14

TABLE 3 Continued

	Version 2 %	Version 3 %	Total %
11. Are you now directing an educational project or program that involves evaluation?			
a. No	34	38	37
b. Yes	61	59	59
No answer	5	3	4
12. Scope of your major project.			
a. Local	48	54	53
b. State	20	13	15
c. Regional	5	1	2
d. National	6	2	3
13. Agency providing funds for your major projects.			
a. Federal	39	30	32
b. State	23	14	17
c. Local	25	35	33
d. Private	2	2	2
e. Combination	8	7	7
14. Funding level of major projects.			
a. Under \$50,000	33	35	34
b. \$50 - 100,000	9	13	12
c. Over \$100,000	22	13	16

REFERENCES

- Alkin, M. C. Evaluation theory development. Evaluation Comment, 1969, 2(1), 2-7.
- Klein, S. P., Churchman, D. A., & Alkin, M. C. Simulated evaluation exercise. Unpublished training materials, Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1969.
- Klein, S. P., Burry, J., Churchman, D. A., & Nadeau, M. A. Evaluation workshop I: An orientation. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Klein, S. P., Fenstermacher, G., & Alkin, M. C. The center's changing evaluation model. Evaluation Comment, 1971, 2(4), 9-12.

APPENDIX A

1969 CERA PRESESSION FIELD TEST REPORT

DATE: MARCH 18, 1969
TO: FOR THE RECORD
CC: M. ALKIN
M. BENTZEN
R. SKAGER
FROM: S. KLEIN
G. GRIGSBY
SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON CERA PRESESSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR
FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE SIMULATED EXERCISE.

A. Summary

The pre-session went well. Almost all of the participants thought it was very worthwhile. The cycle of non-threatening work and then feedback appealed to the participants and it helped them identify with the evaluation problem, i.e., they saw it as solvable and they participated in figuring out ways to solve it. Two factors limited the success of the game, namely: (1) the rush to get materials completed and (2) the mobility of the participants in and out of the sessions. Suggestions for further development of the game also are discussed below. Most of these are designed to make the game more transportable via improving the form of the feedback materials.

B. Evaluation of the pre-session.

1. At the end of the training session, an evaluation sheet was completed by all participants (see attached table). An inspection of their evaluations and comments indicated that they thought the session was well run, very worthwhile, and pitched to their level of understanding.
2. Problems with running the pre-session
 - a. Time to prepare it was limited. Thus, some of the materials must be revised and others written out (such as Chase's talk and the Skager-Klein "debate").
 - b. The set of the participants was to hear lectures. They were not prepared for work sessions in the sense that they made appointments during meeting times, arrived late, left early, etc. Despite this problem, the actual number of

participants increased over the two day period. We had a running total of 10-16 during the two days.

- c. The game is still not transportable in that we had to field several questions that were directly or tangentially relevant to the game. Most of these were asked during the "feedback" discussions. It also was important for us to periodically "sit in" on the group meetings to help and direct their discussions.
 - d. By means of the application forms, we assigned at least one "strong" design person to each group. This improved the groups' efficiency.
 - e. The various units of the sessions took about the time we allotted for them; however, the mobility of the participants frequently delayed getting started and caused us to end early on the first day. A few reviews were inserted informally to further cope with the mobility problem.
- C. Suggestions for immediate and long term development of the game.
1. Immediate
 - a. The various talks should be typed from the tapes and then edited and revised as necessary.
 - b. A good final report should be written or at least one that points out the weaknesses in the present one, i.e., written rather than oral feedback.
 2. Long term
 - a. Prepare a shorter but more complete set of advance summary materials on various approaches to evaluation. We also may wish to attach some discussion questions to these. These should be short enough as to not preclude their being read, but long enough to convey the "theory's" major thrust.
 - b. Insert the unit on objectives immediately after the formal request for the evaluation. This unit should be revised to include the following: an instructional package on writing objectives, sample objectives and items to be critiqued, and written feedback in the form of a legitimate set of objectives and items with an explanation of how they differ from the old ones. The revised set can then be used by the participants and would make the game more realistic. The achievement and attitude items might be split for this unit so as to show them how easily it is to forget to include attitudes.

- c. Clean up all feedback to make sure that it meets the following criteria:
 - (1) It is written.
 - (2) When relevant (e.g., revised letter of understanding), it contains an explanation of how it differs from the draft material.
 - (3) It simulates versions of the real thing. These may be condensed versions, e.g., the final report.
 - (4) The feedback materials become a part of the game, e.g., the objectives of the biology curriculum.
 - (5) Whenever possible, it contains various appropriate and inappropriate alternatives to solving the problem, but with a clear indication as to which of these alternatives will be used in the remainder of the game. Remember, we want to encourage flexibility.
- d. Greater stress should be placed on the groups to reach a more finished product in each of the working sessions. For example, they might have to turn in their work.
- e. The groups' work could be evaluated in terms of how well they did in each work session. Such information would be invaluable for improving the game, but it was not possible to collect in our pre-session due to the mobility and limited time factors.

TABLE 1
Summary of Evaluations

Item	Number
1. Improve your ability to conduct an evaluation.	
a. None or very little	1
b. Some	4
c. A great deal	9
2. Improve your ability to judge the quality of an evaluation report and/or procedure.	
a. None or very little	1
b. Some	3
c. A great deal	11
3. Improve your understanding of the evaluation process.	
a. None or very little	0
b. Some	3
c. A great deal	12
4. Alert you to special evaluation problems and ways of handling them.	
a. None or very little	1
b. Some	6
c. A great deal	8

Question	Comments
1. Improve your ability to conduct an evaluation	<p>"Elements of instruction down-to-earth, concrete, generalizable."</p> <p>"Completely changed from old 'school survey-type' to system oriented, etc."</p> <p>"Broadened my understanding."</p>
2. Improve your ability to judge the quality of an evaluation report and/or procedure.	<p>"Popham's paper excellent."</p> <p>"Developed my critical judgment."</p>
3. Improve your understanding of the evaluation process.	<p>"A great deal...discussion of Skager of program design and what could be called - evaluation continuum."</p> <p>"I knew much of the specifics - steps in evaluation, etc., - from prior reading."</p> <p>"Clarification of evaluator's role and procedures. Skager's presentation and first day's presentation enlarged my background and helped me identify and clarify my own techniques."</p>
4. Alert you to special evaluation problems and ways of handling them.	<p>"Tape describing former evaluation extremely well done."</p> <p>"Taught well by Dick Watkins."</p> <p>"I had no idea of some of the problems suggested and ways of handling them."</p>
5. In terms of your own abilities, the pre-session was...	<p>"About right. Excellent - met individual needs too - talked to each in terms of his questions and level of sophistication"</p> <p>"About right - in terms of pace, model used. Too sophisticated in terms of statistical background expectations of participants."</p> <p>"Excellent pre-session. Good materials - continuity - and well presented."</p>

Question

Comments

5. (continued)
- "About right. I would not have wanted it simple nor more sophisticated."
6. Should the pre-session in its present format be held again?
- "Organization and presentation highly effective--and very practical in orientation--without talking down to anyone--first 2 day meeting with continuity I've ever participated in."
- "I like the simulation method very much--realistic--practical--covered a lot of ground."
- "I think planning the work groups more specifically in terms of persons would be helpful."
- "I would have liked more data on our 'target district' to add more flexibility to our choice options."
- "Same format."
- "Yes. Far superior to the usual lecture format! The simulated project and the techniques used (including the role playing and the tape as examples) were outstanding. This alone was worth the time although it was a concomitant gain."
- "Yes, but with a few changes. More information on type of session before commitment is made by prospective participant. This section was excellent."
7. What changes would you recommend be made in the pre-session if it were to be given again?
- "1. Be sure material which is mailed to some participants is mailed to all beforehand.
2. Summarization of material presented by resource personnel."
- "None at this time. The whole program was great!!"

Question

Comments

7. (continued)

"None--one of the best, if not the best that I have attended. Too many preessions fractionate their material into different areas that, while important, subtract from the over all process under consideration. Very worthwhile--since many of us get tied up in so much detail we lose or fail to consider many of the important points brought out. Thanks again."

"It is difficult to anticipate--and you tried to do it--careful formation of discussion groups. I think this session might have spent an hour or so on a discussion of measures--although it would be difficult to limit the discussion. This preession really benefited from imposed restrictions."

"I was very satisfied. Would like a roster rundown on name, address, job, phone, of all members of group. A fringe benefit."

"Beautifully organized. Telescoped a great deal of learning into a brief period. Similar to programmed learning, but much much better!"

"The preession was excellent! It answered my needs--and expectations. I appreciated the relaxed atmosphere created by the 'easy' style of the presenter--also the variety of techniques used. Very planned and organized!"

"I feel this preession was very well presented and would really not need any changes. Thank you."

APPENDIX B

SAN DIEGO FIELD TEST REPORT

DATE: June 22, 1970

TO: S. Klein

FROM: M. Nadeau

CC: D. Woolley
J. Burry

SUBJECT: Analysis of Pre- and Posttest Results - San Diego
Evaluation Workshop - 4/1/70

ANALYSIS OF PRE- AND POSTTEST RESULTS

San Diego Evaluation Workshop - 4/1/70

Results

Table 1 presents the performance of the group of participants who took both the pre - and the posttests without considering the form they took (A or B).

Table 1: Performance of the Group: Pre - and Posttests

Frequency Distribution	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Pre</u>	Mean	Median	S.D.
				17.15	17.5	2.37
22-23	0	8				
20-31	9	8	<u>Post</u>	17.95	18.1	3.14
18-19	12	10	"t" (.01) = 8.69 (significant)			
16-17	13	10	r = .0574			
14-15	9	6				
12-13	3	3				
10-11	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>				
	46	46				

If we look simply at the mean gain showed by the group (Table 1) from the pre - to the posttest (.80), we might be led to believe that the training has little or no effect on the participants. Even though the "t" value is highly significant (8.69, $p < .01$) statistically, intuitively this value has little meaning.

Not only does the training seem to have little effect, but in addition, rather than increasing the homogeneity of the group, the expected result, the training seems instead to increase the heterogeneity of the

group as shown by the S.D. (Pre: 2.37 and Post: 3.14). There is a very little relationship between the pre- and the posttests as shown by the low correlation coefficient, $r = .0574$.

However, limiting the interpretation of the results simply to the means and S.D. would lead us to arrive at false conclusions. A more encouraging outcome is apparent when we consider the performance of the individuals on both the pre- and the posttests. (See Table 2) In fact, the results show that 25 out of 46 participants (54%) show an increase, 16 out of 46 (35%) show a decrease, and 5 out of 46 (11%) achieved the same score on both tests.

Table 2: Performance of the Group: % of Increase

Increase:	25 out of 46	54%
Decrease:	16 out of 46	35%
Same	: 5 out of 46	11%

The percentage of increase (54%) for the group as a whole does represent a positive increase considering the fact that the workshop was conducted in an extremely limited period of time. It would have been more encouraging to have a higher percent of gain, but considering the time constraints, the gain is positive. Among other possible elements that could explain the small gain achieved by the group, we could suggest the element of fatigue.

We might, however, be concerned about the fact that 35% of the participants show a regression on their score from the pre- to the posttests. But in fact, we do not know for sure what this outcome means; does it represent a real detrimental effect of the training session, an effect we seriously doubt, or does it represent a testing effect? The latter element appears to us to be the key to the problem.

Testing Effect

Thirty-five percent of the group as a whole shows a regression from the pre- to the posttests. If we look at the individual performances (Table 3), we see that 13 out of 16 people who regressed took form B as pretest and form A as posttest, and that only 3 out of 16 participants who regressed took form A as pretest and form B as posttest.

Table 3: Performance of the Two Subgroups: % of Increase

A then B	Increase:	20 out of 25	80%
	Decrease:	3 out of 25	12%
	Same :	2 out of 25	8%
B then A	Increase:	5 out of 21	24%
	Decrease:	13 out of 21	62%
	Same :	3 out of 21	14%

The above results, when the group is divided into two subgroups (one being composed of those who took form A then form B and the other being composed of those who took form B then form A), lead us to believe that form A is the more difficult one. If we look at the results in Table 4, we see that the "A then B" group shows a relatively large increase (2.40) and the "B then A" group shows a decrease (1.09).

Table 4: Performance of the Groups:A then B, B then A: Pre- and Posttests

Frequency Distribution:

A then B group			B then A group		
	Pre	Post		Pre	Post
22-23	0	5	22-23	0	3
20-21	2	8	20-21	7	0
18-19	6	4	18-19	6	6
16-17	7	3	16-17	6	7
14-15	7	3	14-15	2	3
12-13	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	12-13	0	1
	25	25	10-11	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
				21	21
	Pre	Post		Pre	Post
Mean	16.28	18.68	Mean	18.19	17.10
S.D.	2.3	2.97	S.D.	2.02	3.17

The results are much more impressive when we consider the individual performances. (See Table 3) Among those who took test A then B, 20 out of 25 show an increase (80%), 3 out of 25 show a decrease (12%), and 2 out of 25 achieved the same score (8%). Among those who took test B then A, 5 out of 21 (24%) show an increase, 13 out of 21 (62%) show a decrease, and 3 out of 21 (14%) achieved the same score.

Thus, it appears that giving form B as pretest and form A as post-test was a disadvantage for the people of this group, since form A is much more difficult than form B.

Conclusion

We can conclude that the training session on evaluation held in San Diego was effective even though the results do not reflect a very large increase. The effect did not appear because of the level of difficulty of one of the two instruments used to measure this effect.

We suggest, therefore, that if both of these forms are to be used as pre- and/or posttest they should be revised to make them equivalent.

Appendix A: Individual results on the pre- and posttests without considering the form given

Pre	Post		Pre	Post	
18	10	-8	17	16	-1
20	14	-6	14	20	
14	16		13	20	
12	14		18	16	-2
14	15		16	22	
21	22		19	18	-1
18	22		14	18	
17	17		19	18	-1
20	22		17	12	-5
18	21		20	14	-6
15	18		21	17	-4
17	13	-4	17	23	
14	19		21	19	-2
13	19		20	16	-4
18	21		15	15	
16	20		15	20	
20	17	-3	17	13	-4
18	18		18	22	
17	17		17	21	
19	22		16	19	
19	20		16	19	
15	15		21	17	-4
17	23		18	16	-2

Appendix B: Individual results on the pre- and the posttests considering the form given

A Pre	B Post		B Pre	A Post	
14	16		18	10	-8
12	14		20	14	-6
14	15		20	17	-3
21	22		18	17	
18	22		17	17	
17	17		18	16	-2
20	22		16	22	
18	21		19	18	-1
15	18		14	18	
17	13	-4	19	18	-1
14	19		17	12	-5
13	19		20	14	-6
18	21		21	17	-4
16	20		17	23	
19	22		21	19	-2
19	20		20	16	-4
15	15		15	15	
17	16	-1	16	19	
14	20		21	17	-4
13	20		17	23	
15	20		18	16	-2
17	13	-4			
18	22				
17	21				
16	19				

SUMMARY

Participant Follow-up Questionnaire

Evaluation Workshop

San Diego

April 1, 1970

PARTICIPANT FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

Evaluation Workshop

I. Complete the table below by placing checks in each column to indicate your feelings about various evaluation tasks.

TASK	As a result of my attendance at the Evaluation Workshop: I am able to attack this task more effectively				I see immediate practical application of the techniques demonstrated in the Evaluation Workshop.			
	YES	DOESN'T APPLY	ABOUT SAME	NO ANS	YES	DOESN'T APPLY	NO	NO ANS
a. Determining the role of a project director during evaluation.	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14</u>	5	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	8
b. Determining the role of an evaluator during evaluation.	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>	5	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>	7
c. Conducting a Needs Assessment.	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>	8	<u>15</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>	8
d. Stating an instructional problem.	<u>16</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14</u>	5	<u>16</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	6
e. Contracting for evaluation services.	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	5	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	7
f. Preparing a project proposal.	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>14</u>	5	<u>13</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	7
g. Evaluating research designs as good, fair, or poor.	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>19</u>	5	<u>12</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>15</u>	7
h. Determining if a program is being conducted as planned.	<u>18</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>14</u>	4	<u>17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>13</u>	6
i. Improving a program as it is being conducted.	<u>13</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>15</u>	5	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>11</u>	6
j. Evaluating a project's Final Report.	<u>18</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	4	<u>16</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>	6

II. Please check each of the following items: Feel free to write additional comments beside any of them.

1. Did you develop solutions to your evaluation problems at the workshop?

12 YES 23 NO NO ANS: 2

2. The overall quality of instruction at the workshop was:

2 EXCELLENT 8 GOOD 9½ AVERAGE 8½ FAIR 7 POOR NO ANS: 2

3. If the same workshop was held again, would you recommend that others attend?

15 YES 19 NO NO ANS: 3

4. How good were the meeting room facilities for the workshop?

0 VERY GOOD 14 GOOD 15 POOR 6 VERY POOR NO ANS: 2

5. Do you think you had the appropriate prerequisites or prior knowledge to make what you learned at this workshop of use to you?

11 MORE THAN NECESSARY 14 RIGHT AMOUNT 7 NOT ENOUGH NO ANS: 5

6. During the workshop did you wish to discuss evaluation problems that had arisen in your own work?

15 YES 19 NO NO ANS: 3

7. If answer to item 6 above was "YES," was there an opportunity to pursue this interest?

0 QUITE A LOT 4 SOME 11 NONE AT ALL NO ANS: 3

8. Did the amount of reading required during the workshop seem acceptable?

15 TOO MUCH 18 JUST RIGHT 0 TOO LITTLE NO ANS: 4

9. Did the amount of writing and problem solving required during the workshop seem acceptable?

11 TOO MUCH 19 JUST RIGHT 3 TOO LITTLE NO ANS: 4

10. In your own job will you use what you have learned in the immediate future?

19 YES 10 NO 6 NOT SURE NO ANS: 2

11. Would you like to learn more about evaluation as defined in the workshop?

24 YES 11 NO NO ANS: 2

12. Was the time allowed for the workshop sufficient to learn the materials?

18 YES 17 NO NO ANS: 2

13. The language level of the materials and the instruction in the workshop was:

1 VERY DIFFICULT 4 DIFFICULT 26 ABOUT RIGHT 4 TOO EASY NO ANS: 2

14. The pace at which the workshop was conducted was:

9½ TOO FAST 15 ABOUT RIGHT 9½ TOO SLOW NO ANS: 3

15. The sequence of activities during the workshop was:

4 VERY CONFUSING 14 CONFUSING 17 EASY TO UNDERSTAND NO ANS: 2

16. The content of the workshop is appropriate for: (check one or more)

8 UNIVERSITY TEACHERS 13 OTHER TEACHERS 26 SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
2 Project Planners
6 OTHERS (1 too elementary)
1 independent evaluators NO ANS: 4

17. Your feeling during the workshop can best be described as:

6 VERY FRUSTRATED 7 FRUSTRATED 14 NEUTRAL 9 EAGER NO ANS: 1

18. How would you describe the correspondence between what you expected to get out of the workshop and what you actually did get out of the workshop?

8 ABOUT WHAT I EXPECTED

4 MORE THAN I EXPECTED

24 LESS THAN I EXPECTED. NO ANS: 1

III. What would you like to see changed in the workshop and how would you change it? What would you add or delete? (Use backside of this sheet if needed.)

General Comments

Excellent presentation
Good content, idea, approach, very timely
The workshop was generally poor
There was nothing new discussed - poorly handled
O.K. as was

Scope of Workshop

- Teach less more thoroughly, more depth, more detail
- Too elementary, wrong level - should be more fundamental for application
- Less structure - more flexibility during day
- More emphasis on program evaluation without "funding" emphasis
- Needs survey inadequate
- Psychologist's viewpoint of a school need rather than team approach
- More relevant to specific needs of participants

Organization

Smaller groups, divided by various factors:

- elementary/secondary personnel
- advanced/beginners
- specific needs

- Range of experience of participants too broad
- Discussion in large group needed
- Smaller Audience
- Workshop was right only for project directors

Facilities and Audio-Visual

- Criticism of room, acoustics
- Criticism of tape quality
- Criticism of use of tape at all
 - "didn't achieve the 'realism' intended" tapes and reading detracted from task

Printed Materials

- Useful alone (after workshop)
- Too much paper shuffling with little reading time; what small part was worthwhile should have been condensed

Length of Workshop

- More time or less materials
- Felt rushed
- 2-5 days needed
- 4 hours enough
- Sessions were too long (with break)
- More time for small discussions
- More time for small groups to work problems by trial and error -- followed by evaluation of leader as to how group did

Evaluation Team

UCLA notables were not present

Instruction was too slow, too casual, considering nature of need for meaningful evaluation

Staff should be more organized and less prone to lazy attitude toward their role and responsibility

More commitment on part of team

Seemed like practice for graduate students

Miscellaneous Comments

Background information should be available before workshop

Should have been made more relevant to Bilingual Projects

I have my own model; I was exposed to your type of model in 1930 at the University of Wisconsin and it was discarded -- back to the drawing board

More information on how to evaluate a project:

1. design
2. roles
3. how to recycle

APPENDIX C

VERSION #2 TEST RESULTS FOR EACH SITE

VERSION #2 TEST RESULTS FOR EACH SITE

	Santa Ana (Calif.)	Seattle I (Wash.)	Plumas (Calif.)	Juneau (Alaska)	Portland I (Oregon)	Total
Mean Pretest	15.5	14.4	13.8	15.5	15.0	14.7
Mean Posttest	15.4	16.9	17.3	16.4	16.8	16.8
"t" test results		2.77**	3.92**	1.15	5.4**	4.85**
N increase	4	14	12	9	18	58(76%)
N same	1	2	1	1	0	5(7%)
N decrease	3	4	0	3	4	14(17%)

* .05
** .01

Note: Santa Ana and Juneau were run in 1 to 1½ days. The other workshops were run in 2 days.

APPENDIX D

FIELD TEST RESULTS INVOLVING CENTER, USOE,
AND NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION PERSONNEL

FIELD TEST RESULTS FOR SPECIAL FIELD TESTS

	R & D Center	Washington D.C.	Total
Mean pretest	17.31	14.27	16.07
Mean posttest	19.63	17.81	18.89
"t" test results	3.83**	4.42**	5.66**
N increase	13	10	23 (84%)
N same	2	0	2 (8%)
N decrease	1	1	2 (8%)

** .01

Table I: Distribution of "yes" answers to questions 1: "I am able to attack this task more effectively," per training session and total.

	<u>Center's Staff</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>Total</u>
	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes
a. Determining the role of the project director during an evaluation.	86%	64%	76%
b. Determining the role of an evaluator during an evaluation.	79%	64%	72%
c. Conducting a Needs Assessment.	93%	55%	76%
d. Preparing a project proposal.	50%	27%	40%
e. Planning a project.	54%	55%	52%
f. Deciding how to evaluate a project.	86%	55%	72%
g. Evaluating research designs as good, fair, or poor.	43%	45%	44%
h. Determining if a program is being conducted as planned.	86%	55%	72%
i. Improving a program as it is being conducted.	79%	64%	72%
j. Preparing a project's Final Report.	64%	40%	52%

Table II: Distribution of "yes" answers to question 2: "I see immediate practical application," per training session and total.

	<u>Center's Staff</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>Total</u>
	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes
a. Determining the role of the project director during an evaluation.	57%	27%	44%
b. Determining the role of an evaluator during evaluation.	71%	36%	56%
c. Conducting a Needs Assessment.	79%	18%	52%
d. Preparing a project proposal.	57%	27%	44%
3. Planning a project.	46%	30%	36%
f. Deciding how to evaluate a project.	57%	45%	52%
g. Evaluating research designs as good, fair, or poor.	50%	55%	52%
h. Determining if a program is being conducted as planned.	57%	45%	52%
i. Improving a program as it is being conducted.	57%	36%	48%
j. Preparing a project's Final Report.	36%	27%	32%

Table III: Distribution of "Frequently and/or occasionally" choices on question 3: "Within the next year I foresee referring to and using this resource," per training session and total.

	<u>Center's Staff</u>	<u>Washington</u>	<u>Total</u>
	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes
a. Center's Model for Evaluation at the end of each major unit and summary sheets of project director and evaluator roles.	85%	64%	72%
b. Needs Assessment Handbook.	77%	55%	64%
c. Some suggestions for the preparation of a proposal for a project.	57%	45%	72%
d. Booklet I: Program Planning Tools and Procedures.	67%	82%	68%
e. Booklet II: Building The Evaluation Information System Into the Program Plan.	73%	82%	68%
f. Booklet III: Clarifying Objective and Planning Data Collection Techniques.	75%	82%	72%
g. Sample letter of agreement between evaluator and project director; and communications guidelines.	46%	45%	44%
h. Checklist and guide for conducting Implementation Evaluation and sample Implementation Report.	77%	45%	60%
i. Outline of contents of outcome Evaluation Report (Final Report).	69%	45%	56%
j. Reporting results to non-technical audiences.	46%	36%	40%

Table IV: Distribution of answers to Part III of the questionnaire,
per training session and total.

	Center's Staff	Washington	Total	%
1. Did you develop solutions to your evaluation problems at the workshop?	Quite a lot	2	4	22%
	Some	7	16	56%
	None at all	2	4	22%
2. The overall quality of instructions at the workshop was:	Excellent	5	8	33%
	Good	7	13	54%
	Average	1	2	8%
	Poor	0	1	5%
	Very Poor	0	0	0%
3. Do you feel the workshop was beneficial to you?	Very helpful	4	6	25%
	Useful	3	8	33%
	Of little or no value	0	1	4%
4. If the same workshop was held again, would you recommend that others attend?	Not applicable to my job	6	9	38%
	Strongly recommend	7	12	50%
	Recommend	4	8	33%
5. How good were the meeting room facilities for the workshop?	Not recommend	2	4	17%
	Strongly not recommend	0	0	0%
	Very good	0	0	0%
6. Do you think you had the appropriate prerequisites or prior knowledge to make what you learned at this workshop of use to you?	Good	8	17	71%
	Poor	3	5	21%
	Very poor	2	2	8%
6. Do you think you had the appropriate prerequisites or prior knowledge to make what you learned at this workshop of use to you?	More than necessary	2	4	17%
	Right amount	8	14	61%
	Not enough	2	5	22%

Table IV (continued)

	Center's			Total	%
	Staff	Washington			
7. During the workshop did you wish to discuss evaluation problems that has arisen in your own work?	Yes No	4 8	2 7	6 15	29% 71%
8. If answer to item 7 above was "YES" was there an opportunity to pursue this interest?	Quite a lot Some None at all	1 1 2	0 2 0	1 3 2	17% 50% 33%
9. Did the amount of reading required during the workshop seem acceptable?	Too much Just right Too little	8 5 0	2 7 2	10 12 2	42% 50% 8%
10. Did the amount of writing and problem solving required during the workshop seem acceptable?	Too much Just right Too little	2 9 2	1 9 1	3 18 3	12% 76% 12%
11. In your own job will you use what you have learned in the immediate future?	Yes No Not sure	10 0 3	5 3 3	15 3 6	63% 12% 25%
12. Do you anticipate that the experience will have an effect on the way you plan in the future?	Quite a lot Some Not at all	6 6 0	1 6 3	7 12 3	32% 55% 13%
13. Have you changed your conception of evaluation?	Quite a lot Some Not at all	2 8 3	1 6 3	3 14 6	13% 61% 26%
14. Would you like to learn more about evaluation as defined in the workshop?	Yes No	12 1	10 1	22 2	92% 8%

Table IV (continued)

		Center's Staff	Washington	Total	%
15. Was the time allowed for the workshop sufficient to learn the materials?	Yes	9	8	17	74%
	No	4	2	6	26%
16. The language level of the materials and the instruction in the workshop was:	Very difficult	0	0	0	0%
	Difficult	1	0	1	4%
	About right	11	9	20	83%
	Too easy	1	2	3	13%
17. The pace at which the workshop was conducted was:	Too fast	2	1	3	12%
	About right	6	7	13	54%
	Too slow	5	3	8	34%
18. The sequence of activities during the workshop was:	Very confusing	0	0	0	0%
	Confusing	2	2	4	18%
	Easy to understand	11	7	18	82%
19. The content of the workshop is appropriate for: (check one or more).	University teachers	6	0	6	25%
	Other teachers	5	1	6	25%
	School administration	13	8	21	88%
	Others	2	4	6	25%
20. Your feelings during the workshop can best be described as:	Very frustrated	0	0	0	0%
	Frustrated	2	0	2	9%
	Neutral	7	8	15	68%
	Eager	3	2	5	23%
21. How would you describe the correspondence between what you expected to get out of the <u>workshop</u> and what you actually <u>did</u> get out of the workshop?	More than I expected	3	2	5	23%
	About what I expected	9	7	16	73%
	Less than I expected	1	0	1	4%

APPENDIX E

VERSION #3 TEST RESULTS FOR EACH SITE

VERSION #3 TEST RESULTS FOR EACH SITE

	Portland II Oregon	Newport I Calif	Newport II Calif	Newport III Calif	Helena Montana	Cypress Calif	Beaverton Oregon	Burlingame Calif	Lubbock Texas	Dover Delaware	Seattle II Wash	Honolulu Hawaii	
Mean pre test	14.31	13.35	14.90	14.40	15.22	14.51	14.15	15.77	13.12	15.22	17.40	15.20	14.69
Mean post test	17.44	16.77	17.50	17.10	15.92	17.24	16.92	17.81	15.92	17.04	18.73	18.10	17.15
"t" test results	** 3.84	** 5.71	** 3.0	** 3.5	1.07	** 7.12	** 3.64	** 3.48	*** 9.49	* 2.08	2.09	*** 6.13	*** 12.67
N increase	13	23	12	15	12	33	20	20	20	17	10	29	224 (79%)
N same	0	1	0	1	3	5	2	5	1	0	2	1	21 (7%)
N decrease	3	2	1	6	8	4	4	1	4	6	3	2	44 (14%)

* significant at .05
 ** significant at .01
 *** significant beyond .01

APPENDIX F

VERSION #2 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FOR EACH SITE

Table I: Distribution of "yes" answers to question I: "I am able to attack this task more effectively," per training session and total.

	Santa Ana	Seattle I	Plumas	Juneau	Portland I	Total
	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes
a. Determining the role of project director during evaluation.	90%	68%	93%	64%	90%	81%
b. Determining the role of evaluator during evaluation	73%	95%	93%	57%	95%	85%
c. Conducting a Needs Assessment.	91%	68%	79%	43%	76%	71%
d. Stating an instructional problem.	55%	55%	71%	36%	62%	56%
e. Contracting for evaluation services.	55%	70%	43%	57%	81%	64%
f. Preparing a project proposal.	80%	70%	79%	57%	62%	68%
g. Evaluating research designs as good, fair, or poor.	73%	75%	77%	29%	67%	65%
h. Determining if a program is being conducted as planned.	90%	85%	93%	64%	81%	82%
i. Improving a program as it is being conducted.	80%	75%	86%	54%	76%	74%
j. Evaluating a project's final report.	82%	75%	79%	57%	81%	88%

Table II: Distribution of "yes" answers to question 2: "I see immediate practical application," per training session and total.

	Santa Ana	Seattle I	Plumas	Juneau	Portland I	Total
	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes
a. Determining the role of project director during evaluation.	55%	56%	62%	38%	67%	57%
b. Determining the role of an evaluator during evaluation.	80%	67%	71%	62%	76%	71%
c. Conducting a Needs Assessment.	80%	61%	86%	31%	65%	65%
d. Stating an instructional problem.	60%	44%	64%	38%	45%	50%
e. Contracting for evaluation service.	30%	50%	31%	31%	73%	47%
f. Preparing a project proposal.	78%	59%	77%	38%	62%	62%
g. Evaluating research designs as good, fair, or poor.	70%	39%	69%	46%	62%	56%
h. Determining if a program is being conducted as planned.	82%	66%	85%	38%	62%	66%
i. Improving a program as it is being conducted.	73%	56%	85%	33%	67%	63%
j. Evaluating a project's final report.	40%	61%	69%	46%	52%	55%

Table III: Distribution of "Frequently and/or occasionally" choices on question 3: "Within the next year I foresee referring to and using this resource," per training session and total.

	Santa Ana	Seattle I	Plumas	Juneau	Portland I	Total
	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes	% of yes
a. Table for assigning priorities to objectives according to size of discrepancy and to importance.	73%	70%	92%	64%	76%	74%
b. Some suggestions for the preparation of a proposal for a project.	91%	85%	75%	93%	90%	87%
c. Booklet I - Focusing Planner's Attention	80%	83%	83%	60%	75%	76%
d. Booklet II - Building Evaluation Information System (Research Design).	90%	63%	83%	43%	86%	72%
e. Booklet III - Feasibility	90%	85%	91%	57%	90%	83%
f. Booklet IV - Measurement	100%	72%	82%	71%	86%	81%
g. Sample Letter of Agreement between evaluator and project director.	36%	45%	17%	21%	38%	27%
h. Checklist and guide for conducting Implementation Evaluation.	100%	75%	58%	54%	86%	75%
i. Sample Implementation Evaluation Report with list of errors.	73%	35%	42%	36%	62%	49%
j. Outline of contents of a Summative Evaluation Report (Final Report).	73%	80%	67%	50%	87%	72%

Table IV (continued)

		Santa Ana	Seattle I	Plumas	Juneau	Portland I	Total	%
8. Did the amount of reading required during the workshop seem acceptable?	Too much	5	10	6	0	9	30	38%
	Just right	6	9	8	10	11	44	56%
	Too little	0	0	0	3	1	4	6%
9. Did the amount of writing and problem solving required during the workshop seem acceptable?	Too much	4	3	4	0	7	18	23%
	Just right	7	16	10	10	13	56	71%
	Too little	0	0	0	3	0	3	6%
10. In your own job will you use what you have learned in the immediate future?	Yes	10	16	9	5	17	57	71%
	No	0	1	0	3	1	5	6%
	Not sure	1	3	5	6	3	18	23%
11. Would you like to learn more about evaluation as defined in the workshop?	Yes	11	17	13	10	19	70	89%
	No	0	2	1	4	2	9	11%
12. Was the time allowed for the workshop sufficient to learn the materials?	Yes	0	4	4	8	4	20	25%
	No	11	16	10	6	16	59	75%
13. The language level of the materials and the instruction in the workshop was:	Very difficult	0	1	0	0	1	2	3%
	Difficult	3	3	7	2	1	16	20%
	About right	8	16	7	11	19	61	77%
	Too easy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
14. The pace at which the workshop was conducted was:	Too fast	9	14	8	5	15	51	65%
	About right	1	6	6	8	6	27	34%
	Too slow	1	0	0	0	0	1	1%
15. The sequence of activities during the workshop was:	Very confusing	1	1	0	0	0	2	3%
	Confusing	0	5	2	5	4	16	20%
	Easy to understand	10	14	11	9	17	61	67%

Table IV (continued)

	Santa Ana	Seattle I	Plumas	Juneau	Portland I	Total	%
16. The content of the workshop is appropriate for: (check one or more)	University teachers 5	5	4	1	3	18	23%
	Other teachers 6	7	11	5	8	37	46%
	School administrators 10	19	11	10	19	69	86%
	Others 4	5	0	6	12	27	34%
17. Your feeling during the workshop can best be described as:	Very frustrated 0	1	0	0	0	1	2%
	Frustrated 4	3	6	3	5	21	27%
	Neutral 4	11	4	9	5	33	44%
	Eager 0	4	4	1	11	20	27%
18. How would you describe the correspondence between what you expected to get out of the workshop and what you actually did get out of the workshop?	About what expected 4	11	5	4	7	31	41%
	More than expected 4	6	7	0	11	28	37%
	Less than expected 0	3	2	9	2	16	22%

APPENDIX G

VERSION #3 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FOR EACH SITE

Table I: Distribution of "yes" answers to questions 1:
"I am able to attack this task more effectively,"
per training session and total.

	Portland	Hawaii	Newport I	Newport II	Newport III	Montana	Lubbock	Delaware	Cypress	Seattle II	Burlingame	Beaverton	Total
a. Determining the role of the project director during an evaluation.	88%	79%	79%	100%	100%	92%	96%	91%	98%	79%	85%	85%	89%
b. Determining the role of an evaluator during evaluation.	88%	85%	93%	100%	86%	92%	86%	87%	98%	79%	88%	96%	89%
c. Conducting a Needs Assessment.	59%	85%	83%	82%	82%	72%	100%	74%	88%	64%	73%	77%	80%
d. Preparing a project proposal.	59%	70%	69%	82%	71%	84%	68%	70%	81%	71%	73%	65%	72%
e. Planning a project.	59%	75%	69%	73%	86%	84%	75%	70%	78%	79%	69%	65%	74%
f. Deciding how to evaluate a project.	82%	70%	83%	91%	71%	72%	93%	78%	81%	79%	81%	96%	81%
g. Evaluating research designs as good, fair, or poor.	65%	55%	62%	64%	45%	60%	46%	35%	63%	71%	85%	58%	59%
h. Determining if a program is being conducted as planned.	59%	73%	72%	82%	71%	64%	89%	83%	86%	57%	81%	69%	75%
i. Improving a program as it is being conducted.	59%	76%	69%	82%	64%	72%	93%	57%	90%	64%	77%	65%	74%
j. Preparing a project's Final Report.	59%	61%	72%	64%	59%	64%	68%	48%	71%	86%	77%	69%	67%

Table II: Distribution of "yes" answers to question 2:
"I see immediate practical application,"
per training session and total.

	Portland	Hawaii	Newport I	Newport II	Newport III	Montana	Lubbock	Delaware	Cypress	Seattle I	Burlingame	Beaverton	Total
a. Determining the role of the project director during an evaluation.	76%	64%	66%	73%	50%	80%	63%	68%	63%	86%	79%	36%	68%
b. Determining the role of an evaluator during evaluation.	71%	70%	72%	64%	62%	80%	59%	73%	65%	86%	83%	64%	69%
c. Conducting a Needs Assessment.	53%	79%	66%	91%	52%	75%	78%	75%	93%	64%	88%	56%	72%
d. Preparing a project proposal.	47%	48%	55%	64%	52%	84%	65%	64%	70%	64%	48%	32%	58%
e. Planning a project.	53%	61%	62%	73%	62%	76%	78%	61%	70%	54%	63%	48%	64%
f. Deciding how to evaluate a project.	65%	55%	72%	73%	48%	64%	78%	68%	64%	71%	88%	88%	68%
g. Evaluating research designs as good, fair, or poor.	35%	48%	59%	36%	15%	64%	52%	14%	48%	43%	48%	38%	44%
h. Determining if a program is being conducted as planned.	71%	64%	72%	82%	55%	68%	74%	55%	79%	57%	88%	64%	70%
i. Improving a program as it is being conducted.	65%	61%	72%	73%	48%	72%	74%	41%	82%	64%	77%	67%	68%
j. Preparing a project's Final Report.	53%	55%	52%	45%	33%	60%	56%	32%	57%	64%	56%	16%	48%

Table III: Distribution of "Frequently and/or occasionally" choices on question 3: "Within the next year I foresee referring to and using this resource," per training session and total.

	Portland	Hawaii	Newport I	Newport II	Newport III	Montana	Lubbock	Delaware	Cypress	Seattle I	Burlingame	Beaverton	Total
a. Center's Model for Evaluation and summary sheets of project director and evaluator roles at the end of each major unit.	76%	85%	83%	90%	82%	98%	86%	86%	92%	100%	96%	73%	86%
b. Needs Assessment Handbook	88%	88%	93%	100%	95%	98%	89%	91%	96%	93%	93%	81%	90%
c. Some suggestions for the preparation of a proposal for a project.	88%	76%	76%	91%	82%	100%	85%	87%	88%	93%	81%	63%	84%
d. Booklet I: Program Planning Tools and Procedures.	75%	85%	93%	100%	91%	100%	93%	87%	100%	93%	96%	66%	90%
e. Booklet II: Building the Evaluation Information System into the Program Plan.	75%	85%	90%	100%	86%	100%	89%	83%	88%	93%	100%	70%	89%
f. Booklet III: Clarifying Objective and Planning Data Collection Techniques.	82%	79%	97%	91%	91%	91%	89%	87%	100%	93%	92%	76%	90%
g. Sample letter of agreement between evaluator and project director; and communications guidelines.	31%	55%	55%	40%	29%	40%	46%	65%	56%	64%	37%	30%	46%
h. Checklist and guide for conducting Implementation Evaluation and sample Implementation Report.	59%	82%	83%	82%	68%	83%	74%	78%	84%	93%	81%	54%	76%
i. Outline of contents of an outcome Evaluation Report (Final Report).	56%	73%	79%	55%	55%	76%	79%	78%	72%	100%	78%	63%	72%
j. Reporting results to non-technical audiences.	76%	67%	62%	64%	73%	83%	64%	70%	66%	64%	52%	58%	67%

Table IV (continued)

	Portland	Hawaii	Newport I	Newport II	Newport III	Montana	Lubbock	Delaware	Cypress	Seattle II	Burlingame	Beaverton	Total	%
6. Do you think you had the appropriate prerequisite sites or prior knowledge to make what you learned at this workshop of use to you.	More than necessary	3	4	3	0	2	0	1	5	5	3	2	33	11%
	Right amount	10	23	21	6	15	14	10	17	22	9	19	182	62%
	Not enough	4	5	5	5	5	11	16	2	15	0	5	78	27%
7. During the workshop did you wish to discuss evaluation problems that has arisen in your own work?	Yes	4	21	16	8	11	16	20	13	17	11	11	161	55%
	No	13	11	13	3	10	8	8	10	25	3	13	132	45%
8. If answer to Item 7 above "YES", was there an opportunity to pursue this interest?	Quite a lot	0	2	2	1	0	2	2	3	1	0	1	17	11%
	Some	3	13	11	3	10	13	12	8	16	7	4	110	70%
	None at all	1	6	3	4	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	29	19%
9. Did the amount of reading required during the workshop seem acceptable?	Too much	4	4	2	4	11	10	6	8	10	1	7	70	24%
	Just right	13	29	25	7	11	15	21	16	32	13	17	221	75%
	Too little	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	1%

Table IV (continued)

	Portland	Hawaii	Newport I	Newport II	Newport III	Montana	Lubbock	Delaware	Cypress	Seattle II	Burlingame	Beaverton	Total	%
10. Did the amount of writing and problem solving required during the workshop seem acceptable?	0	1	9	1	6	4	4	1	2	1	1	1	31	11%
	16	31	18	9	14	19	22	18	40	13	22	23	245	84%
	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	0	0	3	2	17	5%
11. In your own job will you use what you have learned in the immediate future?	10	26	24	10	12	24	19	18	32	12	26	14	227	77%
	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	2%
	7	5	5	1	8	1	8	5	10	1	0	11	62	21%
12. Do you anticipate that the experience will have an effect on the way you plan in the future?	6	22	17	7	3	19	16	12	33	12	16	9	172	58%
	10	11	12	4	18	6	11	11	9	3	11	17	123	41%
	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1%
13. Have you changed your conception of evaluation?	2	9	9	7	5	12	11	5	26	4	9	9	108	37%
	14	19	18	4	15	11	17	16	15	7	12	15	163	55%
	1	5	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	3	4	2	23	8%
14. Would you like to learn more about evaluation as defined in the workshop?	12	32	28	10	20	22	26	20	41	12	23	22	258	91%
	5	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	1	1	4	4	27	9%

Table IV (continued)

	Portland	Hawaii	Newport I	Newport II	Newport III	Montana	Lubbock	Delaware	Cypress	Seattle II	Burlingame	Beaverton	Total	%	
15. Was the time allowed for the workshop sufficient to learn the materials?	Yes	8	19	15	5	10	8	4	13	29	10	12	18	151	52%
	No	8	13	14	6	12	16	23	10	12	14	8	8	139	48%
16. The language level of the materials and the instruction in the workshop was:	Very difficult	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	Difficult	1	0	2	1	1	2	7	1	6	0	5	2	28	10%
	About right	15	33	27	9	19	23	21	22	35	13	20	24	261	90%
	Too easy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0%
17. The pace at which the workshop was conducted was:	Too fast	5	4	7	3	8	11	19	3	9	3	4	2	78	27%
	About right	10	29	22	7	13	14	8	19	31	11	21	24	209	71%
	Too slow	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	7	2%
18. The sequence of activities during the workshop was:	Very confusing	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
	Confusing	3	0	3	0	7	3	7	2	1	1	2	1	30	10%
	Easy to understand	13	33	26	10	14	22	21	21	40	13	23	25	261	89%
19. The content of the workshop is appropriate for: (Check one or more).	University teachers	4	9	2	3	5	4	5	7	13	5	8	9	74	25%
	Other teachers	10	16	19	4	7	9	5	12	16	10	21	19	148	50%
	School Administrators	14	30	28	10	21	21	26	20	40	11	21	24	266	90%
	Others	4	15	5	2	3	13	5	18	6	3	3	7	86	29%

APPENDIX H

VERSION #2 IMPACT STUDY RESULTS

%

7. In what way can the workshop be changed or the situation in which it is used be modified so that it might have a greater impact?

8. As a result of the workshop have you been able to use time, money, or resources more effectively in your educational programs?

- a. Not appropriate
- b. No
- c. Yes
- No answer

23 36
12 19
23 36
6 9

9. As a result of the workshop, have you been able to avoid potential problems in your educational programs?

- a. Not appropriate
- b. No
- c. Yes
- No answer

30 47
13 20
13 20
8 13

10. The Center is planning to construct intensive workshops in each of the areas listed below. In which of these would you be interested in participating?

- a. Needs Assessment
- b. Program Planning
- c. Implementation Evaluation
- d. Progress Evaluation
- e. Outcome Evaluation
- f. Not Interested
- g. I would like the Center to develop workshops in other area(s)

25 39
34 53
17 27
24 38
27 42
9 14
3 5

11. Are you now directing an educational project or program that involves evaluation?

a. No	22	34
b. Yes	39	61
No answer	3	5

12. Scope of your major project.

a. Local	31	48
b. State	13	20
c. Regional	3	5
d. National	4	6

13. Agency providing funds for your major projects.

a. Federal	25	39
b. State	15	23
c. Local	16	25
d. Private	1	2
e. Combination	5	8

14. Funding level of major projects.

a. Under \$50,000	21	33
b. \$50 - 100,000	6	9
c. Over \$100,000	14	22

APPENDIX I

VERSION #3 IMPACT STUDY RESULTS BY GROUP

VERSION #3 IMPACT STUDY RESULTS BY GROUP

1. Have you used the notebook since the workshop?	Principals						Evaluation, Researchers						Curriculum Specialists						Other School District Education Specialists						Teachers and Related Functions						Total	%
	District Administrative and Business Functions	Principals		Evaluation, Researchers		Curriculum Specialists		Other School District Education Specialists		Teachers and Related Functions		Total		%																		
a. No	5	9	1	5	8	6	6	6	6	11	11	40	23	40	23																	
b. Yes	18	45	11	11	6	11	40	40	11	11	131	76	131	76																		
No answer	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1																		
Sections Referred To:																																
a. Needs Assessment	13	40	5	5	3	28	4	4	4	4	93	54	93	54																		
b. Program Planning	10	28	6	6	4	23	4	4	4	4	75	44	75	44																		
c. Implementation Evaluation	9	11	5	5	3	17	3	3	3	3	49	28	49	28																		
d. Progress Evaluation	12	16	6	6	1	21	1	1	1	1	60	35	60	35																		
e. Outcome Evaluation	8	13	7	7	1	14	1	1	1	1	47	27	47	27																		
f. Communications in School	3	11	1	1	1	11	1	1	1	1	32	19	32	19																		
2. Have you discussed or shared materials and/or ideas in the workshop with colleagues?																																
a. No	6	19	1	1	7	9	9	9	9	9	51	30	51	30																		
b. Yes	17	36	11	11	6	37	6	6	6	6	119	69	119	69																		
No answer	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1																		
3. Number of participants who described how they discussed and/or shared the workshop's materials and ideas with colleagues.																																
	15	36	11	11	7	36	7	7	7	7	117	68	117	68																		

Appendix I (continued)

	17	44	9	13	34	19	136	80
7. In what way can the workshop be changed or the situation in which it is used be modified so that it might have a greater impact?								
8. As a result of the workshop have you been able to use time, money, or resources more effectively in your educational programs?								
a. Not appropriate	6	13	4	8	15	11	57	33
b. No	4	14	1	3	9	8	39	23
c. Yes	10	26	7	2	19	3	67	39
No answer	3	2	0	1	3	0	9	5
9. As a result of the workshop, have you been able to avoid potential problems in your educational programs?								
a. Not appropriate	5	14	6	7	12	9	53	31
b. No	5	13	1	3	6	9	37	22
c. Yes	7	22	3	3	23	3	61	35
No answer	6	6	2	1	5	1	21	12
10. The Center is planning to construct intensive workshops in each of the areas listed below. In which of these would you be interested in participating?								
a. Needs Assessment	9	28	7	6	26	10	86	50
b. Program Planning	13	28	5	6	29	12	93	54
c. Implementation Evaluation	6	14	8	5	24	6	63	37
d. Progress Evaluation	12	16	9	4	33	8	82	48
e. Outcome Evaluation	13	21	11	7	32	5	89	52
f. Not Interested	5	8	0	1	1	2	17	10
g. I would like the Center to develop workshops in other area(s)	5	3	5	2	11	5	31	17

Appendix I (continued)

11. Are you now directing an educational project or program that involves evaluation?

a. No	5	24	7	4	12	14	66	38
b. Yes	18	30	4	10	31	8	101	59
No answer	0	1	1	0	3	0	5	3

12. Scope of your major project.

a. Local	18	31	3	8	21	12	93	54
b. State	3	1	3	1	14	1	23	13
c. Regional	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1
d. National	0	0	0	2	1	1	4	2

13. Agency providing funds for your major projects.

a. Federal	9	7	5	3	25	2	51	30
b. State	7	4	1	1	10	1	24	14
c. Local	11	22	1	6	12	9	61	35
d. Private	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	2
e. Combination	0	1	2	4	5	0	12	7

14. Funding level of major projects.

a. Under \$ 50,000	12	21	3	8	11	5	60	35
b. \$50 - \$100,000	5	3	1	2	11	1	23	13
c. Over \$100,000	3	4	2	0	12	2	23	13

APPENDIX J

VERSION #2 AND #3 IMPACT STUDY RESULTS BY GROUP

VERSIONS #2 AND #3 IMPACT STUDY RESULTS BY GROUP

1. Have you used the notebook since the workshop?	Group						Total	%
	District Administrative and Business Functions	Principals	Evaluation, Researchers	Curriculum Specialists	Other School District Education Specialists	Teachers and Related Functions		
a. No	6	11	2	13	17	12	61	26
b. Yes	21	51	15	10	55	18	170	72
No answer	0	1	0	1	3	0	5	2
Sections Referred To:								
a. Needs Assessment	16	45	9	5	48	9	122	52
b. Program Planning	13	31	8	8	34	11	105	44
c. Implementation Evaluation	10	12	8	4	20	6	60	25
d. Progress Evaluation	13	18	8	2	25	5	71	30
e. Outcome Evaluation	9	15	10	1	19	4	58	25
f. Communications in School	3	11	2	2	4	6	38	16
2. Have you discussed or shared materials and/or ideas in the workshop with colleagues?								
a. No	8	20	1	9	23	10	71	30
b. Yes	19	43	15	13	50	19	159	67
No answer	0	0	1	2	2	1	6	3

Appendix J (continued)

3. Number of participants who described how they discussed and/or shared the workshop's materials and ideas with colleagues.	17	43	14	13	50	19	156	66
4. In what ways have you used the workshop's materials or ideas?								
___ a. Solving evaluation problems and/or setting of procedures for existing projects and programs	14	32	12	7	40	14	119	50
___ b. Writing proposals and/or formulating new program plans.	14	35	9	10	37	14	120	51
___ c. Specifying information requirements for reports and decisions.	7	11	9	5	23	4	59	25
___ d. Determining the quality of evaluation reports.	9	8	5	5	19	8	54	23
___ e. Other	2	4	0	1	3	1	11	5
Specify	13	26	7	7	36	8	97	41
5. Have you read further in the evaluation literature as a direct result of the workshop?								
___ a. No	12	32	7	20	34	22	127	54
___ b. Yes	15	30	10	3	39	8	105	44
No answer	0	1	0	1	2	0	4	2

10. The Center is planning to construct intensive workshops in each of the areas listed below. In which of these would you be interested in participating?

a. Needs Assessment	9	33	10	10	38	11	111	47
b. Program Planning	14	33	8	9	43	20	127	54
c. Implementation Evaluation	7	16	10	7	31	9	80	34
d. Progress Evaluation	14	20	11	7	41	13	106	45
e. Outcome Evaluation	15	26	13	10	43	9	116	49
f. Not interested	6	9	1	3	5	2	26	11
g. I would like the Center to develop workshops in other area(s)	5	3	6	2	13	5	34	14

11. Are you now directing an educational project or program that involves evaluation?

a. No	6	28	9	7	20	18	88	37
b. Yes	21	34	7	16	50	12	140	59
No answer	0	1	1	1	5	0	8	4

12. Scope of your major project.

a. Local	21	35	6	11	34	17	124	53
b. State	3	1	5	4	22	1	36	15
c. Regional	0	0	0	2	3	0	5	2
d. National	0	0	1	2	4	1	8	3

13. Agency providing funds for your major projects.

a. Federal	9	11	7	6	40	3	76	32
b. State	8	6	3	4	17	1	39	17
c. Local	14	24	4	7	16	12	77	33
d. Private	1	1	0	0	2	0	4	2
e. Combination	0	2	3	5	6	1	17	7

14. Funding level of major projects.

a. Under \$50,000	13	24	3	13	19	9	81	34
b. \$50 - 100,000	5	3	2	2	15	2	29	12
c. Over \$100,000	4	5	5	1	20	2	37	16

APPENDIX K

INDEPENDENT FOLLOW-UP STUDY FOR SEATTLE I WORKSHOP

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

EVALUATION WORKSHOP #1

June 22-23, 1970

To assist me in planning subsequent workshops utilizing the U.C.L.A. training materials, will you please respond to the following questionnaire. Please base your responses on your experiences with, and reactions to, this week's evaluation workshop.

- | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------|
| 1. Do you feel the workshop was beneficial to you as an administrator? | 16 | 20 2 |
| | YES | NO |
| 2. Do you anticipate that the experience will have an effect on the way you plan in the future? | 17 | 1 |
| | YES | NO |
| 3. Was the concept of evaluation presented in the workshop consistent with your previously held ideas regarding evaluation? | 13 | 4 |
| | YES | NO |
| 4. If not, have you now changed your concept of evaluation? | 4 | |
| | YES | NO |

(NOTE: There are two aspects of the work involved in the workshop: (a) the complexity of the tasks you performed; (b) the number of tasks you performed. Question 5 refers to (a), complexity; question 6 refers to (b), amount.)

5. Considering the level of the participants, how would you categorize the degree of complexity of the materials you used:

TOO COMPLEX	<u>5</u>
ADEQUATE	<u>12</u>
TOO SIMPLE	<u>1</u>

6. Considering the level of the participants, how would you categorize the amount of effort required:

TOO MUCH	<u>8</u>
ADEQUATE	<u>8</u>
TOO LITTLE	<u>2</u>

7. For each of the following groups,
 (1) check those for whom you think the materials might also be used.
 (2) for those you do not check, please indicate whether it is because of the materials' complexity, simplicity, or inapplicability.

- a. Curriculum Directors 16
complexity simplicity not applicable 1
- b. Other central office administrators 13
complexity 1 simplicity not applicable 3
- c. Project Directors (e.g., Title VIII, Interchange) 15
complexity 1 simplicity not applicable 1
- d. Building Principals 12
complexity 1 simplicity not applicable 4
- e. Department Heads 11
complexity 1 simplicity not applicable 4
- f. Teachers 5
complexity 1 simplicity not applicable 10

8. Of the five phases of the evaluation process, were there any on which you feel either more time or less time could have been spent?

- a. Needs Assessment MORE 11 LESS
- b. Program Planning MORE 13 LESS
- c. Program implementation MORE 12 LESS
- d. Program improvement MORE 11 LESS
- e. Summative evaluation MORE 12 LESS

9. Please rank the five sections in terms of: (a) their value to you as an administrator; and (b) their value to the district in terms of priority needs.

	<u>VALUE TO YOU</u>	<u>VALUE TO DISTRICT</u>
a. Needs assessment	<u> 1 </u>	<u> 1 </u>
b. Program planning	<u> 2 </u>	<u> 2 </u>
c. Program implementation	<u> 4 </u>	<u> 4 </u>
d. Program improvement	<u> 3 </u>	<u> 3 </u>
e. Summative evaluation	<u> 5 </u>	<u> 5 </u>

10. In terms of time allocation for the workshop, rank the following in terms of your preference and the effectiveness of effort required.

- a. full day (8 1/2 hours) 5
- b. two half-days 4

- c. three half-days 1.5
- d. one full day and one half-day 3
- e. two full days 1.5

11. Would you prefer to work in teams or as an individual?

- individual 2
- two man teams 7
- three man teams 8

12. If follow up workshops were to be conducted, which of the following would you participate in and which would you want some or all of your staff to participate in?

	<u>YOU</u>	<u>YOUR STAFF</u>
a. developing behavioral objectives for instruction	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>
b. developing behavioral objectives for management	<u>15</u>	<u>10</u>
c. writing proposals	<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>
d. process of needs assessment	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
e. personnel evaluation	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>

13. Comments: