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ABSTRACT

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate local evaluation practices in special education programs within a selected state. More specifically, this research sought answers to the following questions:

1. What local evaluation activities were conducted within the selected state in 1980?

2. Who was involved in the local evaluation activities within the selected state?

3. Who received the local evaluation results?

4. What uses have been made of the evaluation results?

5. How consistent have the evaluation practices of local special education programs been with regard to what the practices and utilization of results should be?

The descriptive survey method of research was used to accomplish the investigation.

The Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of 159 county and 28 city school systems' special education administrators.

The sample selected for this study was the entire population—a census. The sample consisted of 137 special education administrators who were currently employed in the public schools within the selected state.
Findings

This study gave rise to the following findings:

1. The majority of the respondents reported having conducted evaluation activities centered around personnel development and personnel performance evaluation while less than a majority focused their evaluation activities on student change.

   (a) The most frequently used methods, instruments, and strategies used to collect evaluation data were checklists, rating scales, questionnaires, and personal interviews.

   (b) The vast majority of the respondents conduct local evaluations to meet state requirements or to comply with administrative directives.

   (c) More than 90 percent of the respondents state that they are satisfying the state policy which requires local schools to evaluate the special education program.

2. Special education teachers, special education supervisors, and local school principals were the most involved groups in the local evaluation of special education programs.

3. Local evaluation results were most frequently disseminated among local school superintendents, local school principals, special education teachers, and the State Department of Education.

4. The three primary uses of evaluation results were reported to be (1) informing administrators, (2) staff development purposes, and (3) program improvement.

   (a) Success in using local evaluation results was rated highest in the act of informing administrators.

5. The evaluation activities conducted by the local school systems do not meet the requirements of evaluation models for local program evaluation. The evaluation activities conducted by the local school systems did not focus enough attention on student change or growth.
Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, derived from analysis of selected authorities in evaluation, from data analysis of information collected on the questionnaire, and from the personal interviews, the author has drawn the conclusions listed below:

1. The evaluation activities conducted in the selected state fall short of very desirable program evaluation as expressed by recognized experts in evaluation and the prescriptions of PL-94-142.

2. The school systems in this study have given low priority to the inclusion of parents, handicapped students, and other interested observers in the evaluation process.

3. Much of the evaluation of special education in the local schools systems of this study appears to be more for developing favorable relations with high-level school officials than for improving the special education programs for handicapped students.

4. Most of the school systems in this study do not distribute results or receive feedback from many of the important agencies and publics associated with the school.

   Most of the school systems' special education administrators in this study apparently associated the questionnaire item regarding the existence of a state evaluation policy with the mandates of PL-94-142.

5. Most of the school systems in this study demonstrate a lack of internal consistency in their evaluation practices.

Implications

This study gives rise to the following implications:

1. The lack of adequate and consistent evaluation practices prevents appropriate analysis and future development of special education programs in most of the school systems in this study.
2. The local school systems in this study need to rethink their current practices in special education program evaluation and their level of priorities in the total education process.

3. In the absence of an effective evaluation program, special education programs for handicapped students will continue to be less than effective for meeting their varied and unique needs.

4. Support and related services personnel for handicapped students' programs will continue to withdraw whatever support they now provide for public education for handicapped students unless efforts are made at the local school level for the inclusion of these individuals in the evaluation process.

5. Unless great improvement is made in the local school systems in the development of programs for handicapped students, many school systems will jeopardize their cooperative agreements with community and human service agencies which provide a necessary service for handicapped students.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are warranted: that:

1. Studies be conducted on the quality of the academic preparation of special education and general education administrators who are being attracted to administer special education programs.

2. Studies be conducted to investigate the effects of program evaluation results on program improvement.

3. Studies be conducted which investigate the effects of parent and community involvement in program evaluation on student growth among handicapped students.

4. The results of this study be used by local school superintendents for staff development training for local school special education administrators.

5. Local school systems study the barriers to locally conducted evaluations of special education programs and devise ways to minimize or alleviate them.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem involved in this research was to investigate local evaluation practices in special education programs within the selected state. If local and state education officials are to make informed decisions they need evaluative data in order to assess the worth of their educational programs, services, and activities. These administrators, in the absence of evaluative data, must make critical decisions without full benefit of a realistic conceptualization of the consequence of their decisions and the alternatives available to them.

In making decisions regarding education inputs, processes, contents, and outputs, evaluation results can be the administrators' most effective and reliable tool. It is not enough to request an increase in funding or even maintenance at the present level if the only justifications for funding are grounded in moral issues or community values. Neither of these two variables is likely to be translated into adequate funding for special education programs.

The notion that program evaluation is both desirable and necessary has been discussed and debated by scholars, school administrators, and the taxpaying public for decades. The public cry for accountability in education resulted in state departments of education establishing standards for public education. These standards were designed to assess, evaluate, and improve public education.
Some scholars contend that educators and scholars alike have done more talking about evaluation than doing something about it. Still others have postulated that what has been done has been ineffective or that little or no use has been made of evaluation results. And such postulates have resulted in many negative perceptions held by the tax-paying public of the value of public education.

As more and more school systems experienced deficit spending and bankruptcy, taxpayers and federal lawmakers have voiced their dissatisfaction with the ever-increasing cost of public education amid declining enrollments. These actors have charged educators with mismanagement and waste. Others have taken steps to limit spending for public education by forming tax revolt groups in support of legislation such as California's Proposition 13.

And while educators were struggling to overcome the impact of these type attacks, school desegregation and violence in the public schools appeared to be destroying the very foundation upon which public education was founded. But these were not new problems. Many of these problems evolved during the 60's in different parts of the country, especially in the southern region of the United States. It was approximately a decade later that the other regions were forced to deal with these same type problems as the media reported and recorded the actions of school officials as they struggled to maintain control of the public school system.

---


The various actors in the school communities were demanding greater participation in education decision-making. It seemed for a time that one group or the other challenged every education decision along racial or economic lines. Many of these challenges led to court decisions that seemed to be overwhelmingly in favor of the plaintiffs. While school boards were busy defending and/or challenging one court decision or the other a new and different problem was evolving.

Pro-handicapped groups, encouraged by court decisions with regard to equality of educational opportunity, moved to insure that handicapped students also had an equal education opportunity to reach their maximum potential. This move brought charges and countercharges of discrimination of a new type. Pro-handicapped groups charged that the handicapped were denied the same opportunity to reach their maximum potential that was provided at taxpayer's expense for other students. Anti-handicapped groups charged that the inclusion of the handicapped in the regular schools would impede the progress of the "typical" student.

In 1975 immediately after the conflict and crisis of the 60's and amidst charges of inefficiency and waste in public education, a federal law was passed that would change public education in America. The law, Public Law 94-142 (PL-94-142) was passed by the 94 Congress of the United States. In addition to mandating a free and appropriate education for all handicapped children, local school systems were required to conduct local special education program evaluation at least annually in order to receive federal funds to help defray the high cost of special education programs.

\(^1\)PL-94-142: The Section on Evaluation is in Appendix A.
Public Law 94-142 precipitated the emergence of anti-handicapped and pro-handicapped coalitions throughout America. Those coalitions resulted in the formation of two distinctly different groups who lobbied local, state and federal school officials and federal legislators in an effort to gain support for their positions. Each group set out to establish the merits of its position. For a time it appeared that the pro-handicapped group had won. That group had proven its point. But the burden of proof did not remain with the pro-handicapped group.

In time, the burden of proof was passed on to local school systems. Local school systems were required by PL-94-142 to demonstrate with evaluation results the merits of their ever-increasing budgets for special education programs. This was no easy task. On the one hand, parents of handicapped children were demanding immediate action. In addition, federal officials were demanding evidence of proof of the worth of special education programs before releasing the funds necessary to implement the kinds of programs and services mandated by PL-94-142.

Compounding the problem for local school systems was the absence of an evaluation model for special education that was either provided or recommended by state or federal educational agencies. In addition, scholars such as Worthen and Sanders and Weiss had contended that:

---

1The author was informed of the absence of a special education evaluation model during a personal interview in the fall of 1980 with the state's coordinator for program monitoring and evaluation and by letter in the spring of 1981 from the U.S. Office of Special Education. Washington, D.C. (See Appendix B for these documents).


(1) little or no evaluation had taken place in education, (2) program evaluation that had taken place was ineffective, and (3) program evaluation results had not been effectively utilized. Providing confidence to an emerging theory, Rippey charged that there was a lack of evidence to support the notion that evaluation makes a positive contribution to educational practice.

During these crucial times of economic stress, public education must compete with other agencies for limited local, state, and federal dollars. The level of success in acquiring adequate funding will depend to a great extent upon the local school system's ability to demonstrate the worth of its programs and new services. Whether to conduct local evaluation of special education programs is no longer an option available to the local school system. The decision that local evaluation of special education programs will take place has been made—it is required by law. The decision that must be made by the local school system is what to evaluate, who is to be involved in the evaluation, how and when the evaluation will take place and how the evaluation results will be utilized.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to investigate the current (1980) local evaluation practices of special education programs in the selected state as compared to the prescriptions of Public Law 94-142 (PL-94-142) and the recommendations of authorities in evaluation.

---

More specifically, this research purports to provide answers to the following research questions:

1. What local evaluation activities in special education programs were conducted within the selected state in 1980?
2. Who was involved in the conducting of evaluation of local special education programs after they were obtained?
3. What happened to the results of the evaluation of local special education programs after they were obtained?
4. Have the results of the evaluation of local special education programs been used in significant ways? If so, to what degree has the use of the results had an impact upon the current or future nature of the program?
5. How consistent have the evaluation practices of local special education programs in the selected state been with regard to prevailing evaluation theories of what the practices and utilization of results should be.

The Treatment of the Data

This was basically a descriptive research study using the census methodology. An effort was made to collect data from each and every member of the population. The major analysis techniques used in this study were such descriptive statistics as frequencies, means, and percentages.

The Delimitations of the Study

This study did not examine the impact of local evaluation of special education programs on student achievement.

This study did not attempt to investigate the effects of local evaluation of special education programs on program improvement.

This study did not investigate local evaluation practices in special
education of vocational-technical or other postsecondary institutions administered by the local school system.

This study was limited to the investigation of local special education programs in the 159 county and the 28 independent school systems within the selected state. The 187 school systems comprise all of the state's public schools.

The Definition of Terms

The following terms, as defined below, have been used throughout this research report.

Evaluation. An evaluation is the systematic process of collection, examination, and analysis of information/data for use in determining the value of a program, product, procedure, or objective; or the potential utility of alternative approaches designed to attain specified objectives.

Local School System. The local education agency that has been delegated responsibility, by the state, for administering the public schools within a specified county, district, or city.

Practices. The ways of conducting the local evaluation activities; customary ways or repeated ways. Also includes procedures, processes, and guidelines.

Special Education Program. Special programs, support services, and activities provided by the local school system for handicapped students above and beyond what is provided for the typical student without such identified handicaps.

Handicapped Student. A student with a diagnosed condition such as mental retardation, learning disability, etc., and the same has been reported to the state department of education as in need of funding for
special support services.

Public Law 94-142 (PL-94-142): The Education for the Handicapped Act of 1975. A federal law mandating that local school systems provide a free and appropriate education for handicapped children. The law also mandates evaluation of special education programs at least annually.

The Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. The need for local special education program evaluation will continue.

2. Local school systems do evaluate their special education programs as mandated by PL-94-142.

3. Local special education program evaluation results are received by a (some) member(s) of the local school system.

4. Some uses are made of local evaluation results by the local school system.

The Significance of the Study

This study, unlike those revealed by the search of the literature, was a conscientious effort to identify what the present status was regarding special education program evaluation at the local level. But more importantly, the study sought to build upon present theories and practices of special education program evaluation and to construct a special education program evaluation framework that would impact local education practices in the state in which the study was conducted. Further, this study should have far-reaching implications for program
evaluation practices in other states as well.

The potential application of the results of this study to evaluation practices, program funding, evaluation staff development, and program improvement should provide viable alternatives for the administrators responsible for decision-making of special education programs. This new knowledge will contribute to evaluation theory development that continues to evolve as PL-94-142 enters its sixth year. The results of this study should lead to other research efforts to examine the effects of program evaluation on such factors as student achievement, staff development, program improvement, etc.

In order to fully appreciate the timeliness of this study, the reader must understand that PL-94-142 was passed in 1975 during the time tax revolt groups were challenging educators on all fronts regarding the high cost of public education. These groups charged that public education was both ineffective and wasteful. The jury is still out. Public educators have yet to provide significant evidence to the contrary.

This study, with its 28 evaluation components consists of the major components of PL-94-142 and the recommendations of evaluation authorities, provides a global view of the present "state of the art", and it elucidates clear guidelines, for future innovations and challenging horizons for the local schools to embark upon. The innovations will not occur without conflict and debate. But that is the nature of organizational change. The local school administrator can use these evaluation components to develop an evaluation program that will ease the pain that change causes in the organization. But the real value will be realized by the local school staff, students and community as they participate together in the evaluation of the special education programs in order to improve their
usefulness to the students and the local school community. If only these goals can be realized, through use of this model, the significance of this study will be evident.

The Program Evaluation Components

The author developed a list of 28 components for a comprehensive program evaluation of special education. Many of the components comprise the major aspects of PL-94-142. For example, "A Free and Appropriate Education for All Handicapped Children" is a major aspect of PL-94-142.

Two components not addressed by PL-94-142 are included in the evaluation outline. These two components have been addressed by several evaluators. Consequently, 25 of the components are based upon the mandates of PL-94-142 and the recommendations of evaluation authorities. Two of the components, meta evaluation, and the politics of evaluation are based on the recommendations of several evaluation authorities and the author's more than two decades of experience in public education at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels as a teacher and administrator.

The Qualifications of the Author

The author is a trained special education specialist with more than ten years of teaching experience as an elementary education teacher, elementary and secondary special education teacher, and with more than ten years experience as a special education administrator at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels.

The practical experience gained as a teacher and as an administrator has provided many experiences and opportunities for the development of
concepts, perceptions, and theories that one could not expect from neither the traditional nor the contemporary university environment— the classroom. Those concepts, perceptions, and theories have evoked the development of some personal and professional sets of knowledge, values, ideas, skills, notions about the role and goals of public education and how those goals might be achieved, especially as they related to special education.

Summary and Order of Presentation

This study was designed to investigate the current (1980) evaluation practices of special education programs in the selected state as compared to the prescriptions of PL-94-142 (1975) and some authorities in evaluation and the development of a list of evaluation components that might aid local and state administrators in their future evaluation efforts in the selected state as well as other states.

Chapter Two of this research study provides a review of the related literature with regard to: (1) program evaluation theory, (3) program evaluation controversy, (3) program evaluation definitions and purpose, (4) program evaluation practices, and (5) utilization of program evaluation results.

Chapter Three presents the research methodology utilized for this study. The data analysis is presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Five presents the findings, conclusions, recommendations and summary.
CHAPTER II

THE REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This study was concerned with investigating local practices in special education program evaluation within a selected state. The search of the literature did not reveal significant literature relative to special education program evaluation. Stake has asserted that there is a scarcity of valuable research reports on program evaluation:

...Seldom do we find a search for research reports or for behavioral data pertinent to the ultimate curricula decisions... Few highly relevant, readable research studies can be found. The professional journals are not disposed to publish evaluation studies. Behavioral data are costly and often do not provide the answers. Too many accreditation-type visitation teams lack special training or even experience in evaluation. 1

Although conceding that significant progress has been made in evaluation theory development, (Steele, 1977) there is some support for the notion that not a great deal of research has been conducted or that what has been done failed the test of time. Steele explained thusly:

...The late 1960's brought an influx of new programs and new demands for evaluation. Established concepts didn't deliver. As a result, new ideas about evaluation emerged and new frameworks appeared....Most of them are still in the trial-and-test-ing stage. Many paths are being taken off the plateau of the

---

earlier period, but few of those are widely accepted....  
Development of theory and practice is not yet sufficient....  

The author was able to locate considerable literature that evolved in the past decade which focused primarily on program evaluation definitions, theories, practices, utilization of evaluation results, program evaluation models, and the evaluation controversy. Consequently, the literature reviewed and included in this study dealt primarily with the broad area of evaluation of education programs. The author reviewed and organized the related literature as follows:

1. program evaluation theory
2. program evaluation controversy
3. program evaluation purposes
4. program evaluation practices
5. utilization of program evaluation results

Program Evaluation Theory

During the past few years, the pros and cons of program evaluation has been widely discussed and debated. Evaluation experts, scholars, school administrators, politicians, and various actors from the school community have joined in the discussions and debates. But as noted by Worthen and Sanders, the concept of evaluation is not new. Evaluation in one form or another has been practiced by all people from all walks of life. When Adam made his decision in the "Garden of Eden" with

---


regard to the "forbidden" fruit, he did so based on his perceived value of the alternatives available to him. In his own way, Adam was an evaluator of the situation. Walton addressed this issue thusly:

Evaluation of one form or another has been with us forever.... The farmer practices his method of evaluation when he decides when and how to till the soil of his farmland. The doctor uses his form of evaluation when he elects to delay surgery and treat the condition with medication for a trial period.... The educational administrator who decides to use the "Normative Group Technique" for decision-making rather than use his leadership authority and issues a directive because of his/her evaluation of the consequences of the two alternatives. ¹

One might correctly question the simplicity of the examples cited above with regard to evaluation theory because they fail to provide evidence of support. These examples do indeed fail to demonstrate what the theorists say program evaluation is or should be. And further, there is no explanation as to whether the examples are applicable to formal or informal evaluation. Such a distinction is necessary and it must be made before engaging in evaluation activities to assess the worth of a program.

For purposes of this study, only the literature relative to formal evaluation were reviewed for inclusion in this dissertation. Formal evaluation will be discussed later in this chapter. For the moment, however, the discussion will focus on prevailing theories of program evaluation.

If the program evaluation is to be effective, school administrators and staff must have a clear concept of program evaluation theory. There are perhaps as many ideas, concepts, and notions about the qualitative and quantitative dimensions of program evaluation as there are people who have written about it, studied it, and practiced it. This is no doubt

true about knowledge in general. Instead of despairing over the diversity, educators could view the situation as one providing a unique opportunity to ground their program evaluation strategies in sound theory while maintaining the "personal perspective" of individualism. This latitude provides the opportunity for such personal qualities as personality, motivation, and leadership style to function as a natural consequence of the decision-making process. This is possible because the commonalities existing among the various theories outweigh the differences.

Howe and Fitzgerald contended that program evaluation should focus on two major issues:

...It would appear that successful program evaluation is concerned with two major issues. The first is that of determining the technical approach which appears to have the highest likelihood of yielding useful data to use in making decisions regarding future directions for the program. For the individual-tailored program in special education, it would seem that the use of Goal Attainment Scaling provides promising possibilities.

The second issue which seems critical is that of developing a readiness in the organization to undertake program evaluation. Time should be spent with those involved to reduce defensiveness, develop trust, and reach a consensus regarding, both the purpose of evaluation and the process to be used. 2

Clearly, these scholars have focused their postulates on two very key factors demanding critical considerations for successful program evaluation. Providing direction and purpose for program evaluation is the first step in the evaluation process. And the very nature of the

---


complexities of the tasks involved in program evaluation speak to the need for the administrator to develop a readiness in the organization and the school community before embarking upon a course of action with such great potential for creating stress and conflict among the school staff and the various community actors.

In considering what program evaluation is or should be, one has found that there is some evidence which provides support for the theory that determining technical approaches and developing a readiness for the tasks to be completed are key issues. Several experts agree that program evaluation is the process of collecting quantifiable data for the purpose of assessing the value or worth of a program in relation to its goals, purposes, and objectives.¹

Alkin advanced the theory that program evaluation addresses contemporary issues and ideas. He posits that:

Evaluation is the process of ascertaining the decision areas of concern, and selecting appropriate information in order to report summary data useful to decision-makers in selecting among alternatives.²

In addressing decision areas of concern in today's pluralistic school setting, such contemporary issues as declining enrollments, mainstreaming of handicapped students in the least restrictive environment, deficit

---


spending, tax revolts, accountability, school governance, recent court decisions\(^1\) regarding year-round schooling for the handicapped, and the Reagan administration's proposed budget cuts and changes are critical issues. Program evaluation and the utilization of the results could mean the difference between adequate programs, inadequate programs or no programs for thousands of handicapped students now attending the public schools, as well as those who will attend in the future. Thus, one can see the potential benefits of program evaluation to the quality and quantity of public education local school systems may provide in the future.

Harris based his ideas and concepts of program evaluation on what he termed the "nature and functions of educational evaluation":

Evaluation is the systematic process of judging the worth, desirability, effectiveness, or adequacy of something according to definite criteria and purpose. The judgment is based upon a careful comparison of observation data with criteria standards. Precise definitions of what is to be appraised, clearly stated purposes, specific standards for the criteria traits, accurate observations and measurements, and logical conclusions are the hallmark of valid observations.\(^2\)

But as has been pointed out, (Steele, 1977) program evaluation as a generalizable process involves more than simply forming judgments. These judgments must be applied to a set(s) of standards or criteria. In applying these standards or criteria, comparisons and descriptions of

---


what actually occurred in the program and the results that were obtained must be assessed in the process of judging the worth of the program.\(^1\)

Even so, program evaluation involves much more than assessing the level at which the program has achieved its objectives. And while there can be no question about the importance of determining how well a program has met its objectives, such an evaluation alone cannot provide the necessary data for the decision-maker to judge the worth of the program. The worth of the program should not be based upon the achievement of the objectives alone. Consideration should also be given to the kinds of qualities of unanticipated results and the impact and effect such results had on the program. Whether or not obtained results had little or no impact or had positive or negative effects on the program should be critically analyzed. Steele (1977) suggested that this approach to evaluation involves the comparison of results to:

1. the needs that initiated the program.
2. the kind and amount of results that must be produced if the agency is to attain its mission.
3. broad competency standards.
4. statements of the kinds of results that a program conducted with the particular clientele using a certain amount of input should be expected to produce.\(^2\)

In examining the degree of success a program has obtained in achieving its objective, attention should focus on the objectives themselves. If the program objectives are nebulous and unimportant in terms of the philosophy, purpose, and mission of the school, then the attainment of

\(^1\)Sarah M. Steele. *Contemporary Approaches*. p. 22.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 24.
the objectives also becomes nebulous and unimportant. The issue here seems to be largely one of semantics. There are basically two schools of thought on this issue. One theory has it that a program should be evaluated based upon the stated goals, objectives, and purposes. Another theory contradicts the first and supports the notion that a program should be evaluated based upon what should be. Steele (1977) supports the latter theory:

...Should programs only be examined in terms of what the programmer thinks he's doing (that is, what he has defined as his objectives)? Or should they be examined in terms of what he should be doing (that is, what should be happening if needs are being met, mission accomplished, broad competency standards attained regardless of what his objectives were)?...

Evaluation that's concerned with the overall effectiveness of a program is concerned not only with results in terms of behavioral changes in people but also with the proportion of the potential clientele that's reached, the balance in types of people reached, the extent to which the results deal with urgent and continual needs, and the care with which participant, agency, and societal resources are used. Program evaluation is as concerned about the suitability of the program as it is with whether its purpose is accomplished.¹

In the examination of the results, consideration should be given to the sufficiency of the results. The decision-maker should be able to determine whether the obtained outputs warranted the resources involved, student time, and effort; and whether or not the same or superior results could be achieved by existing programs, by combining the program with another, or by simply making modifications in a program or programs.² These are key concepts of effective program evaluation.

One might conclude from these comments that evaluation should occur at the conclusion of the program—summative evaluation. The time has long

¹Sarah M. Steele. Contemporary Approaches. p. 28.
²Ibid.
passed when administrators had the option to conduct summative activities to examine program results. The contemporary issues emanating from the socioeconomic, political, and education environments dictate the need for formative evaluation—evaluation while the program is progressing. It is essential for accountability, and it is also professionally prudent that the processes of programming be examined and judgments be made regarding the planning, managing, controlling, and directing processes. The decision-maker should know that they are functioning properly and that the activities are scrutinized at regular intervals. This process provides the necessary lead-time data to anticipate the unexpected and their consequences on the program. And perhaps more importantly, these data are essential ingredients for program development and improvement—very key concepts of program evaluation.

Every program should be reviewed periodically to determine whether it is to be continued or "canned". This is especially true for new programs in the developing stages. It is much less difficult to change or discontinue a nonproductive new program than to dismantle or change an old one that somehow manages to linger after its demise.

But program evaluation involves much more. The notion that the process of examining student achievement produced evidence of the success or failure of a program cannot be supported by evaluation theory. The evaluation of instruction must also occur. This is not to suggest, however, that "you can't have one without the other." To the contrary, it is possible and even plausible to conduct an instructional evaluation without directing any attention toward program evaluation.

Instructional evaluation and program evaluation are not one and the same nor can one serve the purpose for which the other was intended.
Steele (1977) called attention to the distinctions that should serve to clarify some misconceptions regarding the prevailing theories of program evaluation and instructional evaluation:

Instructional evaluation is concerned primarily with the specific course or program. Program evaluation is concerned with the additive effects of a series of instructional components...Instructional evaluation is usually most concerned with knowledge, skills, and attitude change. Program evaluation is concerned with the impact that those changes and program participation have on the person and those he's in contact with. Instructional evaluation is more apt to deal with how the program satisfies the specific needs of individual learners; program evaluation is more apt to deal with how the program meets the needs of the community.  

It is clear that these distinctions have the potential for creating uncertainty for many educators. Far too many educators incorrectly refer to instruction, curriculum, and program without making the necessary distinctions between them. And few are willing to accept the notion that there should be a relationship between evaluating students and evaluating instruction.

Some educational distinctions that could be made between instructional evaluation and program evaluation theory should add greater depth and specificity to the theory of program evaluation—what it is or should be. One area that seems to create stress for instructional personnel has to do with establishing priorities among instructional programs and determining the extent and degree of success the instructional program had attained the institutional goals of the agency.

---

1Sarah M. Steele. Contemporary Approaches to Program Evaluation. p. 29.

2Ibid., p. 29.
Another area which should receive attention in program evaluation is that of adequate resources being applied to the right program. The quality and quantity of the institutions' resources can make little difference in the absence of a resource needs assessment and a critical analysis of the utility of the resources for goal achievement. Also, inappropriately applied resources could be more of a liability to program success than the lack of adequate resources.

The final four distinctions to be made between program evaluation and instructional evaluation are: (1) Program evaluation involves deciding whether to favor one program over another in the application of resources or to attempt to spread the resources in order to provide all services to all students on an equal basis. (2) Instructional evaluation has no such decision to make. It is basically concerned with assessing the quality of clearly defined activities within all of the institutions' programs—the total program of the institution. (3) The overall program evaluation major task is that of determining the extent and degree of success by which the agency carries out its mission, not so much in terms of what the agency perceives itself to be doing but what it should be doing based upon the needs of the students and the school community. And (4) The instructional evaluation serves its major purpose when it successfully controls and improves the interactions and relationships of the program's clients and personnel.

As program evaluation theory continues to evolve, school administrators are faced with the task of having to judge the worth of the various

---

1 Ibid. p. 29.
2 Ibid. pp. 29-30.
theories in order to ground their evaluation activities in theory or they
must engage in activities that will contribute to program evaluation
theory development. But it is important to recognize that there is a
degree of consistency among prevailing theories. The major theories en-
compass the same major elements. Some do, however, take on added dimen-
sions. But this alone is not sufficient evidence to discard a particular
theory. Gottman and Classen, 1972¹ and Steele, 1977² share the viewpoint
that program evaluation is or should be, among other things, a management
tool. Provus called program evaluation the "watchdog of program manage-
ment."³ Although some other theorists have not specifically included
this concept in their theories, one should not discount the plausibility
of the theories of those who have.

If indeed program evaluation is "the systematic process of judging
the worth of something",⁴ it is plausible to concede that it is also or
should be a management tool for choosing among alternatives and guiding,
directing, controlling and managing program activities. As a management
tool, program evaluation provides the necessary lead-time data for these
purposes. But only the well-defined and well-managed evaluation can
serve as a useful management tool. A poorly-managed evaluation is not

¹John M. Gottman and Robert E. Clausen. Evaluation in Education: A
p. 16.

²Sarah M. Steele. Contemporary Approaches. p. 35.

³Malcolm Provus. "Evaluation of Ongoing Programs in Public School

⁴Wilbur Harris. "The Nature and Functions of Educational Evalu-
ations". p. 95.
likely to yield useful data for determining the match between the investment of time and resources with the value of the resulting effects the activities and resources produced.

Scriven tends to agree with the notion that program evaluation is or should be a management tool to answer specific types of questions about the entities--various educational instruments--of processes, procedures, personnel, etc. These and similar type questions are answered by comparing the performance of the entity to specific criteria. Also, the merits and drawbacks of each entity should be weighed against the effects it has made, by its application with regards to the cost. ¹

Finally, one of the major theories of program evaluation is the concept that it is people centered--Steele (1977)², Stufflebeam (1981)³. All of the people to be affected by the evaluation should be involved in the decision-making regarding the who, what, when, and how of the evaluation. School personnel who will be responsible for implementing much of the activity are more likely to make valuable contributions if they are involved in both the planning and implementing stages. The value of student input to the process should not be ignored. They have much to gain or lose depending on whether program evaluation is successful or unsuccessful. Parents and key community leaders whose inputs and support are

---


²Sarah M. Steele. op. cit. p. 37.

essential for successful program evaluation should be active participants in the total process. These various actors are more sophisticated than in years passed and they are less willing to accept and support school programs without some degree of involvement. A realistic understanding of the role of politics and program evaluation policy and practices are key issues to be addressed by program evaluation personnel.

Worthen and Sanders contend that among the most prevailing theories of program evaluation are those that evolved from the works of Stufflebeam (1969), Guba and Stufflebeam (1968), Alkin (1969), and Stufflebeam, et al. (1971). Each of these works has been widely accepted and credited with making useful contributions to educational evaluation. Stufflebeam, et al. advanced the theory that "evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives:

"...Evaluation should provide information which is useful to decision-makers....it is cyclic....it is the ascertainment of values and decisions, as the act of making up one's mind.... It is the process of ascertaining the relative values of competing alternatives."

This brief review of the literature relative to evaluation theory determined that the prevailing theories shared more commonalities than differences. These was a thread of consistency with regard to what evaluation is.

The experts generally agreed that program evaluation is the systematic process of judging the worth, desirability, effectiveness, or adequacy of something according to clearly identified criteria, standards, and program purposes in relation to the mission of the institution or agency.

---

1 Worthen and Sanders, Educational Evaluation. p. 128.

Some other experts explained their theories more succinctly. They advanced the notion that evaluation is the systematic collection, examination, and analysis of information/data for use in determining the value of a program, product, procedure, objective, etc.

The most common threads running between the various theories relate to the notion that program evaluation as a systematic process provides quantifiable data for decision-making. These data should be used to judge the worth of education programs and services relative to the investments of time, energy, and resources. Also, these data provide the necessary information for administrators to examine the available alternatives and their consequences on program development, program improvement, program quality and the impact each will have on the teaching-learning process.

Finally, the notion that program evaluation involves many different actors representing divergent roles and points of view, speaks to the need for total school and community involvement. The special education administrator who attempts to do otherwise is simply "courting disaster" for the process and inviting rejection of the results.

Program Evaluation Controversy

The amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA) that was so forcefully supported by Senator Robert Kennedy signaled the beginning of the evaluation controversy. The amendment mandated

local evaluation as the means for justifying the allocation of federal dollars for public education.

But just as some Americans had come to expect school failures, many now voiced great doubt that educators were capable of evaluating their own efforts. There is some evidence that educators throughout America provided some confidence that those concerns and doubts were warranted. Worthen and Sanders (1973) spoke dispairingly of the plight of educators as they once again found themselves wanting for the skills and expertise essential to the effective management and control of the public schools:

It should not be surprising that educators were unprepared to implement the new mandates effectively. Relatively few educators had any expertise in evaluation techniques. In many school districts the best classroom teachers were released from classroom duties and pressed into service as evaluators on Title I and Title III projects....

Even the supply of expert consultants was soon exhausted, and many persons who were called into service as consultants were little better prepared in relevant areas than local evaluators they attempted to assist.¹

As these untrained or ill-trained evaluators pressed ahead to satisfy the mandates of ESEA, there was growing concern that what some referred to as evaluation was nothing more than opinions and ideas. At the other extreme were the professional researchers who were pressed into service as program evaluators to judge the value of worth of education programs, procedures, and activities.

Perhaps the notion that evaluation and research involved both systematic investigation and disciplined inquiry (Cronbach and Suppes, 1969) attributed to the recent controversy.² The distinction should be made

that research is designed to produce new knowledge in terms of theory development or confirmation. Evaluation has no such purpose. It is designed to assess the value or judge the worth or social utility of a program, procedure, or activity.

The term evaluation is not a "friendly" word to many educators especially when it takes on personal connotations. Such phrases as "too much subjectivity" and "how can we be sure", are frequently uttered by educators in any discussion about accountability for their programs and services. It is no wonder then that when research provided some evidence that neither the schools, the teachers, nor the resources made a difference on student success or failure,¹ that the controversy about program evaluation reached an all-time high. But this was not the beginning of the controversy.

Perhaps the history of the evaluation controversy can be traced to Robert Thorndike who at the beginning of the 1900's almost single-handedly plotted the course for educational evaluation and the way educators would assess human change. This was the birth of the idea that "if something existed in any appreciable amount, it could be measured". Thus came the birth of the measurement movement and the controversy that was to follow.

The measurement movement resulted in the development of an abundance of commercial and "homemade" instruments to measure every conceivable quality and trait. Expert test developers, "would be experts" and educators all joined the bandwagon. For more than half of a century and without

fanfare, the measurement movement continued to impact teaching and learning and the management and control of public education. And during this time there was only minimal dissent demonstrated either by educators or the tax-paying public.

By the 1960's, however, as researchers called attention to the "ineffectiveness of the public schools" there was public outrage. Proponents of the measurement movement pointed to research findings as evidence of support for their ideologies, notions, and theories of the measurement cried "foul play." They charged the researchers with racism. Blacks and other minorities in particular came to be suspicious of both the "liberal" and "extremists" points of view. Adding "fuel to the fire" was the speed with which these research results were affecting local, state, and national policy on education. For almost a decade, researchers seemed to be at war with each other as they appeared to be "running around" the country evaluating every available program in an effort to reject or support the findings of a colleague or several colleagues.

School boards, state and federal departments of education, and the courts were overwhelmed with charges and counter charges of racism and test bias. These actions resulted in the birth of the culture free or cultural bias syndrome in education and measurement of educational programs and the students they served throughout America.

Everything from educational programs to materials and resources was evaluated by expert evaluators, educators, or agencies and organizations. Supporters of "Coleman's Study" (1966) joined forces to support his findings.1

---

1 James S. Coleman. loc. cit.
But educators were in no position to accept or challenge the findings. They had only just begun to deal with the whole notion of evaluation.

University professors with and without research expertise and evaluation skills moved quickly to implement the mandates of ESEA in late 1965. Before they were able to develop strategies for dealing with the mammoth problem and mass confusions, Coleman's report had penetrated the education community.

And as noted by Provus, university researchers added to the confusion by "over-simplyfying the problem--by attempting to determine whether new programs were better than the ones they replaced." This was perhaps the real beginning of the controversy about program evaluation that lingers on today.

It did not take long for educators and theorists to realize that the experts were not exactly speaking the same language. It was this perceived inconsistency that caused educators to be suspicious of program evaluators and their work.

Some experts were less than scrupulous with the liberties they took. Some failed to remember that the employer who commissioned the evaluation wanted or needed valid judgments and descriptions of the educational entity and that the evaluator's role was to ascribe some value to what existed. Instead, far too many evaluators engaged in research to test a theory or to advance a new theory that would expand or develop new knowledge sets. This practice infuriated many educators.

---


Provus identified another problem during the early years of program evaluation:

To the school administrator who needs information about the effectiveness of school programs, the word "evaluation" conjures up some unpleasant memories; a report that took "too long" to prepare and overlooked the obvious while concentrating on the trite, a university consultant who proved unintelligible and eventually hostile, and investigator who got in everyone's way and never seemed able to draw definitive conclusions....

It is also possible that most evaluators do not know their business. No doubt, the weakness of educational programs, evaluation methodology, and the training provided in institutions that prepare both administrators and evaluators are related.

Adding to the controversy was Stake's (1967) claim that educator's disdain for formal evaluation was due to their fears of public criticism, and instead of closeting behind claims of national norm comparisons and the politics of evaluation, they should be employing measurement specialists to develop methods and techniques that would enable them to fully conceptualize and operationally define the complexity, the fullness, and the importance of their programs.

Then there is the controversy surrounding professional versus amateur evaluation. The professional evaluator lacks respect for the accreditation-type evaluator who is usually an educator with "presumed knowledge and expertise." The professional educator likewise has his doubts about the ability of the expert evaluator to judge an educational entity because

---


the evaluator is not likely to be an expert in the field or area to be judged.

One way to describe this controversy would perhaps be to conclude that both the evaluator and the educator were attempting to "protect his territory." It is an age-old problem among professionals. Each one objects to others evading his "sacred ground". The educator claims that the evaluator is not an educator and therefore is not qualified to assess the value of education programs. The evaluator charges that the educator is both untrained and unskilled for conducting evaluation. The charge has also been made that the professional researcher and the evaluator should have a different type of training.

Worthen and Sanders concluded that:

The best training for many educational researchers is likely to be a thorough mastery of a relatively traditional social science discipline....To the extent that the training of evaluators touches on the traditional discipline at all, it is best that several disciplines be sampled.1

Much of the controversy surrounding program evaluation was caused by researchers themselves. As they raced against time to develop guideline frameworks and evaluation theory of practice and utilization, they failed to coordinate their efforts or to establish a system of coordination. The resulting effects were fragmented theories and inconsistencies in definitions, guidelines, models and strategies. Alkin, et al. (1979) state:

Although controversy over definition of evaluation still abounds, most evaluation theorists would agree with Weiss that the primary argument for doing evaluations is to increase the rationality of program evaluation decision-making....

---

1 Worthen and Sanders. Educational Evaluation. p. 36.

If as Stake (1967) claimed there is a scarcity of relevant research on program evaluation and that the research that has been done has not been widely disseminated because research journals have been reluctant to publish evaluation studies, then the obvious roots of the controversy are evident.¹

One wonders then about the nature and extent of the controversy. Perhaps it can all be summed up by advancing the notion that the minor inconsistencies among the theorists regarding program evaluation definition which appears to have been frequently confused with research are far outweighed by the commonalities. Nonetheless educators have contended that the expert evaluator has failed to provide the assistance needed for assessing the value of education programs, procedures, and processes.

Hammond (1973) supported the educator's viewpoint:

Research has failed to produce adequate guidelines and procedures to be utilized by school districts for the purpose of evaluating both current and innovative programs. The problem is further complicated by the fact that the school districts of the past have not included the process of evaluation as one of the major criteria for curriculum improvement.

A lack of guidelines and the reluctance on the part of educators to include evaluation as a major function of curriculum development have produced a situation in which little evidence is available as to what should be evaluated and how evaluation should take place....²

The claim has been made that the guidelines that have been provided are inappropriate and ineffective.³ These guidelines often consist mainly of vague recommendations regarding the use of intelligence and achievement


³Ibid.
tests. Such guidelines presuppose that these tools alone can yield appropriate evaluative data for decision-making. Thus, additional frustration and confusion for educators.

These notions are not universally shared, however. There tends to be an emerging theory that, although some controversy about program evaluation definitions, guidelines, and models prevail, there is evidence also that numerous scholars provided new theories and new sets of knowledge that have stood the test of time.

Taylor (1974) provided support for the postulate that Stufflebeam's Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) evaluation "is considered to be the most comprehensive of the current evaluation mechanisms. This model had been successfully utilized at the local school level to provide evaluative data for decision-making".1

How one views program evaluation will no doubt depend on the side of the theoretical debate that best suits his/her purpose. The author takes the position that despite the differences in definitions, purposes and methodologies, the commonalities far outweigh any substantive differences. It is perhaps time that educators and professional evaluators acknowledge that the controversy exists and make whatever adjustments are needed in order to find answers to the questions that remain unanswered whether it be to provide generalized knowledge for theory development or to determine the worth or value of a program.2 Perhaps the major concern should be that, by whatever name each calls his work, it be technically correct and within acceptable ethical boundaries.


Anderson and Ball (1978) called attention to the emerging points of view:

Gephart and Potter (1976) have declared that the debate between "proponents of the research process" and "dissidents who asserted that evaluation was a different process" is settled. More and more empirical methodologies have recognized that research and evaluation are variants of the scientific methods with different purposes; are appropriate resolution strategies for different classes of problems; involve different sets of procedures; produce different kinds of results; and when qualitatively assessed, require the use of different criteria.¹

It is doubtful that the present controversy will end during this decade or in the near future. But the controversy should not deter the efforts of the researchers nor the evaluators to continue to provide evaluative and quantifiable data that will: (1) contribute to decisions about program installation, (2) contribute to decisions about program continuation, expansion, and modification, (3) provide supportive evidence of the worth of programs, (4) give direction and purpose to staff development activities, and (5) serve as a basic management tool for education administrators.

These kinds and quantities of data will be crucial for effective and efficient decision-making on the part of the special education administrator. Due to the already announced budget cuts and the apparent moderation of the Supreme Court regarding the mandates of PL-94-142, the remaining years in this decade are certain to be economically, politically, and professionally stressful. History has taught us that in difficult times...
times, the weakest members of our society tend to bear a disproportionate share of the burden.

But it need not be. Educators, researchers, and evaluators have the responsibility and the opportunity to put aside petty differences and to work together to find the answers to the questions that must be answered if public education is to remain a viable alternative for the millions of consumers and taxpayers whose right to expect and demand program evaluation is not in question. How best to do it is the question.

Program Evaluation Purposes

Why evaluate? This question has been asked and answered by evaluation experts, scholars, and educators for decades. While the question remained unchanged, the answers have varied among those who have attempted to find the answer. But there is no one answer. Nor is there evidence in the literature that there should be. There is some disagreement among the experts about the purpose of education—a value-laden issue. It is no wonder then that there is disagreement about the purpose of evaluating education programs.

Ask the typical evaluation expert, scholar, or educator to answer the question—why evaluate?—and one is likely to get as many different answers as people asked. Such diverse answers as: (1) To assess the worth of the program; (2) To satisfy administrators who don't have anything better to do than "make-up" busy work for staff; (3) To satisfy the federal bureaucrats who want to control public education; (4) To satisfy some local or state policy that some genius "thought-up"; and (5) To improve educational programs.
Admittedly, these answers represent the two extremes; but they are not uncommon. After more than twenty years of professional and personal interaction and contacts with a wide range of professionals, the author has heard these answers a sufficient number of times to give some confidence to the notion that these statements have been made frequently over an extended period.

These and similar negative comments about the purpose of program evaluation may well represent individual frustrations and the lack of a conceptual framework regarding the whole notion of program evaluation in general and the purposes it can or should serve in particular. These postulates provided the rationale the author needed to justify the inclusion of evaluation purposes in this review of the related literature.

Stake (1967) note that "educators differ among themselves as to both the essence and worth of an educational program."\(^1\) This diversity provides the opportunity for each to ground his/her theory of program evaluation purposes in personal values which speak to individual differences, personal qualities, and life styles. The educator who tends toward a "carefree" life style may perceive program evaluation as too time consuming and placing too much of a strain on staff, students, and community actors. The self-disciplined educator may perceive program evaluation as a desirable management tool. Such differences in perception and personal qualities are likely to result in each individual having opposite views of the purposes of program evaluation.

The purposes of program evaluation are indeed numerous, and the purposes to which one prescribes can perhaps be traced to his/her preference

among the prevailing definitions of evaluation. According to Grote-
lueschen, there is likely to be a match between one's definition of eval-
uation, his philosophy of education, and the way in which he/she intends
to use evaluation results, and his/her program evaluation practices.1

The administrator who accepts the definition provided by Tyler (1950)
will find that his/her purpose will be to "document the congruence of
learner outcomes and program objectives." One who designs his evaluation
to "compare performance data" according to some type consensus standards
accepts the notions of such scholars as Popham (1969), Provus (1969), and
Rivlin (1971). Another might ground his evaluation in Scriven's (1972)
theory and "compare program effects with the needs of students. Others
might tend more toward "judging" the value of a program and matching that
value with the values of significant others in the school community. And
still others might choose to utilize "presumed knowledge" and "expertise"
(Eisner, 1975) to critically judge a program. One might also "describe
and interpret the wider context in which a program functions" according
to the constructs espoused by Stufflebeam(1977) and Worthen and Sanders
(1973).2

Dunst, looking at program evaluation relative to the education of
the handicapped, called attention to the fact that the experts do define
program evaluation with varying degrees of differences, but the differences
are not significant. He concluded that:

1A. D. Grotelueschen, et al. "Program Evaluation", in Alan B. Knex,
et al. (Eds.) Developing, Administering and Evaluating Adult Education

2E. W. Eisner. "The Perceptive Eye: Toward the Reformation of Edu-
Stanford University, December, 1975.
Despite subtle differences, evaluation has been defined by various authors (Gallagher, Surels and Hays, 1973; Stufflebeam, 1971; Worthen and Sanders, 1973) as the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing information (data) for ascertaining the efficacy of plans, program activities, intervention, and so forth. The primary question being asked is Did the (program) efforts have the effect intended. ¹

Each of these definitions no doubt reflect the personal perspective and life styles of the scholars, but they share some basic elements. The various variables on which each definition tends to focus identifies the commonalities among them. Clearly each definition implies the role of description and judgment in the process. The role of description and judgment in evaluation cannot be overly emphasized. Stake ² noted that many evaluations fail because school personnel and program evaluators fail to fully describe their programs and the evaluation activities; and because they are reluctant to judge them. The problem lies in the fact that evaluators are often too restrictive in identifying the descriptive variable which tends to limit the scope of the program evaluation effort which also restricts the range and scope of judgment. Descriptive variables must be all inclusive—they must encompass the totality of the program in order to lend direction and purpose to the evaluation.

The major purposes of program evaluation can be broadly classified according to Grotelueschen, et al. ³ (1974) model as one which examines,

---


assesses or judges: (1) past activities or outcomes, (2) programs in progress or current programs, and (3) actions which might take place in the future. When the administrator decides to conduct an evaluation in order to judge or assess past program activities and outputs, he usually does so because of his interest in providing confidence that the program does not lack accountability and that the outcomes justify the expenditures of time and resources. Likewise, an evaluation of current programs would have as its purpose the role of program improvement. The evaluation concerned with actions and decisions in the future would have as its purpose the goal of providing quantifiable data that might be used in planning, designing, and implementing programs in the future.

Grotelueschen identified some of the major purposes of evaluation more succinctly:

....To account for funds or resources and monitor compliance with legal regulations and guidelines; to document major program accomplishments and examine the expediency of program goals; to identify potential participant needs and establish program emphases; to ascertain collaboration opportunities and evaluate coordination efforts with other institutions and agencies; and to identify program weaknesses and assess progress toward stated goals.1

These purposes encompass the three broad reasons cited by Grotelueschen, et al. But they are not all inclusive. Program evaluation may have as its major purpose the collection of data for policy decisions. Whether or not the "stated" purposes of program evaluation as mandated by the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1969 (ESEA) were realized is debatable. But there can be no doubt about the influence that program evaluation results have had on federal policy regarding funding policies for ESEA

1Grotelueschen. "Program Evaluation" p. 78.79.
programs and the whole issue of accountability. The controversy surrounding ESEA programs moved the late Senator Robert Kennedy to "push" for legislation that would require that local school systems be accountable to the federal government and the taxpaying public for the expenditures of public funds. An unusual requirement of the mandate was that educators demonstrate the value of their programs with evaluative data.

Several scholars have evaluated the worth of education programs, and their judgements have indeed impacted federal policy. When Jencks set forth his premise that only the characteristics of the child made a difference on achievement and learning—not the schools, the teachers or the resources—federal lawmakers used these data for policy-making decisions.1

One might argue that a distinction should be made between evaluation for political purposes and evaluating for educational purposes. The author disagrees with that notion. Both require decision-making—political decision-making. The administrator who denies the interrelationships between the two demonstrates a lack of perception and understanding of the politics of education. Education program evaluation tends to bring forth the "best" and the "worst" in the politics of education.

Sroufe concluded that formal evaluation is a political process and that it is not uncommon for the evaluation process to evoke greater policy consequences than board or bond elections. The fact, that politics involves the distribution of values, resources, prestige, and influence speaks to the interrelationship between program evaluation and politics.2


These are not the only reasons for conducting program evaluation. These and other combination of reasons do, however, tend toward prevailing theories. But among the key concepts to be considered is the notion that program purposes change from time to time. Further, what may be a realistic and useful purpose for one organization may prove to be an unrealistic and of no value to another.

Stake called attention to these notions when he developed the theory of the countenance of evaluation:

The purposes and procedures of educational evaluation will vary from instance to instance. What is quite appropriate for one school may be less appropriate for another. Standardized achievement tests here but not there. A great concern for expense there but not over there...

Generally speaking, one might conclude that the purpose of evaluation is to gather the most reliable data in order to render informed decisions and to select from among several alternatives based on the collected data which provides the basis for judging and projecting. Tuckman supports these notions:

...The purpose of evaluating a program is to provide the means for determining whether the program is meeting its goals; that is whether measured outcomes for a given set of inputs match the measured outcomes...The sole purpose of evaluating an instructional program is to determine how "on-target" it is by comparing achieved outcomes with intended ones.²

Bishop provides a different point of view. He contends that evaluation has many purposes, intents, and uses; that is, to assess the progress of the teacher, the student, and the program in relation to stated

---

²Bruce Wayne Tuckman, Evaluating Instructional Programs (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979), p. 3.
objectives and anticipated outcomes. He prescribed to the five specific purposes theory:

1. To ascertain the extent of gain, not only in selected segments but also in regard to balance between special efforts and the ongoing program.

2. To provide diagnostic and interim data for feedback, reporting, program modification, and decision-making.

3. To continuously assess strengths and weaknesses of leadership as well as the performance of those for whom the objectives and programs have been designed.

4. To assist in the development of growth in evaluative skills and in the production of appropriate instruments at all levels.

5. To acknowledge evaluation as an expected professional obligation.

As you can see, the commonalities among the various program evaluation purposes are more numerous than any apparent differences in most instances. However, Stake declared that program evaluation purposes are identified based on whether the evaluation is formal or informal. Consequently, he posited that the major purpose or program evaluation is to decide and judge the worth of educational programs "based on formal inquiry."

These notions raise some prudent questions regarding the value of informal evaluation—a common practice in many educational environments. One questions the value and purpose of the informal evaluation. One might also conclude that the informal evaluation has neither value nor purpose. But caution should be taken in making such judgments. The informal evaluation has the potential for revealing certain types of information that

---


2 Stake. The Countenance of Evaluation.
may or may not be uncovered in the formal evaluation.

Scriven's note that the purpose of program evaluation is to establish and justify merit is consistent with Hammond's contention that the purpose of program evaluation is to determine the effects of innovation on achievement of objectives, as is Alkin's postulate that the purpose of program evaluation is to report summary data in order to influence decision-making in choosing or selecting among alternatives.

Also contributing to the development of program evaluation purpose theory was the work of two scholars (Smith and Tyler, 1942) whose model focused on the specification of objectives and measuring learning outcomes actually being realized. These scholars contended the purpose of evaluation is to determine the extent to which specified learning objectives or the purposes of learning activities are being attained by the learners for whom the activities were designed or intended.

Cronbach (1963-64) tends to support the notion that a major purpose of evaluation is to provide data for making decisions about individuals. But he sees other purposes as well. Program evaluation should have, among other purposes, the concept of course improvement and administrative regulations. Administrators must make crucial decisions about course improvement in relation to what instructional materials and methods are appropriate and satisfactory as well as where change is needed.

---


2 Robert L. Hammond. "Evaluation at the Local Level" in Worthen and Sanders (Eds.) Educational Evaluation.

Cronbach posited that there was a match between program evaluation purposes and decision types:

1. Course improvement: deciding what instructional materials and methods are satisfactory and where change is needed.

2. Decisions about individuals: identifying the needs of the pupil for the sake of planning his instruction, judging pupil merit for purposes of selection and grouping acquainting the pupil with his own progress and deficiencies.

3. Administrative regulation: judging how good the school system is, how good individual teachers are, etc.¹

As has been noted by Stake (1972) people have different expectations of evaluation. People expect evaluation to accomplish many different purposes:

- to document events
- to record student change
- to detect institutional vitality
- to place the blame for trouble
- to aid administrative decision-making
- to facilitate corrective action
- to increase our understanding of teaching and learning.²


---

¹Lee J. Cronbach. "Course Improvement" in Worthen and Sanders (eds) Educational Evaluation, p. 44.


³Worthen and Sanders. Educational Evaluation Theory contains the original works of these authors except, Tyler (1942), Knox (1980) and Stufflebeam (1981). These works are identified in the bibliography of this dissertation.
The various purposes of program evaluation cited in this review of the related literature comprise the prevailing theories of evaluation purposes. They are also consistent with the holistic concept of what program evaluation is or should be. The whole notion of judging the value of worth of a program for various purposes should rest with the individual administrator and the mission of the organization. Consequently, the purposes of the evaluation, by and large, determine the kinds of data that should be collected. "Each purpose needs separate data; all the purposes cannot be served with a single collection of data".¹

Wentling and Piland see the potential use of evaluation results as a legitimate reason or purpose for conducting local evaluation. Likewise, they contend that evaluation resulting from external motivational forces such as state requirements are less likely to be productive. They contended that:

...Pursuing a task such as evaluation because of influences outside the school (state requirements) or directives from higher ranks within an organizational hierarchy (administrative directive) may negatively influence the actual conduct of the evaluation activities. External motivational forces often do not have the same positive impact as internal motivation, such as the desire to improve programs (Walker, 1978).²

The purpose(s) of program evaluation should be specifically identified before the evaluation takes place. The purpose gives direction to the process. Vague or broadly stated purposes will negatively impact the identification of the types of data to be collected as well as the potential use to be made of the evaluation results.

In making the decision regarding program evaluation purpose, the administrators, school personnel, and other interested participants and observers must have a clear understanding of the purposes. The key issues are not whether the decision is made to evaluate to: (1) judge the worth of a program, (2) provide data for staff improvement, (3) assess student achievement, (4) determine the worth of the school and its programs, (5) develop teacher-training activities, (6) determine the quality of staff, or (7) manage the organization programs and resources. The key issue concerns clarifying and operationalizing the expectations the various actors within the school and community have regarding what the evaluation will accomplish.

Program Evaluation Practices

Program evaluation practices have been as varied as the definitions and purposes that have appeared in the literature over the past few decades. And this is perhaps as it should be. Evaluation practices to satisfy one purpose are no more suited for all purposes than the collection of one type of data to satisfy all purposes of program evaluation.

Also, there are many factors that influence program evaluation practices. Tyler (1968) called attention to some of these:

New concepts, new procedures, and new instruments for evaluation are emerging from the interactions among new needs for educational evaluation, new conditions that must be met, new knowledge about education, and new technologies that can be utilized....

---

The theories of program evaluation practices have evolved as a result of some major assumptions made by the evaluator, the educator, the taxpayer, and the policy maker. These assumptions were made regarding the utility of a variety of evaluation concepts, measurements, tools, and devices for assessing the worth of education programs, procedures, and activities. And as new knowledge, new needs, and new techniques evolved many of these assumptions also changed.

Also influencing program evaluation practices has been the fluidity of the program's goals and objectives regarding equal education opportunity. Many programs that once had the option to practice selectivity on a high order no longer had that option. Consequently, as program focus changed to accommodate the diverse needs and interest of a more pluralistic student population, program evaluation practices also changed.

These new actors in the school's programs and those in the school community (parents, interested observers of the school, and taxpayers) placed new demands on the school in terms of program focus and accountability. These influential individuals and groups demand evidence, provided by evaluative data, that the programs are effective or that improvements are being made. These and other changing conditions provided much of the impetus for program evaluation as an emerging profession.

As program evaluation theories of practice continued to evolve, school organization structures were being reorganized. And while most schoolmen would refute Weber's notion of the school as a hierarchy of authority, specialization of functions, formal intermember communications, and specification of rules and procedures, many in the school community
would agree with Weber.¹

These differences in perception of the organizational structure do not necessarily affect program evaluation practices. However, the fact of the matter is that school organizational structures have influenced program evaluation practices. Weiss called attention to the impact the formal organization can have on program evaluation practices. She contended that although program evaluation theoretically and conceptually examines the formal goals and objectives of the organization, informal goals should not be ignored because it is the totality of the organization that influences evaluation practices.²

One might argue that legislative mandates such as ESEA (1965) PL-94-142 (1975), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (1973) have had the greatest influence on program evaluation practices.³ ESEA was the first to mandate program evaluation. The latest mandate regarding evaluation of ESEA programs, issued in 1974, speaks to the level of influence legislation had on program evaluation practices:

The commission shall provide for independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects assisted under this title. Such evaluation may be provided contract or other arrangements, and all such evaluations shall be made by competent and independent persons, and from program or project participants about the strengths and weaknesses of such programs or projects.

The commissioner shall provide to the state educational agencies models for evaluation of all programs conducted under this title.


²Carol Weiss. Readings in Social Action and Education (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972).

³See Appendix A for excerpts from each of these acts dealing with program evaluation.
The model developed by the commissioner shall specify objective criteria which shall be utilized in the evaluation of all programs and shall outline techniques and methodology for producing data which are comparable on a statewide or national basis.¹

There can be little doubt about the influence of ESEA legislation on program evaluation practices. In fact one might properly question the federal government's broad span of control over public education at the local level. At the other extreme, one could conclude that the federal government "pays the cost to be the boss." These two issues perhaps contributed to the dissatisfaction of some state and local school officials who felt that by accepting federal dollars for public education the local school system was relinquishing too much control of local education programs to federal monitors and the commissioner.

Even though PL-94-142 also mandated program evaluation at least annually, no such guidelines, models, or other technical assistance were provided. In fact, neither the federal government nor the state provided a model for local school systems.² Consequently, one would expect more variances in special education program evaluation practices than are likely to be found in ESEA programs. To say it another way, ESEA had its specific kinds of influence on program evaluation practices in special education.

Depending on the personal qualities and leadership style of the leader, the mandates of one of the acts is an appropriate mechanism for accountability purposes, while the other is perhaps less than appropriate or even

¹Anderson and Ball. The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation. p. 213.

²See Appendix B for a letter from the U.S. Office of Education and the information obtained by the author in a personal interview with the State's Special Education program monitor/evaluator.
undesirable. It is these kinds of concerns that influence program evaluation practices both negatively and positively.

Some additional factors that have influenced program evaluation practices concern: (1) the politics of evaluation (Scribner, et al. 1977); (2) the support of higher-level administrators (Provus, 1969); (3) the level of community support and demands (Tyler, 1969); (4) the level and source of funding for program evaluation (Weiss, 1966); (5) the staffing pattern and the level of evaluation expertise of staff (Weiss, 1966); (6) the lack of faculty time and faculty attitude (Weiss, 1966); (7) the value systems and personal preferences of the evaluator (Anderson and Ball 1978); and (8) the fear of results (Weiss, 1966).

One should not discount the role of personal value systems in program evaluation. Ours is a value-oriented society. Despite claims of neutrality, impartiality, professional integrity and professional ethics, personal value systems cannot easily be disguised or denied. As an example, the


2 Malcom Provus. "Evaluation of Ongoing Programs."

3 Ralph Tyler. Educational Evaluation.
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6 Ibid.

7 Anderson and Ball. The Profession and Practice.
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evaluator who philosophically opposes the use of federal funds to provide equal education opportunities for the handicapped in the "least restrictive environment" may find it very difficult to remain impartial or neutral in the role of the evaluator. The same could be said for the administrator or interested observer of program evaluation practices in special education.

Anderson and Ball concurred:

...Program evaluation takes place in about as value-full a context as can be found. There are the values that surround evaluators, and there are the values that evaluators themselves are burdened with. With respect to the latter, at least three kinds of values may influence what evaluators look at, how they look at it, and what they see....

Anderson and Ball go on to state that many evaluators may be aware of many of the deep-seated values they harbor because these values are shared by peers and associates. Additionally, some values are rooted in professionalism and these values or personal preferences tend not to interfere with the evaluator's activities as much as with methodology, approach, and strategy. Consequently, personal preferences tend not to influence evaluation practices as much as values.

The program evaluation practices that have emerged over the past one and a half decades are perhaps as numerous as the persons who have written about, talked about, and practiced program evaluation.

But clearly certain trends in practice emerged that appear to possess basic commonalities. Worthen and Sanders (1973) noted that many public schools relied on accreditation committees to review the school's Self Study, interview staff, students and community influentials, examine documents and records in relation to state standards, and to pass judgment

---

1Anderson and Ball. The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation. pp. 7-9.
on the worth of the institution's programs, procedures, and activities.\(^1\) Just when and how this practice emerged is debatable. What is known, however, is the fact that it has been the major practice in public schools for better than a century. And only in recent years has the "presumed expertise" of these committee members come to be questioned by professional evaluators and researchers. One might also conclude that federal legislators also question the fitness of these persons to assess the worth of federally funded programs.

Use of accreditation-type committees is but one of several practices found in program evaluation. The "open-ended" interview approach has been successfully used (Patton, et al., 1975).\(^2\) This approach provides the opportunity for program evaluation participants to describe what they do and how they do it. The survey questionnaire, for example, would tend to restrict the responses. There is always the risk that the questionnaire might not be "all inclusive—all possible options" available as a possible response.

Use of The Survey Questionnaire has been one of the most frequently used evaluation practices by educators. School surveys have been used for collecting data for decision-making since as far back as 1910. Prior to 1910 and through 1915, school systems relied on the recommendations and suggestions of "expert" educators to pass judgement on the worth of school programs and services. This practice continues today in the form of


accreditation committees.

Good (1966) called attention to a new practice that was emerging in the 1900's.

After 1915 there was a trend toward more specialized surveys of limited aspects or problems of education, since the large number of recommendations in comprehensive surveys sometimes had proved confusing to the school staff and to the public. It was also thought desirable to add to the administrative staff of the local school system one or more specialists trained in methods of research, measurement, and survey techniques who could assume leadership in conducting school surveys, studies, rather than to depend entirely on the leadership of visiting experts. Frequently local staff members and consulting experts cooperated in conducting school surveys.¹

Educational organizations frequently utilize the school survey for the sole purpose of investigating teachers' attitudes toward a new school policy or procedure. The principal interested in determining student interest in organizing a club may use the school survey. The evaluator interested in investigating teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming may also use the survey, as would the superintendent who is interested in arriving at a consensus regarding school system objectives.

Each of these examples is perhaps an oversimplification of some important uses made of the school survey. But it is not the author's purpose to defend the use of the school survey, but rather to identify its use among others as a frequent practice for collecting data for decision-making.

Synthesizing program evaluation practices for inclusion in this review of the related literature was a difficult task. There is no scarcity of what program evaluation practices should be. It is only when one attempts

to classify what is that calls attention to the absence of documentations of evaluation activities.

Perhaps the most common evaluation practice in special education is the use of the evaluation committee. This involves the local school's self-study in which all school personnel, students, and community influentials serve on various committees—usually organized around the state school standards—for the purpose of collecting and organizing evaluative data that will be utilized by the state visiting committee to evaluate the school's special education programs. This practice is nothing new for educators. It is patterned after the accreditation-type evaluation committee and has several key components:

1. Information is collected regarding the program's philosophy and purpose.

2. Information is collected on the school's child find activities.

3. Information is collected on the school's due process activities and procedures.

4. Information is collected on the school's protection in evaluation procedures.

5. Individual education program information is assembled for review.

6. Information is collected regarding the school's free and appropriate public education activities.

7. Information is collected regarding the school system's efforts to provide appropriate transportation for handicapped students.

8. Information is collected regarding the school's efforts to educate the handicapped in the least restrictive environment.

9. Information is collected to demonstrate certification levels of teachers and administrators.
10. Information is collected to demonstrate the range of supportive/ancillary services provided for the handicapped.¹

The practice of conducting personal interviews is also a common practice in program evaluation. The personal interview is usually conducted by a member of an evaluation committee or the interview may be used in what has been termed the retrospective interview approach (Alkin, 1979). Data are collected by examining past records, student test scores, teacher lesson plans, etc. The evaluator passes judgment on the quality of the program or procedures based upon the evidence resulting from the evaluation activities.

During the 1930's (Tyler and Smith) the now-famous Eight Year Study made use of a wide range of tests, questionnaires, checklists, samples of students' work and other scales and inventories to gather information regarding the achievement of America's school children.² Local schools and school systems systematically use these data, although in less than a systematic manner, to evaluate education programs and teacher performance (perhaps covertly), and to shape school policy regarding the curriculum and instruction. Additionally, classroom teachers periodically develop tests of all descriptions and kinds to judge the performance of students.

These examples represent both the formal and informal practices in program evaluation. The formal evaluation is distinguished by its use of checklists, structured visitations by peers, standardized testing of students, and controlled comparisons. Conversely, the informal evaluation

¹Georgia Department of Education Office of Instructional Services, Division of Special Services Compliance Document (Unpublished) (Atlanta, 1981).

²See Worthen and Sanders. Educational Evaluation. p. 3.
is recognized by its informal or casual observation, implicit goals, intuitive norms, and subjective judgment.¹

A brief summary of a more recent study will perhaps shed some additional light on the match between theories of evaluation practices and program evaluation practices in the public schools.

The Bayview School Title IV-C program evaluation efforts had often been nothing more than "going over" the program's plans and objectives to see that they comply with legal requirements and gathering pre-and post-test data on those objectives. In other instances, the state evaluator participated in developing the program's plans and objectives. Even though the state requirement for the evaluation of Title IV-C projects fall into four categories: Cognitive or academic achievement, improvement in the affective or behavioral realm, the development of staff competencies, and the involvement of community groups and parents in project activities, the state requirement was not being met in some instances.

With the employment of a state evaluator, (a doctoral candidate in evaluation), efforts were made to assist the school in its evaluation activities.² Since the program proposal identified the program's objectives, the evaluator had the task of identifying the procedures for determining the extent to which the program had achieved its objectives.

1. The evaluator identified the kinds and types of data to be collected.

2. The evaluator identified the kinds and types of instruments to be used for measuring student growth.


3. The evaluator compared the results of the various tests.

4. The evaluator made numerous site visits in order to supplement the objective measures.

5. Previous school records were reviewed and compared.

6. School attendance records were reviewed to calculate truancy rates.

7. The evaluator designed a scale to measure student attitudes.

8. Teacher observations were made and the visits were recorded on a checklist that was developed by the evaluator and the project staff. Teachers were evaluated on (recordkeeping, material use, teaching techniques, and student activity, awareness) clarity of presentation, completion of work, awareness of the activity.

9. Quarterly summaries of the observations were compiled and the observer conducted a conference with each teacher to compare impressions and make suggestions.

10. The evaluator met periodically with the classroom observers to discuss the rating sheets, to standardize the criteria used in the classroom visits, and to decide on alternative actions in areas where needed.

11. Year-end surveys were designed and conducted by the evaluator to record reactions of the school staff to the project.

12. The evaluator and the project staff decided not to include parents in many of the project's activities because it was felt that parents were more of a hindrance than a help in the classroom. Parents were restricted to visits for conferences, informal conversations with staff, or telephone contacts regarding school-child-home matters.

13. Parents were asked to complete a questionnaire at the end of the year regarding their reactions to what the school was attempting to do in the project.

14. The state requirement regarding program evaluation was met by providing standardized tests results and by completing the state evaluation form.¹

There was concern expressed by the project staff regarding the local evaluation "to satisfy state requirement." However, the evaluator was

¹Ibid., pp. 63-65.
able to convince the staff that the evaluation served other purposes as well, even though its impact may not be immediate. The staff contended that the state evaluation did not address localized needs. Consequently, the school staff and the evaluator conducted frequent meetings to discuss the evaluation and to refine the state evaluation so that local school needs could also be addressed.

In general, the project staff praised the competent work of the evaluator and that the recent frequent contact with the evaluator was essential and that there was "great utility in having a source of more objectives data by which to assess the effectiveness of the project activities as the individualization of classroom instruction and the development of positive student attitudes."

Olson and Marvin (1970) described the state of Illinois' approach to program evaluation that seemed to demonstrate that evaluation at the local level need not cause frustration, fear, and suspicion to become so pervasive. The authors pointed out that the U. S. Office of Education report (1968) cast doubt on the state offices of education "intentions and capabilities for administering" ESEA Title III programs. Adding to the problems was the perception, at least, that the federal government had transferred administrative authority and responsibility for local education to the U.S. Office of Education. These changes came at a crucial time for educators who were struggling to maintain public support for education at a time when local schools were experiencing their greatest attacks from the tax-paying public.

---

Consequently, the state of Illinois set out to evaluate the influence of Title III in the State. To accomplish this task, six full-time regional consultants were employed. They were not evaluation specialists, but they were provided inservice training and were later described as "proficient in the techniques required for their responsibilities." The activities, procedures, etc. regarding the state's approach to evaluation follow:

1. The six consultants monitored the State's projects for assurances that they were meeting the rules and regulations of the State and the U.S. Office of Education.

2. The consultant's ultimate responsibility was to conduct the study of state Title III programs to determine their influence in the State and to humanize evaluation.

3. The consultants collected demographic data and findings from achievement and attitude tests during their on-site analyses of the projects.

4. The collected data were not the "final word"; the consultants had to make value judgments based on their familiarity with the programs and their observations as experienced educators.

5. The consultants conducted structured interviews and made analyses that provided answers to general questions such as: To what extent are the activities congruent with the projects' objectives and the established procedures? What major weaknesses or inhibiting forces have been discovered and how can these be overcome? What are the community reactions to Title III projects?

6. The consultants conducted two intensive on-site studies of each of the 55 projects. In addition to collecting hard data, the consultants interviewed school district administrators, project directors, and project staffs.

7. The consultants frequently used such unobtrusive measures as listening to teacher's conversations in the lounge or over coffee, or they talked to parents. (This practice should be used with extreme care. Many educators are opposed such techniques and if the techniques are discovered, an evaluation program could be destroyed.)

8. The consultants reported the collected data, including that obtained by direct interviews and unobtrusive measures, to the project directors and the school district administrators with specific recommendations for improving the projects.
Based on the findings of the six consultants and the recommendations they made for improving the projects and for humanizing evaluation a series of activities followes:

1. A workshop was provided for project directors and staffs in relation to training staff for stating program objectives.

2. A filmstrip series on behavioral objectives was shown and a local university assisted in the training of staff.

3. A second workshop was conducted to help provide project staffs with an understanding of the complete spectrum of evaluation responsibilities and techniques. The humanistic approach to evaluation was the workshop's central theme.

To provide input into the State's evaluation program, a local university's trained staff developed a highly-structured questionnaire to collect data from 225 project staffs, other school staffs, community and parents. In addition, the university staff examined project correspondence, reports, and the unique milieu of each of the State's projects.

These two evaluation results provided useful information for local and state decision-makers regarding the worth of the programs, staff development needs, communication problems, parental involvement, interpersonal relationships between local school and state staffs, and equally important, the evaluations focused on some alternatives for eliminating staff resistance to evaluation or fear of the results on the part of educators.

As part of the author's initial research for this study of local evaluation practices in special education, a structured questionnaire was developed to conduct personal interviews with three different type education agencies.

---

1 Ibid., pp. 33-34.

2 Lorraine H. Walton. "Program Evaluation as Understood and Carried Out by Three Different Type Educational Agencies."
The purpose of these interviews was to provide confidence for the author's assumption that local schools do evaluate their special education programs as mandated by PL-94-142.

One of these agencies was a regional accreditation association; one was an urban school system; and one was a state department of education, special education division. All three have an evaluation component or major responsibility for program evaluation.

When asked to describe their evaluation practices, each of the administrators suggested that perhaps his/her organization did not conduct program evaluation according to the theory of practice.¹

One administrator indicated that his/her agency simply monitored the schools to insure compliance with PL-94-142 with regard to:

1. Administrative procedures regarding policies-procedures-standards for providing a free and appropriate education for handicapped students, public participation in the program's activities, reporting procedures, inclusion of handicapped persons on committees and councils, staff development, and educational practices.

2. Procedures for annual evaluation of special education programs including the Individual Education Program.

3. Policies, procedures and practices for establishing priorities for special target groups.

4. Identification, location, and evaluation of handicapped students (Child Find Activities).

5. Utilizing the resources of private schools and community agencies.

6. Protection and confidentiality regarding access rights, hearing rights, children's rights, and safeguards of students' rights.

¹Lorraine H. Walton. "Program Evaluation."
7. Protection in evaluation procedures regarding the IEP, least restrictive environment, due process, procedural safeguards, parental complaints, civil action, and rights of parents.

According to the administrator, the local school system is provided a set of standards patterned after accreditation agencies' self study document. The local school has complete autonomy in the evaluation process. The agency administrator visits the local school and examines the records, interviews students, staff, administrators, and parents. In addition, a semi-structured interview form is completed by various actors in the school and community:

1. General administrators complete the administrators interview form.

2. Regular classroom teachers complete an interview form regarding their knowledge of and participation in the special education program.

3. Special education teachers complete an interview in screening, program evaluation, the referral procedure, placement of students, utilization of diagnostic data, the instructional program, and the programs' strengths and weaknesses.

4. Parents of handicapped students complete the parent form regarding their level of participation in their child's program.

5. Diagnostic personnel in the local school system complete the interview form regarding procedures and techniques used in the diagnostic process.

The second administrator described his/her agency's evaluation effort as purely summative context and process evaluation with little or no attention to input and process evaluation. It was felt that the mandates of PL-94-142 had been adhered to.

---

1Lorraine H. Walton. "Program Evaluation,"
To accomplish the evaluation, the agency developed a questionnaire for each audience identified in PL-94-142 as those to be involved in the evaluation. Local school administrators and teachers completed the questionnaire regarding their participation in due process procedures, their views on the communication network utilized by the local school and their assessments of the behavior changes and academic progress of handicapped students.

Parents of handicapped students completed a parent-satisfaction questionnaire regarding their satisfaction with the school's due process procedures, the school's communication network, the behavior and academic progress of their handicapped children, and the help the local school had provided regarding PL-94-142, meetings for parents of handicapped children, books to read which deal with education for the handicapped and parent-community groups and organizations.

The third and final questionnaire was an agency questionnaire regarding cooperating agencies' attitudes and perceptions about the level of participation the local school had granted to agencies making referrals to the local school.

Each questionnaire required a "yes" or "no" answer but did provide the opportunity for respondents to make comments after each subset of the questionnaire items. Additional space was provided for comments or suggestions at the end of each questionnaire.

To supplement these data questionnaires were used with handicapped students to determine their attitudes, perceptions, and satisfaction with the special education program and the local school's efforts to meet their special needs. Considering the limitations of handicapped students, these data should be analyzed with great care and caution. It seems unlikely
that many handicapped students would be capable of providing the evalu-
ative data needed to make program decisions.

Additional evaluation practices of this agency involved the following:

1. Stating the objectives for each component of the special education program.

2. Conducting cooperative planning and staff development meeting with all staff providing services for the handicapped students.

3. Conducting needs assessment of each program, selecting learner competencies, a curriculum task force committee to recommend the curriculum guide, assessment instruments, core materials, and an inventory format for adoption.

4. Staff development for the teachers and principals was provided for curriculum implementation.

5. Formal and informal instruments will be used for assessment in the development, monitorship, and revision of both the Individual Education Program and the Individual Instruction Plan.

6. Parents were notified of the school's activities regarding evaluation and placement of children. Parents were involved in writing individual education plans for their children and changes were made only with parental consent.

Other factors affecting the school's evaluation practice was the collection of data regarding the number of cooperating meetings conducted, number of participants, number of referrals, work of the task force, number of students served, pre- and post-assessment data and anecdotal records. The number of parents participating in staffing and planning meetings and the questionnaires they completed provided the confidence for the local school to judge the worth of the program. These data were assessed in relation to the data collected by the assessment of student progress, the teacher survey, the local administrator survey, and the agency survey. Value judgements were based on the local central office staff's knowledge of the program and his/her educational training and experience.
The third administrator interviewed by the author states simply that his/her agency was not in the business of evaluating programs. But rather, the agency evaluated institutions according to state education standards and that the instructional program was but one facet of the total process.  

Enell, (1972) used administrator, teacher, and parent survey questionnaires to collect a wide range of evaluative data and information. In addition, various tests data were collected and analyzed to assess student academic growth and competency skills. Finally, school records and documents were reviewed and analyzed to provide the evaluator with a global view of the local school educational practices.

The study revealed that the local education agency had gone beyond the mandates of PL-94-142 regarding the evaluation process of monitoring the expenditure of PL-94-142 funds. The local education agency had engaged the services of an expert evaluator to administer tests, conduct experiments, observe classroom behaviors, analyze current data, etc. in order to collect quantifiable data to assess the worth of the special education program and services.

Alkin, et al. (1979) described a local program evaluation practice that provided some confidence for the author's claim that this study of local program evaluation practices would contribute to existing knowledge as well as provide local administrators with a list of evaluation components for the evaluation of special education programs.

---

1 Lorraine H. Walton. "Program Evaluation."
The administrator of the School in the study by Alkin, et al. was frustrated and angry with the district schools' central office directive to conduct an evaluation of the bilingual education program before giving clear guidelines and support to the local school staff who had neither the expertise nor the desire to conduct an evaluation for evaluation sake. Additionally, the local school administrator claimed that the state education office had initiated the evaluation directive without providing any guidelines or support for the local school district central office.

Consequently, the local administrator employed a program evaluator to assist the local staff in conducting the evaluation. Immediately it was discovered that the proposal for funding had stated specific objectives without giving any thought to the evaluation process. Secondly, the stated objectives would not produce the "hard data" the state was interested in receiving in order to judge the worth of the program. As a result of these discoveries, the evaluator and the local school administrator established the procedures for conducting the evaluation:

1. The objectives stated in the funding proposal were identified and modifications were made to satisfy the State's directive that "hard data" would be needed to judge the worth of the program at the end of the year.

2. A decision was made regarding the best alternatives for conducting the evaluation.

3. The data needed to satisfy the purpose of the evaluation were identified as well as the source and location of the data.

4. Individuals were identified to collect the needed data according to an established schedule. The major data were identified as:

   (a) Test results
   (b) Classroom observation reports
   (c) Samples of students' work
5. Acceptable measures for the affective facet of the program were agreed upon by the central state office, the state education staff, and the local school administrator.

6. A questionnaire was developed to collect data from parents and the advisory committee regarding their attitudes toward the bilingual program.

7. A schedule was developed to conduct classroom observations.

8. The program evaluator conducted periodic inservice workshops with local staff to provide training and assistance in the evaluation process.

9. The program evaluator kept in close touch with the school administrator by phone throughout the evaluation process.

10. All of the collected data were compiled and submitted to the evaluator for analysis and writing the final evaluation report to be submitted to the state education office.

11. The final evaluation report was submitted to the State. The state simply acknowledged receiving the report with no comments.

The local school administrator expressed her disdain for the State's evaluation directive:

...These people (i.e., Those in charge of Title IV-C are very difficult to deal with: All they want is hard data and tests.)

The local school administrator also noted that other programs such as Title I used criterion-referenced tests, attendance records, parent surveys, etc., as part of the evaluation process. There was concern also that the politics of program evaluation influenced the state education of the bilingual program and did not attempt to provide even minimal assistance.

Although there were some few changes made in the evaluation of the bilingual program during the second and third years of the funding period, there were no substantial changes made in the way the evaluation was conducted.

---

1Ibid., pp. 170-193.
Ornstein (1974)\textsuperscript{1} posited that program evaluation practices have been hampered by political pressures and the pressures of Black militants who demand that negative evaluation results be buried or correctly reported. He contended that what takes place in the name of program evaluation leaves much to be desired.

Weiss (1972) advanced the notion that evaluation practices are influenced by factors and forces outside the local school. She identified these as:

- Inadequate academic preparation for research in action agencies;
- The low status of evaluation in academic circles;
- Program ambiguities and fluidity;
- Practitioner suspicion and resistance;
- Organizational limitations on boundaries for study, access to data and design requirements;
- Inadequate time for followup;
- Inadequacies of money and staffing;
- Controls of publication; etc.\textsuperscript{1}

Wentling and Piland (1980)\textsuperscript{2} conducted a descriptive census study of "Local Evaluation Practices in Vocational Education." Their study utilized the survey questionnaire to collect data from the sample population regarding their program evaluation activities. Although the majority of the sample population reported having engaged in various evaluation activities because of an interest in program improvement, 37 percent of the respondents indicated that they conducted their evaluation activities to "meet state requirements." Interestingly enough the state had no such requirement.

The study was organized around four specific research questions relative to program evaluation practices. The answers to those questions

\textsuperscript{1}C. H. Weiss. Evaluating Action Programs, loc. cit., pp. 1.

were provided by the data collected with the survey questionnaire that the researchers developed and mailed to the sample population. The reader should analyze carefully the results of the study before drawing conclusions and making inferences. The low return rate of 51% must be considered even though the researcher contacted a sample of non-respondents by telephone to gain some assurances that a representative sample had been obtained.

As you can see, there is no definite match between the theories of program evaluation practices and what is practiced at the local school level. The problem can perhaps be traced back to some issues raised in the literature. The issues of: (1) conflict in definition of evaluation and research, (2) lack of training and experience of local school personnel for conducting program evaluation, (3) failure on the part of school administrators to conceptualize the purposes program evaluation should serve, and (4) fear of evaluation results on the part of school administrators have not been satisfactorily resolved. Consequently, their impact no doubt influences the ways in which local schools conduct program evaluation.

It does appear, however, that by whatever name the public schools call what they do regarding program evaluation, they do it in varying degrees. And the extent to which these practices are successful would depend upon the program's objectives, the purpose(s) of the evaluation, and the extent to which those objectives were achieved.

In reviewing the evaluation practices described in this section of the review of the literature, one might wonder about the purposes for which the evaluations were conducted and the qualitative and quantitative dimensions of the evaluative data and information that were collected. Unless there is a match between what is needed to address all areas of the
education program, services and procedures, and the data and information collected, reviewed, analyzed and reported, the evaluation serves little or no useful purpose.

Additionally, the practice of conducting summative evaluations as opposed to both summative and formative evaluations negate a very viable purpose of program evaluation—the opportunity to examine the program while it is in progress. "Hind Sight" has its place, but the end of the school term is too late for the students, school staff, and the taxpaying public to learn that the students' time and the school's resources did not yield desirable results.

Finally, the author notes that the local school evaluation practices described herein tend toward what Stufflebeam termed context and process evaluation with little or no attention to process and input evaluations.¹ This is not surprising, however. This is a common practice at the local school level. Also, both ESEA and PL-94-142 require only that context and product evaluations take place. It would seem then that local evaluation practices at least meet the minimum requirements of these legislative acts—the purpose for which many evaluations take place at the local level. However, such practices fall short of what an effective program evaluation should be.

Utilization of Program Evaluation Results

There can be little doubt that local school systems do in fact evaluate their education programs. Why they evaluate, what they evaluate, how

they evaluate, when they evaluate and who was involved in the conducting of the evaluation are not the concern here but rather what happened to the results of the evaluation of local education programs after they were obtained.

Theories of program evaluation utilization are numerous and varied. One theory of utilization postulates that little or no use has been made of program evaluation results (Rippey, 1973). Another theory is that program evaluation results have been effectively utilized (Alkin, et al., 1979). Still another is the contention that underutilization of program evaluation results is more prevalent than lack of utilization (Weiss, 1966). Then there is the theory grounded in the philosophical and theoretical debate which claimed that the definition of utilization to which one ascribed impacts his/her findings regarding utilization (Alkin, et al., 1979).

As you can see, there is some evidence of support for numerous and varied theories. But once again, the controversy over definitions of utilization, like those of evaluation and research, may have resulted in someone "yelling fire because of what smelled like smoke." Clearly many of the experts disagree regarding what constitutes evaluation. It seems to follow then that when addressing the broad issue of utilization of evaluation results, that what each evaluator sees, is what he sees, is what he sees.

3 Carol Weiss. *Readings*.
4 Marvin C. Alkin, et al. *Using Evaluations*, 
Alkin, et al. contended that how one defines utilization and evaluation comprise the major conflict:

The conflict between mainstream and alternative perspectives on evaluation impact is, first and foremost, a conflict between definitions of utilization. Most mainstream commentators seem to impose as their criterion for utilization immediate and direct impact on one or more critical program decisions. They want to see the evaluation findings tied closely to some vital choices made about the program—for example, the choice of one program over another, the decision to pursue one instructional strategy versus another, the decision to continue funding a program or to terminate it, and so forth.... 1

It seems plausible that these notions have contributed to the conflict regarding evaluation utilization. If, as Alkin, et al. contends, this narrow view of utilization is the standard by which utilization is judged, one might suggest that no such evidence is necessary before an administrator can correctly claim to have made effective use of the evaluation results. Such a view discounts the role of evaluation results in influencing or focusing the perception, ideology, or philosophy and purpose of the program, procedure, or activity that produced the evaluation results.

Patton, et al. supports this notion. He contended that evaluation results can have a gradual influence on the administrator and taken together with other factors and perceptions about a particular program, could lead to a decision about the program. 2 But is this utilization? Whether or not this constitutes utilization of results would, as Alkin, et al. (1979) noted, depend on the application of the definition of evaluation and utilization. 3

---

2 Ibid., p. 25.
3 Ibid.
The review of the literature regarding utilization of evaluation results provided some confidence for the author's assumption that some uses have been made of program evaluation results by local school systems. Just what these uses have been can perhaps best be understood in the context provided by Alkin (1975) and Patton (1975).

Alkin (1975) identified four sets of factors that might impinge on or influence utilization of evaluation information. He classified these four sets of factors as:

1. Decision-maker/decision process
2. Program and social context
3. Nature of the evaluator
4. Evaluation process/evaluation report
   (a) attention to appropriate goals
   (b) technical credibility
   (c) report comprehensibility
   (d) report timeliness
   (e) scope of recommendations
   (f) evaluator relationships

Four years later, Alkin, et al. (1979) acknowledged that Alkin's (1974) notions about evaluation process and evaluation report revealed a lack of focus regarding evaluation utilization. In fact they concluded that his utilization factors clearly focused on the final evaluation report and comprised a very narrow definition of utilization.

Patton, et al. (1975) conducted a study of the review of the literature of utilization factors and produced three very comprehensive and explicit sets of potential factors that might impact on or influence utilization of evaluation results. However, these three factors tend to encompass the major tenets found in Alkin's four sets of utilization factors. In essence, what Patton, et al. did in deriving their sets of

---

1These four sets of factors were abstracted from Marvin Alkin, et al. Evaluation and Decision Making: The Title VII Experience. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation, 1974, (Number 4) and included in Alkin, et al. Using Evaluations, p. 20.
factors was to extract from the literature those factors which seemed to be prevalent at the time their study was conducted.

These three sets of factors were broadly classified as: (1) The characteristics of the organization which included the constraints of decision-making in bureaucratic organizations, inherent competition between new and innovative organizations and the status quo organization, the patterns of communication within the organization, the level at which the evaluation took place, and the degree of politicalization of the organization; (2) The characteristics of the influential actors in the system: evaluators and decision makers which addressed such issues as divergent community theories, different value systems, languages, reward systems, and affiliations, academic versus private contract evaluators, research experience, leadership styles, traits, and qualities, internal versus external evaluators and the reputation and legitimacy of the evaluator, and (3) The characteristics of the evaluation which focused on methodological quality, relationship to original objective, bias, complexity, degree of dissemination, relevancy of the evaluation to the affected agency, format or the final report, positive versus negative findings, timeliness of the report, formative versus summative evaluation, and scope of recommendation for change.¹

These factors have clear implications for utilization of program evaluation results. Just what effects these factors have actually had perhaps can be determined from the review of several studies on utilization conducted in field settings. (Alkin, 1974) provided some support for the theory that evaluation results are effectively utilized at the local level. At

¹M. Q. Patton, et al. In Search of Impact,
the same time, the study also provided some support for the theory that no use is made of evaluation results or that the results had no influence on program decision.

One would do well to use caution in interpreting and analyzing these data. The research methodology was significantly different. In one instance the researchers examined the influence of evaluation results on the decision-making in forty-two ESEA Title VII programs. The researchers examined the evaluation reports, data provided as a result of program audits, data on federal funding decisions, information provided by the federal monitor, and information provided by the local program director. Their major task was to relate characteristics of the evaluation to reported evaluation influence and impact. The researchers concluded that:

...At the federal level, despite the injunction to evaluators to provide information enabling federal personnel to judge which projects "warrant continuation", we found no evidence that evaluations were in fact used for this kind of summative decision. Refunding levels remained rather constant from year to year with all projects receiving similar percentage increases or decreases in funding.¹

At the local level, the study provided support for the theory that effective use was made of evaluation results. At the local level, the survey questionnaire method of obtaining the data was utilized. Project directors agreed that evaluation results had indeed influenced program decisions. Sixty-four percent of the directors indicated that the decisions they made had been influenced by the evaluation results. One director indicated that the evaluation results of his program had not

¹Marcin C. Alkin. Using Evaluations, p. 22.
influenced his program decision:

...Sixty-four percent "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that evaluation influences decisions that were made to modify the project during the year...When asked if the evaluation had been of assistance to them, project directors strongly contended that it had been. This applied in many areas but particularly in "identifying possible problems", "preparing reports", and "providing general recommendations for program changes".

Another important study of evaluation utilization was conducted (Pattón, 1975) of health programs. The researchers examined the evaluation studies of twenty national health programs. In addition to examining the evaluation studies, the researchers interviewed the evaluator and the major program decision-maker for each of the twenty programs studied. The "open-ended" interview approach was utilized so that the evaluators and the major decision-makers could operationalize the term utilization in the discussion regarding the uses that had been made of the evaluation results. In addition, the researchers prompted the respondents to give full information by providing a general set of questions about utilization that would tend to give the respondents much latitude for describing the ways in which the evaluation had influenced or impacted decision-making. Finally, the respondents were allowed to "discuss at length the effects of the evaluation." The researchers explained:

What we found in response to these questions on impact was considerably more complex and less dismal than our original thinking had led us to expect. We found that evaluation research is used by decision-makers but not in the clear-cut and organization-shaking ways that social scientists sometimes believe research should be used...The results of our interviews suggest that what is typically characterized as under-utilization or non-utilization of evaluation research can be attributed to substantial degrees of utilization that is too narrow and fails to take into consideration the nature of actual decision-making processes in most programs.  

1Ibid., p. 23.  
2Ibid., p. 23.
One of the more recent studies of evaluation utilization (Granville, 1977) was conducted by what may be termed as the establishment of the level of confidence approach. In this approach, the researcher established a level of confidence for the acceptability of the data. The researcher used program change or adoption as the measure of utilization. In reviewing the results of this study, Alkin pointed out the value of the findings but expressed some concerns, also.¹

The key point made by Alkin was that the study "did find that social and political contextual factors influence decision-making, but in complex, interactive ways." He noted that the need to consider these factors was supported by the data, but that the "complexities of the interactions of people, context, and programs make it difficult to promulgate hard and fast guidelines for the evaluation to follow."²

Alkin, et al. (1979) utilized a retrospective interview approach to examine the evaluation programs of five ESEA Title I or Title IV-C programs.³ The researchers conducted indepth interviews with the programs' operational staff; reviewed documentary evidence such as program proposals, and evaluation reports. The five programs had been evaluated annually. Consequently, evaluation data were available for each of the selected programs. The researchers noted that the participant-observer approach was


³The researchers noted that the evaluation of these programs constituted the bulk of local evaluation activity. See Alkin, et al., p. 42.
an alternative to the retrospective-interview approach. However, the use of the participant-observer approach would have been both time-consuming and costly. It was determined that such an approach would have taken from seven to nine years. The retrospective-interview approach took two years to complete the five studies: (1) Bayview, (2) Valley Vista, (3) Rockland, (4) Clayburn, and (5) Garrison.

For purposes of the review of the related literature on evaluation utilization, only the results of these studies relative to utilization will be reviewed here.

The Bayview study results revealed that evaluation results had been used formally to keep state department of education personnel informed of the progress the programs made toward achieving stated goals and that this information was also used of negative results to justify decision to terminate federal support. Informally, the study revealed that no such use had been made of the results because the evaluation reports were not completed and received in the state education office until after the school year was over and the budget decisions had been made months earlier. In essence, during the first two years of the project, evaluation results did not impact budget decision.

The major decisions impacted by evaluation results were (1) personnel changes, (2) refinement of instructional skills, (3) student placement, (4) changes in decision-making procedures, and (5) improvement in communication channels.¹

The Valley Vista Study, like the Bayview Study, utilized the retrospective-interview approach. The study focused on the Individually Guided

Education and was concerned with (outcome) summative evaluation and documentary evidence of compliance with the official program plan.

The study revealed the following:

1. The local school board and the state education agency made the least use of evaluation results.

2. No state feedback was provided by the state or federal education personnel.

3. The school's parent advisory committee made no use of the evaluation results.

4. The outcome data were largely ignored by the principal for decision-making purposes.

5. Two learning specialists utilized the results to make adjustments in teaching techniques. ¹

The formative evaluation focused on program wide procedural matters which revealed the following:

1. The specialists although expressing appreciation for the availability of the evaluator, expressed concern over the breadth of the evaluation report.

2. Greater use was made of materials and communication networks improved.

3. Test data were used to identify student weaknesses and to correct them.

4. The evaluation results made little impact on decision-making. ²

The study of the Rockland School System was conducted on the kindergarten program. The results of the study regarding utilization of results follows:

1. Evaluation results were utilized for decision-making purposes, regarding continuation of the program.

¹Ibid., pp. 80-108.

²Ibid.
2. Evaluation results were utilized to establish future objectives for the program.

3. Evaluation results were utilized to make decisions regarding testing and other resource materials.

4. Evaluation results were utilized to make decisions regarding future program evaluation.

5. Evaluation results were utilized to examine the utility of the instructional approach.

6. Negative evaluation results were utilized to make decisions regarding personnel changes.¹

The Clayburn Study was made of a career high school. The results of the study regarding utilization of evaluation results follow:

1. Evaluation results were utilized in decision-making regarding program continuation by the local school system.

2. State level personnel utilized evaluation results (test scores) in deciding against dissemination funding.

3. Evaluation results were utilized in decisions regarding the selection process for student enrollment in the project.

4. Evaluation results were utilized to support the need for a school system policy on admission to the project.

5. Evaluation results were utilized in decisions regarding the participation of community people of the school committee.²

The Garrison Study was made of an elementary school's bilingual program. The results regarding utilization of evaluation results follow:

1. The local school utilized evaluation results to secure funding for the program at the state level when Title funds had been withdrawn.


²Ibid., pp. 127-156.
2. The evaluation results were utilized to secure additional staff, teaching materials, and staff development.

3. The evaluation results were utilized for making macro-level decisions regarding the changing of the forms used at the district and state levels.

4. The evaluation results were utilized by staff for the purpose of redefining their job roles and responsibilities.

5. Evaluation results were utilized in decision-making regarding supervision, staff development, needs assessment, public relations purposes, program modification, teacher preparation, etc.¹

Olson and Marvin (1970)² reported that evaluation results had been effectively used by local and state education officials as follows:

1. To humanize local evaluation practices.

2. To identify staff development needs and to plan appropriate inservice workshops.

3. To improve communication between the local school and the community.

4. To improve relations among state staff members and between the state staff and special program staff

5. To influence decisions regarding implementing new programs.

6. To nourish confidence in state staff on the part of project staff and to overcome resistance or fear of evaluation.

7. To increase the desire on the part of state and local staffs to expose their activities for gainful advancement of knowledge.

¹Ibid., pp. 157-204.

The author obtained information regarding the utilization of program evaluation results from personal interviews with three education agencies during the initial research for this dissertation. That information has been summarized as follows:

The major uses made of program evaluation results by one of the agencies was to complete a report for the U.S. Office of Education and to make funding decisions.

Another agency used program evaluation results to make decisions regarding implementing new programs, discontinuing programs, making changes in curriculums, planning staff development in-service activities, developing individual educational programs for handicapped students, and planning meetings and conferences with parents.

The evaluation results were used by another agency to write the formal evaluation report for the local school that commissioned the evaluation and for the agency responsible for insuring that the local school was in compliance with established state standards.

Wentling and Piland (1980) found program evaluation results being utilized for making changes in curricula, informing administrators, staff development efforts, supporting equipment requests, recruiting students, discontinuing programs, etc.

The study revealed that: (1) sixty-seven percent of the respondents utilized program evaluation results, for making curricula changes, (2) sixty-one percent of the respondents used the results to inform administrations, and (3) fifty-one percent of the respondents used the results for staff development efforts.

---

1. The author obtained information in personal interviews with an administrator of a regional accreditation association, the program monitor/evaluator of a state department of special education, and a special education administrator of an urban school system. These interviews were conducted in the office of the administrators during the fall of 1980. (See Appendix for the names of these administrators.)

Based on the results of the study, the researchers recommended these additional uses of program evaluation results:

1. To inform local education agencies of state-wide evaluation practices and success.
2. To study the barriers to locally-conducted evaluation and to develop ways of getting around them.
3. To explore ways of enhancing the use of evaluation results.
4. To provide inservice activities to promote the concept of locally-directed evaluation.

Enell (1979) found that one state had employed a professional evaluator to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of all of the state's special education programs and services. Additionally, the results were used at the local school levels to focus on program improvement, and teacher inservice training needs.

This brief review of the related literature regarding the utilization of program evaluation results revealed that there is some conflict among prevailing theories of evaluation utilization. As the author pointed out earlier in this chapter, much of the conflict tends to surround variations in definition of the key concept—utilization.

One theory posits that there is little use made of program evaluation results. Proponents of this view contended that effective utilization results in immediate impact or influence on decision-making. Dissentors of this view have contended that no such immediate impact is necessary. Instead, they claimed that incremental influence takes place and influence may not be immediately evident.

Another theory espoused during the last decade suggests that the problem is not non-utilization but under-utilization. One expert evaluator charged that non-utilization and under-utilization results from the school

administrator's inability to conceptualize the value of evaluation results.¹

The author takes the view that perhaps enough has been written about the theory of program evaluation utilization. What is needed now is for educators and evaluators to work together to produce the qualitative and quantitative evaluation data that will resolve the utilization conflict.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was basically a descriptive research study. Consequently, the author made every effort to conduct this study according to acceptable practices and procedures as described by various research scholars. Best concluded that:

A descriptive study describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trends that are developing.

The modes described by Best and Ary, et al. guided the conducting of this research. Special attention was given to their postulates with regard to constructing the survey questionnaire and the treatment of the data. With regard to the treatment of the data from the answers to the specific research questions, the model developed by Leedy was followed in this study.

This chapter presents the methods used to conduct this research which includes: (a) the research data, (b) the criteria for the admissibility of

---


3John W. Best. loc. cit., p. 166.

4Ibid.

the data, (c) the research population and the characteristics of the selected state, (d) the research procedure, (e) the development of the questionnaire, (f) research design and methods of data analysis, (g) specific treatment of the data for the research questions, and (h) the chapter summary.

The Research Data

The data used in this study were of two kinds: primary data and secondary data. A brief description of these data are provided below.

The Primary Data. The responses to the survey questionnaire comprised one type of primary data. Information obtained by the author during personal interviews with state and local special education program administrators and an executive director of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (an accrediting agency) comprised another type of primary data.

The Secondary Data. The secondary data consisted of published studies and texts, unpublished studies, dissertations, papers presented to professional conferences, newspaper articles, and local school system handbooks dealing with special education program evaluation practices and utilization. Also used was information obtained from local special education program administrators.

The Criteria for the Admissibility of the Data. The data collected by the survey questionnaire that was developed by the author and completed in accordance with the written instructions were used in this study. Information obtained by the author in the personal interviews with state and local special education administrators and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools was also included.
Only the responses of the respondents who identified themselves on the survey questionnaire as representing a local school system's special education program were included in this study.

The Research Population

The population for this research was comprised of the 159 county and the 28 independent school system special education administrators within the selected state. (See Appendix A) The 187 school systems provide a free education for all of the students attending the public schools in grades K-12. The selected state, the state of Georgia, is located within the southeastern region of the United States.

The respondents identified their job titles as follows: (1) assistant superintendents, (2) directors of special education, (3) directors of transportation/maintenance/special education, (4) coordinators of special programs, (5) coordinators of special education, (6) teachers, and (7) other. The other classification consisted of titles such as school psychologist, superintendent, visiting teacher/social worker, and special projects director. All of these persons were identified by the local school system superintendent as the official representative of the special education program in the school system where they were employed.

In this study, a census was taken. One hundred eight-seven questionnaires were used. From the population of a sample 187 potential respondents, admissible responses were returned from 137 individuals for a response rate of 183 percent. The response rate was computed by dividing the number of completed questionnaires (156) by the net sample size (187) which produced a response rate of 83 percent and an admissible response
rate of 74 percent. The responses of 17 of the respondents were discarded and not included in this research. Those 17 respondents gave insufficient data. Thirty-one of the potential respondents did not complete the questionnaire or they failed to return the completed instrument to the author.

**Characteristics of the Selected State**

For the purpose of this research, the author divided the selected state, Georgia, into three regions: (1) south, (2) middle, and (3) north. The state has a total population of approximately five million. Approximately 1.5 million of the residents attend the public schools within the state in grades K-twelve. Approximately 240,000 of these children are provided special education programs and services (approximately one-sixth of the student population).

**The Southern Region.** The southern region of the state comprises more than half of the state's farmlands. This region is commonly referred to as the rural section of the state. A large portion of the state's poor reside within the region. A small percentage of the state's white children attend private schools. Most of these schools were founded during the 60's during the civil rights movement to desegregate the public schools.

The major farm products of the region are peanuts, cotton, tobacco, and corn. However, due to the technological changes made in the farming industry over the past two decades, school attendance has not been affected by reason of students engaging in farming activities. Only a very few manufacturing plants and factories are located within the region.

**The Middle Region.** The middle region of the state comprises approximately 25 percent of the state's farmlands. The major farm products of
the region are grain and truck crops (vegetable crops). The economic status of the region has been enhanced by the presence of military facilities which provide employment for many residents of the region. The interstate highways and the close proximity of much of the region to the state's capital city and other larger cities provide the opportunity for many residents to seek employment outside the region.

As compared with the southern region, a larger percentage of the White children within the region attend private schools. Although this region had a large number of private schools over two decades ago, the number increased significantly during the latter 60's and early 70's.

The Northern Region. The northern region of the state comprises approximately 25 percent of the state's farmlands and more than 50 percent of its residents. The major agricultural products of the region are dairy products, grain, poultry, and truck crops.

The majority of the state's wealthiest cities, including the capital city with international recognition, are located within the region. The presence of four international highways and expressways, an international airport, military facilities, automobile plants, and other plants and factories enhance the economic status of the region. Even so, the majority of the state's poor Blacks are residents of the region and their unemployment rate is approximately double the national average. Conversely, the majority of the state's middle class Blacks as well as its registered voters also reside within the region.

The largest percentage of the state's White children attending private schools reside within this region. Whether this could be attributed to the economic status of the parents or other factors such as perceptions of the quality of the public schools or racial prejudices was not addressed by
this research.

A map of the selected state is exhibited in Appendix D. It should be remembered that these three regional divisions described above were drawn by the author for the purposes of this research.

The Research Procedure: Data Collection

This research utilized the survey method for collecting the data. This technique is also referred to as the self-report descriptive survey.¹

The survey questionnaire, commonly referred to as a schedule when completed in the presence of the researcher,² was precoded before placing it inside a large brown letter size envelope with a corresponding code number. The process of precoding and the use of the brown envelope were designed to facilitate the distribution and collection of the returns. Also included in the brown envelope was the cover letter which explained the purpose of the study, the potential use of the results, the value of the results to the respondents, and specific instructions for responding to the questionnaire items.

The researcher delivered the survey questionnaire packet to the respondents attending the first general session of the selected state's annual special education administrators' conference. The conference was conducted by the State Director of Special Education on March 26, 1981. Each of the 187 school system superintendents had been informed by letter


from the Assistant State Superintendent of Schools to send one local school system special education administrator to the conference to represent the local school system. One hundred eight-seven participants from local systems came and registered. The State Director of Special Education had given prior verbal approval for the researcher to attend the conference as a registered participant for the purpose of asking the local school systems' special education administrators to participate in this study by responding to the survey questionnaire.

One hundred eight-seven questionnaires were distributed. Of that number, 137 usable and 17 unusable responses were returned for a return rate of 83 percent. The questionnaire consisted of 32 items: thirty-one of the items were of the checklist type and one of the rating type.

Method of Screening the Collected Data

The completed questionnaires returned by the respondents were screened to eliminate those which did not meet the criteria for the admissibility of the data with respect to job title and those which were not completed according to the instructions. The questionnaires were organized according to the regional location of the school system—south, middle, and north regions.

The respondents were provided the option to indicate "other" as the regional location of their school systems. However, in selecting the option, respondents were asked to specify the region. The 17 respondents who elected the option "other" also specified the regional location. The author classified those 17 questionnaires, based upon the information provided by the respondents, as either south, middle, or north regions.
The Item Analysis Procedure

The total sample response data were treated first by performing an analysis of each item of the questionnaire. This process was needed in order to determine which responses had been made to each of the items in the survey questionnaire. The total number of persons within the sample who selected each response was converted to a percent value. That value was numerically compared with the number of like responses within each of the three regional groups. This data were then organized and presented as a composit, also in tabular form, using the various tools of descriptive statistics.

In drawing conclusions and making recommendations, the resulting values were compared to PL-94-142's special education evaluation criteria, and to some prevailing concepts of evaluation.

Development of the Questionnaire

In constructing the questionnaire, the author was guided by the model provided by Ary, et al. who concluded that there were at least twelve general characteristics of the well-constructed questionnaire with which the researcher should be concerned:

---

1 See Appendix A. See also: Clifford Howe and Marigail Fitzgerald, "Evaluating Special Education Programs" in Herbert Goldstein (ed.) Exceptional Children: A Reference Book (Failford, Conn.: Special Learning Corporation, 1978), pp. 21-29.


1. Construct the instrument in such a way that it reflects quality.

2. Keep the questionnaire as brief as possible so that it requires a minimum of the respondent's time.

3. Phrase questionnaire items so that they can be understood by every respondent.

4. Phrase questionnaire items so as to elicit unambiguous answers.

5. Phrase questionnaire items so as to avoid bias or prejudice that might predetermine a respondent's answer.

6. Questionnaire items should not mislead because of unstated assumptions.

7. Alternatives to the various questionnaire items should be exhaustive; that is, all the possible alternatives on the issue should be expressed.

8. Avoid questions that might elicit reactions of embarrassment, suspicion, or hostility in the respondent.

9. Arrange questions in correct psychological order.

10. Arrange questions in such a way that responses can be tabulated and interpreted readily.

11. A cover letter must accompany the questionnaire to explain the purpose and value of the study and the reason why the respondent was included in the study.

12. The respondents must be assured that their responses will be confidential.

A structured/closed survey questionnaire was designed by the researcher to collect the data needed to answer the research questions. It was patterned after an instrument developed by Wentling and Piland.  

---


2Tim L. Wentling and William E. Piland. "Local Evaluation Practices in Vocational Education", a paper presented to the American Vocational Education Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, December 8, 1980. The author used the instrument developed by Wentling and Piland as a model for developing the instrument for this study.
The draft copy of the instrument consisted of 27 check list and one rating-type item. The instrument is exhibited in Appendix E.

A pilot test of the instrument was conducted with two separate distinctly different groups at different intervals. The first pilot test was accomplished by submitting the first draft of the instrument to ten special education specialists who were not included in this research. The ten participants were not randomly selected. Five of the participants worked in the north region; three in the middle region; and two in the south region. They were selected on the basis of their agreement to participate in the pilot study. The revisions made in the instrument as a result of their suggestions may or may not have resulted in a clearer or more concise instrument for the selected population.

Consequently, the author made the decision to conduct a second pilot test. This test was accomplished by submitting the revised draft copy of the instrument to a panel of five "judges" with "presumed/actual expertise" to "judge the worth" of the instrument in terms of clarity, specificity, and ability to collect the data needed to answer the research questions described in the statement of the problem section of this dissertation.

The panel of judges consisted of: (1) the State Director of Special Education, (2) an assistant superintendent for vocational education and special services, (3) a senior analyst with a professional research organization, (4) a state planning and research coordinator, and (5) a university professor of education research. None of these five participants was aware that other individuals had been asked to make suggestions for possible revision of the instrument.

Three of the participants suggested the addition of the same three items to the instrument. Four of the participants suggest that the
demographic data section be changed from the last items on the questionnaire to the first items of the questionnaire. These suggestions were acceptable to the dissertation committee and to the author. The instrument in its final form contained 32 items instead of the original 29 items.

Research Design and Methods of Data Analysis

This was basically a descriptive research study, using the census methodology. Consequently, an effort was made to collect data from each and every member of the selected population. The major analysis techniques used in this research were such descriptive statistics as frequencies, means, and percentages.

In the final analysis, the researcher was guided by the models and theoretical constructs established by Ary, et al. and Leedy for descriptive research design and for the treatment of data in the research. These two models were selected by the author on the basis of the wide range of acceptance that their works have received from the research and education communities. Providing additional confidence for the author's choice of a model for this research was the concrete evidence that Ary, et al. and Leedy's models had been used extensively and successfully by doctoral

---

1 Ary, et al. *Introduction to Research*, pp. 311-312


The five questions answered by this research are restated below:

1. What local evaluation activities in special education programs have been conducted within the selected state?

2. Who has been involved in the conducting of evaluation for local special education programs in the selected state?

3. What has happened to the results of the evaluation of local special education programs after they had been obtained?

4. Have the results of the evaluation of local special education programs been used in significant ways? If so, to what degree has the use of the results had an impact upon the current or future nature of the program?

5. How consistent have the evaluation practices of local special education programs in the selected state been with regard to prevailing evaluation theories of what the practices should be?

The Data Used to Answer the Research Questions

The major data used to answer the five research questions were the responses of the selected special education administrators to the items of the survey questionnaire. The data were organized and classified according to the demographic data resulting from the responses of the respondents. More specifically, the data used to answer the research questions were as follows:

1. The first question was answered by the data, resulting from the respondents' responses to item 13 of the survey questionnaire.
2. The second question was answered primarily by the data, resulting from the respondents' responses to item 15 of the questionnaire. The additional data used to answer the second question were the respondent's responses to items 9, 10, 11, and 12 of the same instrument. These data were used because the respondents' knowledge and perceptions of the local school systems' policy with regard to practice were important considerations in the analysis of the data.

3. The third question was answered by the data, resulting from the respondents' responses to items 16 and 17 of the survey questionnaire.

4. The fourth question was answered by the data, resulting from the respondents' responses to item 18 of the survey questionnaire.

5. The fifth question was answered by the data, resulting from the respondents' responses to items 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, and 23.

The additional questionnaire items were used as supportive information for the research questions and to provide ancillary information which gave rise to some global concerns of special education program evaluation.

Once the treatment of the data had been completed, the author compared the findings with the prescription of PL-94-142 and the recommendations of authorities in evaluation. This process was achieved by identifying the major components of PL-94-142, (twenty-five components were identified by the author and are included in the evaluation outline located in Chapter Five as a recommendation), and by reviewing the related literature. After the literature review had been completed, two additional components not covered by PL-94-142 were added to the evaluation outline. These two components, "Meta Evaluation" and "the politics of program evaluation" have been identified as critical areas of concern for program evaluation by several authorities in evaluation.

All of these data and information were organized and presented in tabular form to permit the reader to observe the relationship between
PL-94-142 and the recommendations of several authorities in evaluation.

The procedure used to organize these data are as follows:

1. The 25 major components of PL-94-142 were identified and listed in column one of Table 16.

2. Several authorities in evaluation who had addressed each of the components of PL-94-142 were listed in column two.

3. The data collected with the survey questionnaire were ranked in order to identify the three most prevalent practices in special education program evaluation. These data were identified and listed in column three.

4. The authorities in evaluation identified in table 16 were listed in alphabetical order in column one.

5. A summary of the literature of these authorities in evaluation regarding the various components were written and provided in column two.

6. The merit or criteria for selecting the recommendations of the authorities were identified and listed in column three.

The Location of the Data

All the data needed to answer the five research questions were located within the personal knowledge base of the respondents who participated in this research.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was an investigation of local evaluation practices in special education programs within a selected state as compared to the prescriptions of PL-94-142 and the recommendations of authorities in evaluation.

More specifically, answers were sought to the following research questions:

1. What local evaluation activities in special education programs were conducted within the selected state during 1980?

2. Who was involved in the conducting of evaluation of local special education programs in the selected state?

3. What happened to the results of the evaluation of local special education programs after they were obtained?

4. Have the results of the evaluation of local special education programs been used in significant ways? If so, to what degree has the use of the results had an impact upon the current or future nature of the program?

5. How consistent have the evaluation practices of local special education programs in the selected state been with regard to PL-94-142 and the prevailing evaluation theories of what the practices and utilization of results should be?
This chapter is devoted to the presentation and analysis of the data collected for this study for the purpose of answering the five research questions stated above.

For the sake of clarity and to permit the interested reader to compare a specific special education program and its environment to similar local programs as were identified in the selected state, the reader will find that much of the data will be presented by regions as well as for the state at large. The interested reader should review Chapter III of this study—"Characteristics of the Selected State"—to be reminded of the distinct characteristics of each of the three regions.

The author wishes to remind the reader that the primary data for this study were collected with a survey questionnaire that was administered to the official special education administrators of the 187 school systems within the selected state. Some additional primary data were collected through personal interviews with three administrators with responsibilities for program evaluation within the selected state or within their respective organizations.

The primary data collected with the survey questionnaires are presented here, followed by the data collected through the personal interviews. Copies of these instruments are located in Appendix E and Appendix C.

Local Evaluation Practices

In order to identify the local evaluation practices in education within the selected state, it was first necessary to determine what
special education activities had been conducted and how the data had been collected for these activities. These data were obtained from questions on a survey questionnaire that was developed by the author. The questionnaire listed thirteen specific evaluation activities for the responding sample to select or identify as those which the local school had conducted. Space was also provided for the addition of one unspecified evaluation activity that might have been conducted during 1980 for a total of fourteen possible activities. In addition, seven items were listed regarding the methods used to collect the data. Space was provided for the responding sample to add another method that might have been used to collect data for the local evaluation. A total of eight possible methods were used at the local level.

Table 1 presents these data graphically. In the south region, the author observed that only three of the fourteen activities were used by a large majority of the population. Two of these activities focused on the school personnel and only one on the students. The one activity focusing on students was related to the identification of handicapped students in need of special education services.

Table 1 further reveals that in the middle region of the selected state an overwhelming majority of the school systems focused their evaluation activities on the same three as did the south region. None of the remaining eleven activities were used by a large number of the school systems.

A closer look at Table 1 permits one to observe a somewhat different pattern in the north region. A large majority of school systems engaged in four of the fourteen evaluation activities, and to a somewhat lesser degree, many systems engaged in three additional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Development</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Find Activities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Instruction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an Evaluation System</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Student Services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Instructional Materials</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Facilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Curriculum</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Career and Vocational Programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Outcome Analysis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Follow-Up</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activities. One can observe also that a fairly large number of school systems focused some attention on students and the school environment in the north region.

Table 1 also permits the reader to observe the state at large in terms of the evaluation activities conducted within the selected state. The pattern is similar throughout the state. Only three of the evaluation activities were conducted by at least 50 percent of the population. These were the same three activities conducted by a large majority of the school systems in the south and middle regions—personnel development, personnel performance evaluation, and Child Find activities.

Since educational practices and activities are influenced by many factors within and outside the local school, it was deemed important to this study to observe the patterns of some of these factors in the local school systems. The factors considered to be valid areas of inquiry for this study have been categorized as follows:

(a) Methods and techniques used to collect the evaluation

(b) Purposes or reasons for conducting the local evaluation

(c) Local school policy and procedures regarding the conducting of the evaluation

(d) Methods by which the school system's special educational personnel are informed of the school policy

(e) State policy regarding the conducting of the local evaluation

(f) Methods by which the local school's special education personnel learn of the state policy regarding evaluation

(g) Special education personnel's perception of
the requirements of the state policy

(h) Frequency of the local evaluation of the special education program

(i) Types of program evaluation conducted

(j) Evaluation model used to conduct the local evaluation

(k) Local special education personnel's perceptions of barriers which impede or inhibit local special education program evaluation.

In order to give the reader a very graphic view of the data collected regarding these factors, the author presents this information in tabular, graph, or chart form in the several pages to follow, beginning with Table 2.

Table 2 permits the reader to examine the evaluation instruments, techniques, and tools used by the school systems to collect local special education program evaluation data.

As one can observe in Table 2, the most frequently used methods, techniques, and tools for collecting local evaluation data for the state at large were self-reports such as checklists, rating scales, questionnaires, and interviews (71.5%). The second and third methods and tools frequently used by the school systems were personal products such as samples of work, tests (61.3%), and written accounts such as observation forms completed by independent observers (59.9%). One can further observe in Table 2 that mechanical devices (15.3%), unobtrusive measures (24.1%), on-site visiting committees (25.5%), and the review and analysis of existing data (5.1%) were not used by many of the school systems.

A closer look at Table 2 permits one to observe the pattern within and among the three regional school districts. As one can see, the
TABLE 2

TECHNIQUES BY WHICH LOCAL SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION DATA WERE COLLECTED WITHIN THE SELECTED STATE BY REGIONS AND FOR THE STATE AT LARGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques/Methodology/Instruments</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reports, i.e., Checklists, Diary, Rating Scales, Questionnaires, and Interviews</td>
<td>28 70.0</td>
<td>38 76</td>
<td>35 74.5</td>
<td>98 71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Products, i.e., Samples of Work, Tests</td>
<td>20 50.0</td>
<td>39 78</td>
<td>28 59.6</td>
<td>84 61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Accounts, Observation Forms Completed by Independent Observer</td>
<td>22 55.0</td>
<td>28 56</td>
<td>33 70.2</td>
<td>82 59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Visiting Committee/Personal Interviews</td>
<td>9 22.5</td>
<td>9 18</td>
<td>18 38.3</td>
<td>35 25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unobtrusive Measures</td>
<td>9 22.5</td>
<td>11 22</td>
<td>10 21.3</td>
<td>33 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Devices, i.e., Audio or Video</td>
<td>4 10.0</td>
<td>9 18</td>
<td>8 17</td>
<td>21 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Analysis of Existing Data</td>
<td>2 5.0</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
<td>7 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
north region made far greater use of on-site visiting committees and the personal interview technique (38.3%) than did either the middle (18.0%) or south (22.5%) regions. Conversely, it is important to note that the three regions were about evenly divided in the use of unobtrusive measures to collect evaluation data—south (22.5%), middle (22.0%), and north (21.3%).

Table 3 provides a global view of the purposes or reasons for which the local school systems conduct evaluation of the special education program. These data are presented now.

The most important observation the author can make regarding these data centers around the large number (75.2%) of the respondents who conduct local evaluations of special education to meet state requirements or because it is perceived as a state policy. However, no such state policy exists.¹

Table 3 further reveals that a large percentage of the school systems conduct program evaluation to meet the requirements of PL-94-142 (71.5%). Conversely, little more than half of the school systems (57.7%) conduct evaluation because of an interest in improving programs. A somewhat smaller percentage (55.5%) of the school systems conduct program evaluation in response to administrative directives.

Table 4 reveals that approximately half of the school systems within the selected state have a local evaluation policy, with the middle region having a slightly higher percentage than the other two.

¹These findings were so overwhelming that the author contacted the State Coordinator for the special education monitoring program to confirm that the selected state has no such policy requiring the local school systems to evaluate special education programs.
**TABLE 3**

PURPOSES OR REASONS FOR WHICH THE LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEMS CONDUCT
THE LOCAL EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
BY REGIONS AND FOR THE STATE AT LARGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes/Reasons</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets State Requirement</td>
<td>29 72.5</td>
<td>41 82</td>
<td>34 72.3</td>
<td>103 75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
<td>29 72.5</td>
<td>35 70</td>
<td>35 74.5</td>
<td>98 71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Improving Program</td>
<td>21 52.5</td>
<td>27 54</td>
<td>30 63.8</td>
<td>79 57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Direction</td>
<td>17 42.5</td>
<td>35 70</td>
<td>25 53.2</td>
<td>76 55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System Policy</td>
<td>9 22.5</td>
<td>20 40</td>
<td>15 31.9</td>
<td>44 32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to Improve Program</td>
<td>13 32.5</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>16 34.0</td>
<td>39 28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Visitation Suggestion</td>
<td>11 27.5</td>
<td>13 26</td>
<td>9 19.1</td>
<td>33 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Purposes</td>
<td>4 10.0</td>
<td>9 18</td>
<td>8 17.0</td>
<td>21 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify Program</td>
<td>5 12.5</td>
<td>8 16</td>
<td>5 10.6</td>
<td>19 13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
<td>3 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>South Region (N=40)</td>
<td>Middle Region (N=50)</td>
<td>North Region (N=50)</td>
<td>State at Large (N=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows that the most frequently used method for informing special education personnel about the policy was through some media initiated by the local school system's superintendent (28.5%). It is important to note that 44.5% of the respondents did not respond to this item on the questionnaire.

Table 6 shows that the overwhelming majority of the respondents for the state at large reported an awareness of a state policy requiring local evaluation of special education programs. The selected state for this study does not have an evaluation policy. Perhaps the respondents are confusing the regulations of PL-94-142 regarding program evaluation with state policy. Table 6 permits the reader to observe that better than 90 percent of the respondents stated an awareness of a nonexisting policy.

Table 7 reveals some interesting facts regarding the state policy requiring local evaluation of special education programs. In the south region, 60 percent of the respondents learned of the nonexisting policy at a state in-service meeting, while 56 percent in the middle region and 48.9 percent in the north region also learned about the nonexisting policy during a state in-service meeting. A closer look at Table 7 shows that 75.1 percent of the respondents, which represent approximately 83 percent of the total state population of special education administrators, had received from some source erroneous information about the existence of a state policy regarding the evaluation of special education programs.

Table 8 reveals that the majority of the school systems within the selected state conducted process (83.2%) and context (75.9%) evaluations
### TABLE 5
METHODS BY WHICH THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED THEY HAD LEARNED ABOUT THE LOCAL SCHOOL POLICY REGARDING THE CONDUCTING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION BY REGIONS AND FOR THE STATE AT LARGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>19 47.5</td>
<td>21 42</td>
<td>21 44.7</td>
<td>61 44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Superintendent</td>
<td>10 25.0</td>
<td>20 40</td>
<td>9 19.1</td>
<td>39 28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Policy Development</td>
<td>7 17.5</td>
<td>7 14</td>
<td>12 25.5</td>
<td>26 19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>4 8.5</td>
<td>6 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Meeting</td>
<td>3 7.5</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
<td>5 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Minutes</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6
RESPONDENTS' AWARENESS OF A STATE POLICY REQUIRING
EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
BY REGIONS AND FOR THE STATE AT LARGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aware of Policy</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 7

**METHOD BY WHICH RESPONDENTS REPORTED HAVING LEARNED OF THE STATE POLICY REQUIRING THE EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY REGIONS AND FOR THE STATE AT LARGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State In-Service Meeting</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from State Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types</td>
<td>South Region (N=40)</td>
<td>Middle Region (N=50)</td>
<td>North Region (N=47)</td>
<td>State at Large (N=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as opposed to input and product evaluations. There were no other distinctly discernible patterns among the three regions as reflected in table 8.

Table 9 reveals that the evaluation models most frequently used by the local school systems within the selected state were SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) (59.8%) and locally developed (53.2%). The third most frequently used model was identified by the respondents as the state model. Once again the reader is reminded that the selected state does not have a special education program evaluation model. However, the state's program monitoring model was patterned after the SACS evaluation model.

Table 10 shows that the majority of the respondents perceived the major barriers to the conducting of local evaluation of special education programs as lack of faculty time (74.5%), lack of appropriate funding (53.3%), and faculty attitudes (46.7%). It is important to note that the percentage of the three regions identifying fear of evaluation results and lack of evaluation expertise were about equal, while failure to see how evaluation would lead to improvements shows twice the percentage in the south region.

**Individuals Involved in the Evaluation**

In order to make some type of definitive statement regarding the local school systems' openness to and spirit of cooperation with the local school community, data were collected to identify the range of the involvement of the school staff and the community in the evaluation of special education programs.

Before examining the range of involvement by the various school
TABLE 9
A LIST OF THE EVALUATION MODELS USED WITHIN THE SELECTED STATE
BY REGIONS AND FOR THE STATE AT LARGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACS Model</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Developed Model</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Developed Model</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Developed by Consultant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted Another's Model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Model</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>South Region (N=40)</td>
<td>Middle Region (N=50)</td>
<td>North Region (N=47)</td>
<td>State at Large (N=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Time</td>
<td>26 65.0</td>
<td>41 82</td>
<td>34 72.3</td>
<td>102 74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Funding</td>
<td>20 50.0</td>
<td>27 54</td>
<td>25 53.2</td>
<td>73 53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Attitude</td>
<td>16 40.0</td>
<td>26 52</td>
<td>22 46.8</td>
<td>64 46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Results</td>
<td>8 20.0</td>
<td>13 26</td>
<td>10 21.3</td>
<td>31 22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Evaluation Expertise</td>
<td>9 22.5</td>
<td>11 22</td>
<td>11 23.4</td>
<td>31 22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Competent Assistance</td>
<td>6 15.0</td>
<td>13 26</td>
<td>11 23.4</td>
<td>30 21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy about What Constitutes Evaluation</td>
<td>7 17.5</td>
<td>13 26</td>
<td>9 19.1</td>
<td>29 21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriateness of Existing Evaluation Models</td>
<td>8 20.0</td>
<td>14 28</td>
<td>6 12.8</td>
<td>28 20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to See How Evaluation Would Lead to Improvements</td>
<td>12 30.0</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>7 14.9</td>
<td>24 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Local Policy</td>
<td>6 15.0</td>
<td>8 16</td>
<td>2 6.4</td>
<td>17 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Higher Level Administrative Support</td>
<td>4 10.0</td>
<td>7 14</td>
<td>2 4.3</td>
<td>13 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
<td>3 2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
publics in the local evaluation of special education programs, it was deemed important to see which individuals at the local school level had major responsibility for evaluation of special education programs. While there is no rule by which to measure the level of participation in school affairs with the job title or position, it is generally agreed that the higher the position is, the less involvement there is of subordinate and various individuals and groups representing the school community.

Table 11 depicts the information regarding the position of the individual with major responsibility for program evaluation. A closer look at Table 11 reveals that for the state at large, the respondents reported that someone other than the individuals listed have major responsibility for program evaluation (27.7%). The research staff (26.3%), and the local school superintendent (22.6%) were the other two individuals/staff with major responsibility for program evaluation.

Table 12 permits the author to make some significant observations regarding the range of involvement in the local evaluation by the various school publics. By referring to Table 11, one can observe that the research staff, the local school superintendent, and others had major responsibility for program evaluation.

Table 12, on the other hand, reveals that, without exception, special education teachers, supervisors, and the local school principals were the only three groups with 80 percent or better involvement. It is important to note, however, that the south region shows a relatively high level (37.5%) of involvement by regular counselors. Likewise, Table 12 also reveals that there was some noteworthy involvement in the evaluation by regular classroom teachers in the south (55%) and the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development Staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Superintendent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I do&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Special Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Special Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>South Region (N=40)</td>
<td>Middle Region (N=50)</td>
<td>North Region (N=47)</td>
<td>State at Large (N=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teachers</td>
<td>32 80.0</td>
<td>42 84</td>
<td>41 87.2</td>
<td>115 82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Principals</td>
<td>31 77.5</td>
<td>35 70</td>
<td>32 68.1</td>
<td>98 71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Supervisors</td>
<td>23 57.5</td>
<td>31 62</td>
<td>37 78.7</td>
<td>91 66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>22 55.0</td>
<td>13 26</td>
<td>19 40.4</td>
<td>54 39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>13 32.5</td>
<td>19 38</td>
<td>17 36.2</td>
<td>49 35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular School Counselors</td>
<td>15 37.5</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>11 23.4</td>
<td>36 26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Teachers</td>
<td>10 25.0</td>
<td>12 24</td>
<td>10 21.3</td>
<td>32 23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>9 22.5</td>
<td>11 22</td>
<td>12 25.5</td>
<td>32 23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors</td>
<td>13 32.5</td>
<td>7 14</td>
<td>7 14.9</td>
<td>27 19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Education Personnel</td>
<td>8 20.0</td>
<td>7 14</td>
<td>5 10.6</td>
<td>20 14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>7 17.5</td>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>3 6.4</td>
<td>15 10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Just Me&quot;</td>
<td>4 10.0</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>2 4.3</td>
<td>10 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
<td>3 2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
north (40.4%) regions. Conversely, it is important to notice the relatively moderate range of participation in the local evaluation by parents and students and the extremely low range of participation by the general public in all three regions. There is a pattern, however. A closer look at Table 12 shows that there is very little difference between the percentages for the parent and student groups as represented by the three regions.

The regional patterns are reflected in the state at large. Special education teachers (82.2%), special education supervisors (66.4%), and school principals (71.5%) maintained an important level of involvement in the evaluation of special education programs, while all other groups maintained a moderate or low level of involvement.

What Happened to the Evaluation Results

As noted earlier in this chapter, the author was interested in observing the local school systems' practices in special education. In addition to observing the pattern regarding the involvement of the various school publics and the school community in the evaluation, it was deemed important to determine whether the school system shared the local evaluation results with the school publics—including those who had been involved in the evaluation. These data are presented here.

Table 13 shows that the local school superintendent, the State Department of Education, local school principals, and special education teachers were the primary recipients of local evaluation activities. In the state at large, school superintendents had an 89.8 percent receipt rate; local school principals, a 74.5 percent rate; and special
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals/Groups</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local School Superintendent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Principals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teachers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State Department of Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Administrators</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Supervisors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local School Board</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
education teachers, a 62 percent rate. It is important to note that the state at large shows that special education teachers were more likely to receive the local evaluation results than were the special education administrators whose receipt rate was a modest 50.4 percent.

Further examination of Table 13 reveals that parents, students, and other significant school publics only received local evaluation results at a relatively moderate or low rate. The local school board, for example, did not receive local evaluation results at a 50 percent level or better. In fact, none of the groups not previously discussed approached the 50 percent rate for the state at large. Another noteworthy observation is the relatively low rate (24.1%) of receipt by school counselors who as Table 12 shows had a moderate rate of involvement (26.3%) in the evaluation process.

Learning which individual received the local evaluation results was important to this study was observing how the local evaluation results were disseminated to the various school publics. Table 14 permits one to observe that there was no distinctly discernible pattern in this regard. What is important is the extremely high number of individuals who reported that "other" methods were used to disseminate evaluation results for two of the three regions—south (87.5%) and north (93.6%). The pattern remained stable for the state at large.

**Significant Uses of Evaluation Results and the Degree of Success Obtained**

In order to observe the significant ways in which local evaluation results had been utilized and to examine the perceptions of the users of the evaluation results as to the degree of success obtained, the author
TABLE 14
SOME METHODS USED FOR REPORTING LOCAL EVALUATION
RESULTS TO THE SCHOOL PUBLICS BY REGIONS
AND FOR THE STATE AT LARGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Document</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Report</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Report</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results not Shared</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
noted that it was first necessary to provide a graphic picture of the range of use made of the results. These data are depicted in Table 15.

Table 15 shows that the greatest use made of local evaluation results for the state at large was for informing administrators (84.7%). The second and third highest uses were for staff development purposes (77.4%) and for program improvement (76.6%). Sixty-two percent of the respondents used local evaluation results for making curricular changes while 54 percent used the results for informing parents. Likewise, evaluation results were used by 54 percent of the respondents for supporting equipment requests and 51.7 percent for expanding support services. The reader may observe the relatively small use of local evaluation results for informing the general public (26.3%) and for discontinuing programs (22.6%). In addition, one can observe that only 5.1 percent of the respondents listed other significant uses that had been made with local evaluation results.

A closer look at Table 15 reveals that there were only a few variances in practice among the three regions. By disregarding the size of the regions and concentrating on the percentages, one can observe that school district practices differed most regarding the use of evaluation results in two areas—for informing the general public and for supporting equipment requests. In the south region, for example, one can observe that 37.5 percent of the school systems have the practice of using evaluation results for informing the general public, whereas in the middle region only 18 percent, and in the north region a low moderate 25.5 percent have that practice. Regarding the practice of using evaluation results for supporting equipment requests, both the middle (48%) and the south (47.5%) regions showed a moderate use in this
TABLE 15

SIGNIFICANT USES MADE OF LOCAL EVALUATION RESULTS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS WITHIN THE SELECTED STATE BY REGIONS AND FOR THE STATE AT LARGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>South Region (N=40)</th>
<th>Middle Region (N=50)</th>
<th>North Region (N=47)</th>
<th>State at Large (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing Administrators</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Purposes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Improvement</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Curricular Changes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Equipment Requests</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing Parents</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Support Services</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing General Public</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuing Programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Purposes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
manner while the north group (68.1%) showed a fairly high use.

To obtain information regarding the degree of success obtained in using local evaluation results for the purposes depicted in Table 15, the respondents were asked to rank the degree of success in using the evaluation results on a scale of 1 to 5—1 being the lowest and 5 the highest score. These data are reported in terms of the number of respondents who selected each of three degrees of success—low, moderate, and high. A score of 1 to 2 was judged low; 3 was judged moderate; and 4-5 was judged high.

When one looks at the degree of success the various regions and the state at large obtained in the use of local evaluation results as listed in Table 15 it is important to remember that success as a factor is relative. Thus, the author will simply report the success factor data in terms of either low success, moderate success, or high success as reported by the respondents.

First of all the data for successful use show that out of the first seven items ranked in Table 15, sixty-five percent of the respondents, on average, considered their use of evaluation results very successful. The last three items, on the other hand, were used by a relatively small number of respondents and the success factor was correspondingly low. Second of all, the higher the use made of the evaluation results the greater the success identified with that use, on average.

Item 1 in Table 15 was concerned with the use of local evaluation results for informing administrators. Of the 116 individuals who used evaluation results for this purpose, only six experienced low success; 15, moderate success; and 95, high success.

Item 2 in Table 15 was concerned with the use of evaluation results
for staff development purposes. Of the 106 individuals who reported using evaluation results in this way, only 11 experienced low success; 19 experienced moderate success and 76 percent, high success. Evaluation results, the correspondingly higher rating of success, on average.

Item 3 in Table 15 centered around the use of evaluation results for program improvement purposes. Of the 105 individuals who reported using the results in this way, only seven experienced low success; 24 experienced moderate success and 74, high success.

Item 4 in Table 15 concerns the use of local evaluation results for making curricular changes. In the state at large, of the 85 individuals who reported using local evaluation results in this way only 11 experienced low success; 33 experienced moderate success, while 41 experienced high success.

Item 5 in Table 15 involved the use of evaluation results for supporting equipment requests. Of the 75 who reported using the results in this manner, only nine experienced low success; of the rest, 23 had moderate success and 43 had high success.

Item 6 in Table 15 involved the use of evaluation results for informing parents. Of the 74 individuals using the results in this manner, only 14 experienced low success; of the rest, 29 had moderate success and 31 had high success.

Item 7 in Table 15 centered around the use of evaluation results for expanding support services. Of the 70 individuals who reported using the results for this purpose, only six experienced low success; 14 experienced moderate success and 50, high success.

Item 8 in Table 15 concerns the use of evaluation results for the purpose of informing the general public. Only 36 reported using the
results in this way. Thirteen of these experienced low success, eight experienced moderate success, and 15 experienced high success.

Item 9 in Table 15 was concerned with using evaluation results for discontinuing programs. Of the 31 individuals using the results for this purpose a majority (19) had a low level of success; five had moderate success and only 7 had high success.

Item 10 in Table 15 sought information regarding some additional ways that the local school systems had used local evaluation results. Only seven individuals reported using evaluation results for purposes other than those discussed in items one through nine above. Of these seven, four experienced low success, and the remaining three experienced high success.

**Information Obtained Through Personal Interviews**

In the fall of 1980, the author conducted personal interviews with three educational administrators who were either directly responsible for giving direction and purpose to the evaluation of programs in the public school or their positions allowed them to influence local evaluation practices within the selected state.

During the interviews with these administrators, some primary data and information were obtained which directly relate to this study. More specifically, some of the data obtained through the interviews were directly related to the research questions.

The major purposes of the interviews were to obtain information
regarding these administrators' perceptions of program evaluation and to learn how they conducted their program evaluation activities.

The information obtained through the personal interviews can be presented primarily under the following topics which are germane to the research questions of this study: Evaluation Activities, Individuals Involved in the Evaluation, and Utilization of Evaluation Results.

The interview format and the specific questions for the interview can be located in Appendix F and Appendix C. As mentioned in Chapter III, certain specific items of the survey questionnaire were used to provide the information to answer the research questions.

**Evaluation Activities**

These three administrators generally agreed that their evaluation programs did not fit the criteria for program evaluation as prescribed by evaluation experts and scholars. There was some concern that program evaluation experts have been so involved in their efforts to obtain a professional status for the expert evaluator that little or no time and effort has been devoted to developing models and guides that could be utilized at the local school level by local school staffs. In fact, one administrator noted that many expert evaluators and scholars discounted the notion that professional peers possessed the expertise, skill, and knowledge to assess the value of an educational program.¹

Program evaluation activities have been hampered by numerous problems associated with the implementation of PL-94-142. A significant

---

¹Interview with James Stiltner. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Atlanta, Georgia, November 14, 1980.
amount of time that could and should be devoted to program evaluation,
staff development, curriculum development, etc., was being spent in
discussions with school attorneys, collecting data for the hearing
officer, testifying in court litigations, and reading and re-reading the
law and the agency's own procedures in order to implement the mandates
of PL-94-142.

Developing, implementing, and coordinating the monitoring program
documents, coordinating/conducting the on-site visits, and reporting to
local school superintendents and special education principals comprised
the major evaluation activities of one of the agencies.¹

It is not the agency's purpose to evaluate programs.

The agency conducts institutional evaluations for which educational
programs are an important component. In the process of evaluating
educational programs, personal interviews are frequently used/conducted
with staffs, students and community people; documents are read, studied,
and compared with what this committee observed during the on-site
visitations.²

Some of the most frequently used evaluation activities conducted at
the local level included assessing student change, assessing adminis-
trators, teachers, parents, students, and the community's satisfaction
with the evaluation program, and assessing school and community inter-
actions.³

¹ Interview with Larry Gallaway, Georgia Department fo Education,
Atlanta, Georgia, December 3, 1980.

² Ibid.

³ Interview with Nan Hughes, Fulton County School System, Atlanta,
Georgia, December 3, 1980.
Almost without exception, these administrators defended the use of professional peers with "presumed expertise" to pass judgment on the worth of educational programs. Conversely, there was general agreement that there was a need for local evaluation activities to focus more on obtaining quantifiable data and information in order to measure the effects—anticipated and unanticipated—on student achievement.

Individuals Involved in the Evaluation

It was evident that these administrators were fully aware of the benefits to be derived by the local school and the community from a cooperative effort regarding program evaluation. Each administrator spoke about the wide range of school and community involvement in the evaluation process. But without exception, there was concern that many parents did not take advantage of the opportunity to participate.

One of the standards for Georgia Public Schools relates to the involvement of the school community in the affairs of the local school. The local school P.T.A. is one example of how the local community provides input and feedback to the decision-making process at the local level.¹

The school system's policy statement provides for the inclusion of special education staffs, local administrators, parents of handicapped students, and students in the evaluation process. The satisfaction of these school publics with their involvement is a major concern in the evaluation process.²

---

¹Interview with James Stiltner

²Interview with Nan Hughes
The monitoring program provides for the involvement of the special education teachers, administrators, parents, and the school diagnostic staff in the evaluation of the local school program. Information regarding their involvement is obtained through personal interviews.  

Utilization of Evaluation Results

The administrators acknowledged that some important uses had been made of local evaluation results but that in terms of some significant potential uses that should and could be made of the results, much needs to be done. The practice of using local evaluation results almost exclusively to meet certain laws or regulations was a common concern. There was also concern that evaluation results were used extensively for informing administrators.

The school system uses local evaluation results to monitor the local school's compliance with PL-94-142 for program improvement and for informing administrators and parents. 

The evaluation results are mainly used to monitor the local school system's compliance with PL-94-142 for funding of staff and other resources and to support the annual budget request that must be submitted to the Georgia Legislature for approval.

The evaluation results are used to determine whether the local school meets the Georgia standards for public education, inform the local administrators and staff, or inform the State Education Commission of the school's standings regarding the state's educational standards.

---

1 Larry Galloway
2 Nan Hughes
3 Larry Galloway
4 James Stiltner
What Happened to Local Evaluation Results

The interviewees agreed that the local evaluation results had been disseminated to the various audiences for whom the evaluation was intended. This dissemination generally tended more toward those individuals who had commissioned the evaluation and the school staff who had been directly involved in the evaluation process than toward the general public—the owners of the local schools.

The committee usually makes a formal oral and written report to the school administrator who commissioned the evaluation and to the State Education Standards Commission.  

An exit interview is conducted by the on-site visiting committee with the superintendent of schools and "any other school" personnel on the third and final day of the on-site visit. Program strengths, weaknesses, and discrepancies are pointed out. In addition, recommendations, suggestions, and commendations are also made. The state superintendent receives the final report and the sharing of the results and programmatic decision rests with the State Superintendent of Schools and the State Board of Education.

The reader is once again reminded that one of the major purposes for conducting the personal interviews was to learn how the three agencies that the three interviewees represented carried out local evaluations—the agencies' practices. Also, the reader is reminded that the three agencies represented by the interviewees exert great influence

---

1 James Stiltner

2 Larry Galloway
on education evaluation practices throughout the selected state for this study. Bilyue's comments are germane to this study.

...The Georgia Department of Education does not have a special education evaluation program. What we do have is a PL-94-142 monitoring program....We hope to develop a proposal to try to get funding support to develop and implement an evaluation program for the State by 1982. ¹

For the benefit of the interested reader, the writer will now present some ancillary data. It was determined that these data were important to the development of a conceptual framework for understanding the local evaluation practices within the selected state. These data are presented under the following topics:

- Demographic data
- Policy data
- Staffing data
- Budget data

Demographic Data

The respondents reported that the handicapped student enrollment for the state at large was approximately 200 thousand in grades K-12 during 1980, with the largest handicapped student population concentrated in the north region. The majority of the school systems reported to have been providing special education for handicapped students for more than fifteen years. However, only a small percentage of the school systems reported having conducted local evaluation of special education prior to 1975.

¹ Telephone conversation with Dr. Arthur Bilyue, Director of Special Education, Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, September, 1980.
Policy Data

As reported earlier in this study, a large percentage of the respondents reported having an awareness of a state policy (no such policy exists) requiring local program evaluation. It is important to note that the respondents identified several categories in which the state requirements for evaluation fall. Most of these categories are included in the state's PL-94-142 Monitoring Program. However, only a fraction of the respondents identified individuals or groups with whom they had shared the state policy or the method used for sharing the state policy.

Staffing Data

As pointed out by the author in this chapter, educational practices are influenced by a number of factors in the environment. An overwhelming majority of the respondents reported that the local school system did not employ an expert program evaluator, and a slightly smaller percentage reported that the local school system did not provide competent consultant assistance.

Budget Data

More than half of the respondents reported that less than half of the local school systems had education program evaluation budgets, while an even larger percentage reported no budgets for special education. Of the relatively small percentage of the groups that reported having a special education program evaluation budget, approximately 90 percent identified the local school system as the source of funding.
The reader is reminded that the information provided by the respondents regarding the program evaluation budget did not reveal any distinct discernible pattern for the state at large. What the study did reveal was that some school systems had program evaluation budgets but that the special education programs frequently did not share in the distribution of the local school system's evaluation budget.

It is important for the reader to know that the respondents identified the three most important ways in which they would expend a limited amount of resources, if given the opportunity.

More than half of the respondents would use limited resources for program evaluation, while less than a majority would use limited resources for course evaluation. It is important for the reader to know that only 12 of the respondents would use limited resources for advisory committee purposes; a little over fifty percent would use limited resources for student assessment; and a very small fraction of the respondents would use limited resources for new equipment purposes. Conversely, a large percentage would use limited resources for program improvement.

Again, one can see the respondents rejecting the practice of involving the community in the affairs of the school. Only 15 responded favorably to this item. Likewise, one can see a lack of student concern on the part of the respondents, as only 18 indicated that they would use limited resources for student counseling.

Finally, there was little interest in using limited funds for materials and supplies.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to investigate the current (1980) evaluation practices in special education programs in the selected state, comparing them with the prescriptions of PL-94-142 and the recommendations of prominent authorities in the field of evaluation.

More specifically, this research sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What local evaluation activities in special education programs were conducted within the selected state during 1980?

2. Who was involved in the conducting of evaluation of local special education programs in the selected state?

3. What happened to the results of the evaluation of local special education programs after they were obtained?

4. Have the results of the evaluation of local special education programs been used in significant ways? If so, to what degree has the use of the results had an impact upon the current or future nature of the program?

5. How consistent have the evaluation practices of local special education programs in the selected state been with regard to PL-94-142 and the prevailing evaluation theories of what the practices and utilization of results should be?

The population of this study consisted of the special education
administrators of the 159 county school systems and the 28 city or independent school districts within the selected state. These 187 school systems provide a free education for all of the students attending public schools in grades K - 12. In other words, the vast majority of the state's school-age children attend the public schools of these 187 school systems.

From this population of 187 administrators, the sample selected for this study was the entire population—a census. Of the 187 questionnaires distributed to the population, 156 were returned for a response rate of 83 percent. Nineteen of the completed questionnaires were unusable; 137 were consequently used in the analysis.

The remaining section of this chapter is devoted to the presentation of the summary, the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations. Each of these components is organized around the research questions. The major thrust of the findings is centered around the discernible local evaluation activities that occurred within the selected state regarding the local evaluation practices and the utilization of the evaluation results compared to authoritative prescriptions in the law and recommendations of recognized experts. Additionally, special effort was devoted to observe the relationships between and among certain internal and external forces which might have impeded or enhanced the local evaluation practices of these local school systems.

Findings

The answers to the five research questions posed by this study will be provided here. To assist the reader in following the pattern of the
presentation: (a) key words or phrases from the research questions are provided; (b) the research questions are restated and followed by a brief discussion; and (c) the data analysis concludes the pattern for the presentation.

Evaluation Activities

Research Question 1: What local evaluation activities in special education programs were conducted within the selected state in 1980?

Earlier studies indicated that two schools of thought existed regarding local program evaluation practices. On the one hand, there was wide support for some definitive statements that local schools did little about program evaluation or little more than conduct casual interviews and examine a few selected documents. On the other hand, there was minimal support for some definitive statements that local school did systematically collect, analyze, and produce both quantifiable and qualifiable evaluative data and procedures for the purpose of determining the value of education programs. This study sought to determine whether the five years since the passage of PL-94-142 had brought about any discernible changes regarding either or both of these conditions.

A variety of evaluation activities had been conducted within the selected state during 1980. The data revealed the following collective information:

1. During the 1980 school year, 66.4 percent of the school systems conducted evaluation activities centered around personnel development while 60.6 percent directed the evaluation activities toward personnel performance evaluation, and 62.8 percent focused the evaluation activity on child find activities.

2. Over the one-year period, 48.2 percent of the school systems conducted evaluation activities regarding the assess-
ment or evaluation of academic achievement, and 47.4 percent of the systems were involved in the evaluation of instruction.

3. During the same time period 38.7 percent of the school systems focused some attention on assessing the student services program, and 16.1 percent focused on student follow-up activities. These figures indicate that relatively few school systems involved themselves in student-centered evaluation activities as compared to the emphasis placed on evaluation of personnel performance and personnel development.

4. During this time, 43.1 percent of the state's school systems conducted activities for developing an evaluation system.

The data further revealed the following on policies and practices:

6. Such reports as checklists, rating scales, questionnaires, and interviews were the most frequently used method/instrument/strategy for collecting evaluation data.

7. Personal products such as samples of work and tests were widely used to collect the evaluation data.

8. Written accounts such as observation forms completed by independent observers were moderately used.

9. Unobtrusive measures were used by a small number of school systems.

10. Administrative directive and/or school policy were the main reasons local school systems conducted local evaluation activities.

11. Few evaluations were conducted as a result of an on-site evaluation committee's suggestions.

12. Approximately half of the school systems have a local evaluation policy.

13. More than 75 percent of the respondents reported awareness of state policy which requires local evaluation of special education programs.

14. Fifty-five percent of the state's school systems conduct local evaluations of special education programs for the purpose of improving programs.

15. More than 70 percent of the school systems conduct local evaluations in response to administrative directives.
Individuals Involved

Research Question 2: Who was involved in the conducting of evaluation of local special education programs in the selected state?

Issues surrounding the theory of public school governance and control appear to be "alive and prospering" in the state. Historically—and the practice continues today—educators have generally made only limited provisions for the full participation of the owners of the school systems (parents and the tax-paying public) in the education process. A close scrutiny of the data permits one to observe and to gain some insight as to the present trends existing within the selected state. As in previous studies, individual schools systems' practices varied as they did in this study. However, as a collectivity, the analysis failed to produce any new knowledge, as indicated by the results listed below:

1. In the majority of the school systems, the school superintendent and the research staff have major responsibility for the evaluation of special education programs.

2. The individuals most frequently involved in special education program evaluation activities include the special education teachers, special education supervisors, and school principals.

3. Parents, students, and other school publics are involved at a very modest or low rate.

What Happened to Results

Research Question 3: What happened to the results of the evaluation of local special education programs after they were obtained?

The decision regarding the dissemination of local evaluation results is a local matter. Nonetheless, it is generally agreed by educators and evaluation scholars that local evaluation results should
be disseminated to all of the school publics—those for whom the
evaluation was intended, parents, and other interested observers of the
local school. This practice provides confidence in public education on
the part of both the providers and consumers of public education. The
practice also provides evidence or demonstrates the openness of the
local school to the school community.

The findings regarding dissemination show that:

1. Local evaluation results were the most frequently
received by: the local school superintendent, 89.8
percent; local school principals, 74.5 percent;
special education teachers 62.9 percent; and the
State Department of Education, 61.3 percent.

2. Parents, students, and support personnel were includ-
ed, at a very modest level, as those for whom local
evaluation results were disseminated.

Uses of Results and Success

Research Question 4: Have the results of the evaluation of local
special education programs been used in
significant ways? If so, to what degree
has the use of the results had an impact
upon the current or future nature of the
program?

Several studies indicated that generally little or no significant
uses have been made of local evaluation results by educators; or that
most evaluation results have been underutilized. One study revealed
that the only uses made of local evaluation results by one school
district was to complete the state report and that no feedback was
received from the state other than a form letter acknowledging receipt
of the report. This study sought to learn if history was repeating
itself or whether the findings of those studies simply were not
generalizable to the sample of the author's research. The findings
relating to uses made of results showed that:
1. The three primary uses made of local evaluation results were reported to be (a) informing administrators, (b) staff development purposes, and (c) program improvement.

2. Success in using the results were reported highest in (a) informing administrators, (b) staff development purposes, and (c) program improvement. This was indicated by slightly more than half of the respondents.

3. Many of the respondents reported that they had obtained only moderate or low success in using evaluation results.

Models of Evaluation

Research Question 5: How consistent have the evaluation practices of local special education programs in the selected state been with regard to the prescriptions of PL-94-142 and prevailing evaluation theories of what the practices and utilization of results should be?

Historically, and in some of the school systems within the selected state, special education evaluation and the utilization of the results have received less attention than is desirable in order to provide a quality education.

The comparison of local school practices with the mandates of PL-94-142 and prevailing theories of what local evaluation practices and the utilization of the results should be, revealed several discrepancies which will be addressed in the following section.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, derived from data analysis of the information collected with the survey questionnaire and the information obtained through personal interviews, the author has drawn the following conclusions:
1. The evaluation activities conducted in the selected state fall short of desirable program evaluation as expressed by most authorities in education and the specifications of PL-94-142.

2. The presence of PL-94-142 in public education has not had a positive influence on special education to the extent that the programs share an equal status with the regular school program in terms of prestige, funding, and other resources.

3. The school systems in this study have given low priority to the inclusion of parents, handicapped students, and other interested observers in the evaluation process.

4. The program evaluation conducted in the selected state in special education programs has not produced the detailed indepth kinds of evaluation that would provide widespread productive results.

5. Much of the evaluation of special education in the local school systems appear to be more for developing favorable relations with high-level school officials than for improving the special education programs for handicapped students.

6. Most of the school systems' special education administrators in this study apparently associated the questionnaire item regarding the existence of a state evaluation policy with the mandates of PL-94-142.

7. Most of the school systems do not distribute results or receive feedback from many of the important agencies and publics associated with the school.

8. Most of the school systems demonstrate a lack of internal consistency in their evaluation practices—a necessity for effective program evaluation.

9. The lack of adequate and consistent evaluation practices prevents appropriate analysis and future development of special education programs in most of the school systems.

10. The evaluation activities of the local school systems do not meet the requirements of the minimal components to be evaluated according to evaluation models for local evaluation of special education programs. The evaluation activities did not focus enough attention on student change, growth, curriculum development/improvement, staffing patterns, and service delivery models.

11. The primary data collected by the local school
systems depended too much on personal judgments. Evaluation models dictate that some quantifiable data be collected frequently, some as an ongoing process, and others periodically and annually.

12. The range of school publics was too narrow. Evaluation models call for the involvement of a representative from each of the school publics including sport and related services personnel.

13. The dissemination of the evaluation results by the local school systems was too narrow. Evaluation models dictate that local evaluation results be disseminated to all affected individuals who are either providers of school services or the consumers of the services provided by the school, or the owners of school system—the taxpaying public.

Implications

The following implications regarding the local evaluation practices in special education programs of the selected state are warranted:

1. Local school systems need to rethink their current practices in special education program evaluation and their level of priorities in the total education process.

2. In the absence of an effective evaluation program special education programs for handicapped students will continue to be less than effective for meeting their varied and unique needs.

3. Special education related services and support personnel will not continue to provide effective and efficient services for handicapped students unless efforts are made at the local school level for greater involvement of these individuals in the evaluation process.

4. Many of the local school systems in this study will jeopardize the continuation of cooperative agreement contracts with community and human service agencies which provide a necessary service for handicapped students, unless greater effort is made for the inclusion of these agency representative in the evaluation of special education programs.
Discussion

The conclusions and resulting implications of present policies (or lack of them), strategies, and procedures for generating disseminating and using evaluations for special education programs at the local school system level stimulate concern for formulating a list of components which might be used as a base for developing commonalities and equivalencies among the various systems.

The lack of measurable and systematically coherent evaluation among the various operating units within the state point clearly to the need for a list of components which might serve as the foundation for a common evaluation data base. The benefits for such a commonality are apparent.

Twenty-eight components for a comprehensive evaluation program were identified. Twenty-four of them are identified in PL-94-142 and the other four are consistent with the mandates of the law. Similarly, several authorities in evaluation have addressed the need or desirability for the inclusion of many of these same components in the evaluation program. The study investigated the status of local evaluation efforts in a selected state as compared to the two sets of criteria identified in the law and/or the literature.

Therefore, drawing upon the evidence gleaned from PL-94-142 and the speculations and work of respected authorities in the field of evaluation, the writer has pooled the information in two tables. From this has emerged an evaluation outline which might serve as the framework for establishing a common basis for developing and measuring evaluation efforts in special education programs.
The procedure used to organize these data are as follows:

1. The 25 major components of PL-94-142 were identified and listed in column one of Table 16.

2. Several authorities in evaluation who had addressed one or more components of PL-94-142 were listed in column two.

3. The data collected with the survey questionnaire were ranked in order to identify the three most prevalent practices in special education program evaluation. These data were identified and listed in column three.

4. The authorities in evaluation identified in Table 16 were listed in alphabetical order in Table 17.

5. A summary of the literature of these authorities in evaluation regarding the various components were written in column two.

6. The merit or criteria for selecting the recommendations of the authorities were identified and listed in column three.

Recommendations

Two kinds of recommendations are warranted as a result of this study. The first kind centers around the specific research questions of this study, and the second kind pertains to some much needed research regarding special education program evaluation and the effective utilization of the evaluation results. These following represent some uses which might be made of this study and some further research which should be considered:

1. That the results of this study be used by local school superintendents for staff development training for local special education administrators.

2. That the results of this study be used as a guide to strengthen the local evaluation program.
## TABLE 16

**RECOMMENDED COMPONENTS FOR EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Components for an Effective Evaluation Program</th>
<th>Criteria for the Selection of the Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
<td>Summary Literature Recommendation Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Policies and Procedures</strong></td>
<td>Comfort (1980); Wayson (1975); Scriven (1973); The Joint Committee on Educational Evaluation Standards (1981); Epstein and Tripodi (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Philosophy/ Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Anderson and Ball (1978); The Joint Committee on Educational Evaluation Standards (1981); Grotelueschen (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Evaluation Planning</strong></td>
<td>Anderson and Ball (1978); Epstein and Tripodi (1977); Sanders (1976); Brophy, Grotelueschen, and Gouler (1976); White and Belt (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Evaluation Staff Training</strong></td>
<td>Anderson and Ball (1978); Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1978); Shepard (1977); Hammond (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Special Education Programs</strong></td>
<td>Alkin (1973)(1979); Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1978); Provus (1973); Stake (1973); Grotelueschen (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Special Administrative, Instructional and Support Staffs</strong></td>
<td>Maher (1979); Jackson (1973); Barclay and Wertheimer (1978); Prost and George (1978); The State of Georgia, House Bill 671 (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. Regular Administrative, Instructional and Support Staffs</strong></td>
<td>The State of Georgia, House Bill 671 (1976); Numerous other states and/or school districts require/provide inservice training for regular staff to facilitate the educational process for handicapped students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 16 (cont)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Components for an Effective Evaluation Program</th>
<th>Criteria for the Selection of the Component</th>
<th>PL-94-142 Summary Literature Recommendation Source</th>
<th>Findings (N=137)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Child Find, Protection in Evaluation Due Process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The State of Georgia Monitoring Cf. Table Document (process evaluation model) (1981)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Free and Appropriate Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The State of Georgia Monitoring Cf. An-Document (process evaluation model) (1981); Olsten (1975) data in Ch. IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Least Restrictive Environment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The State of Georgia Monitoring Cf. An-Document (process evaluation model) (1981); Olsten (1975) data in Ch. IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Comprehensive System of Personnel Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bishop (1976); Epstein and Tripodi (1977)</td>
<td>Cf. Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Components for an Effective Evaluation Program</td>
<td>Criteria for the Selection of the Component</td>
<td>Summary Literature Recommendation Source</td>
<td>Findings (N=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. Interagency Cooperation and Coordination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Maher (1979); Bernauer and Jackson (1973); Barclay and Wertheimer (1978); Prost and Georgia (1978)</td>
<td>The local school system's local plan document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. Interagency Cooperation and Coordination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The State of Georgia Departments of Education and Human Resources Cooperative Agreement Plan (1980)</td>
<td>The local school system's local special education plan document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX. Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scriven (1973); Cronbach (1973); Cf. Table 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. Assessment of Student Change</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The Joint Committee on Educational Evaluation Standards (1981); Morris and Fitz-Gibbon (1978); Tindall (1980)</td>
<td>Cf. Table 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI. Levels of Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Howe and Fitzgerald (1978); Grotelueschen (1980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII. Utilization of Evaluation Results</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Anderson and Ball (1978); Wentling and Piland (1980); Enell (1987-79); Taylor (1974)</td>
<td>Cf. Table 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV. Advisory Committees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Enell (1978-79); Wentling and Piland (1980)</td>
<td>Cf. Ancillary data in Ch. IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Components for an Effective Evaluation Program</td>
<td>Criteria for the Selection of the Component</td>
<td>PL-94-142 Summary Literature Recommendation Sources</td>
<td>Findings (N=137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII. Evaluation Standards</td>
<td>X Stufflebeam; The Joint Committee on Educational Evaluation Standards (1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII. Evaluation Budgeting</td>
<td>X Stufflebeam; The Joint Committee on Educational Evaluation Standards (1981); Stufflebeam (1974); Epstein and Tripodi (1977)</td>
<td>Cf. Ancillary data in Ch. IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. Ancillary data in Ch. IV
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Source</th>
<th>Basic Thrust of Document</th>
<th>Merit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alkin, Marvin. &quot;Evaluation Theory Development&quot; in Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Edited by Blaine R. Worthen and James R. Sanders. (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc. 1973) pp. 150-156.</td>
<td>The Author addressed various aspects of Component V. He concluded that evaluation regarding particular program elements, program objectives, program offerings, and program planning descriptions are needed in order for the decision-maker to select a course of action with regard to the utility and effectiveness of a program.</td>
<td>PL-94-142; State of Georgia Monitoring Program; The Local School Plan for Special Education as Required by PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alkin, Marvin, et al. Using Evaluation Results: Does Evaluation Make a Difference? (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1979) pp. 1-27</td>
<td>These authors identified Component XXIII as a desirable aspect of program evaluation. They cited such authorities as Cuba (1969), Mann (1972), Cohen and Garet (1975), Rossi (1972), Dexter (1966), Anderson and Sherwood (1967), Alkin (1975), and Weiss (1966) to support the theory that evaluation results have not been utilized effectively or they are underutilized. They contend that the effective use of evaluation results would improve public education. Conversely, they cited Alkin, et al. (1974) as evidence that some effective uses are made of evaluation results.</td>
<td>PL-94-142; The Local School Plan for Special Education as Required by PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alkin, Marvin. &quot;Evaluation Theory Development&quot; p. 151</td>
<td>Here Alkin also addressed Component XX in terms of the assessment of student change or growth. He looks at the process as the systems assessment whereby the assessment is related to the &quot;ultimate behavior&quot; of the clients—students, parents, etc. In broader sense, he sees the need for such an assessment in order that objective statements regarding program objectives will evolve in terms of outputs of the school.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 17 (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Source</th>
<th>Basic Thrust of Document</th>
<th>Merit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Anderson, Scarvia B. and Ball, Samuel. <em>The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation</em>. (San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978) pp. 3-109.</td>
<td>These authors addressed Components II, III, IV, and XXIII. With regard to the purpose of program evaluation, they cited such experts as Scriven (1967), Harless (1973), Baker (1976), Dennis (1955), and Messick (1972) in support of their contention that the identification of the purpose of the evaluation is important to the success of the evaluation program. Anderson and Ball pointed out that there is a growing trend toward continuing education and staff development for persons who are not professionally trained evaluators. The noted that Wright (1977), Sechrest and Campbell (1975), Scriven (1973)(1976b), the California Department of Education (1977), the Southern Regional Education Board (1975), and the Langley Porter Institute (1977) had addressed this same issue—the trend toward staff development training in program evaluation. Anderson and Ball also address Components III and XXIII. They spoke of the need for an effective system of dissemination of evaluation results that should result from the identification of the individuals to be involved in the evaluation process whereby an effective communication network is established. According to Anderson and Ball, Weiss(1972)(1971), Longood and Simmel (1972), Ward and Kassebaum (1972), Riecken and Boruch (1974, Myers (1970), and Berke (1976) support their argument regarding the utilization of evaluation results. In short, these authorities support the right of the various school publics to evaluation results and they command the use of the results by school personnel for program decision-making.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Source</td>
<td>Basic Thrust of Document</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Atkin, Myron J. &quot;Behavioral Objectives in Curriculum Design: A Cautionary Note&quot; in Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Edited by Blaine R. Worthen and James R. Sanders. (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1973)</td>
<td>Atkin addressed Component XX and calls attention to the need for educators to justify the high cost of public education. He posits that we need a firmer basis for making assessments and decisions than what we now utilize. He contends that the specification of curriculum objectives in terms of student performance is an attempt to provide direction to an effective program that will assess student change adequately and appropriately.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bishop, Leslee. Staff Development and Instructional Improvement: Plans and Procedures. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976), pp. vii-92.</td>
<td>Bishop addressed Component XIII which focuses upon personnel development. He cited the needs and objectives of staff as vital considerations since each and every member of the school staff and the school community dictate a staff development need. He argued for clearly defined programs, goals, and objectives for the program in order for effective evaluation to occur.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Combs, A. W. &quot;Evaluation as Feedback and Guide.&quot; (Washington, D. C.; National Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967), p. v.</td>
<td>The author addressed Component XIX which focuses upon curriculum development. He concluded that curriculum development is an essential component of educational assessment in light of &quot;awakened public concern, massive federal commitment and wide professional reappraisal of educational endeavors.&quot; He called for the development of &quot;new procedures for assessing far beyond present levels to meet properly the changing needs of our times.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comfort addressed policy concerns of program evaluation identified in Component I. She contended that evaluation policies fail because the originate at the federal level and not at the state level where they rightfully belong. She stated that local school personnel resent the interference of the federal government in the activities of the local schools. The author also addressed Component XXV, the politics of evaluation. She cited Wayson (1975), Isaac and Michael (1971), and Wilensky (1967) to support her thesis that the broad concept of evaluation is the information-gathering, analysis, and dissemination that is akin to intelligence functions regarding the economic and political contexts in which the organization is functioning.


The author addressed Component XIX with regard to the need to improve curricula in order to improve education. Cronbach takes the position that unless definitions and objectives are clearly defined one should not expect much to be done toward the attainment of the objectives. He called attention to the desirability of the total school publics to be involved in defining objectives and the methods and procedures by which the objectives will be attained. Finally, the author notes that course improvement and curriculum development are not one and the same. He concludes, however, that course improvement should not take place in isolation from curriculum development.


Enell conducted an evaluation of the special education programs within a selected state. She addressed Components I through XVI, XIX, XX, XXII to XXIV, and XXVII. The results of this study were used to develop the state's Master Plan for Special Education which provides for a comprehensive evaluation of all programs and services provided by the local schools.
TABLE 17 (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Sources</th>
<th>Basic Thrust of Document</th>
<th>Merit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epstein, Irwin and Tripodi, Tony. <em>Research Techniques for Program Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.</em> (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), p. 42 seq.</td>
<td>These authors addressed Components III and XIII in terms of the administrator's functions of program planning, monitoring, and evaluation. They concluded that local school administrators need not be expert researchers or program evaluators in order to plan, organize, and implement effective education programs to meet the needs of the school publics. They also addressed Components III and IV regarding evaluation planning. They note that program planning is closely related to program monitoring and evaluation. They suggest that it is during the planning for the delivery of educational programs and services that the need for evaluative data is most evident. They conclude that administrative decisions that must be made should be supported by evaluative data regarding the needs of the community, available resources and the individual and collective competencies of program staff. Finally, the authors posit that program planning is a precursor to effective program monitoring and that valid, reliable monitoring information is necessary for effective program evaluation, and competent staffs are essential for the implementation of the educational process. (pp. 1, 30, 44-49, 49-52) They contend further that program planning and staff development training programs need not rely upon the expertise of consultants who are either too costly, who produce useless results, who cause time-loss in explaining program means and objectives, and who are often confronted by hostile staffs who resent the outsider's interference. A viable alternative is to train the local staffs.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Source</td>
<td>Basic Thrust of Document</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fitz-Gibbon, Carol Taylor and Morris, Lynn. <em>How to Design a Program Evaluation</em>. (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, Inc., 1978), pp. 19-22</td>
<td>These authors addressed Components V and XX. They contend that the nature of special education programs dictates a special evaluation model. They suggest that the evaluator not attempt to evaluate &quot;whole programs,&quot; but rather, specific components of the program. The practice of identifying specific components to be evaluated, and making the evaluation theory-based, is supported by the authors.</td>
<td>PL-94-142; The Local School Plan Document as required by PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Grotelueschen, A. D. &quot;Program Evaluation,&quot; in <em>Developing, Administering, and Evaluating Adult Education</em>. Edited by Alan B. Knox, et al. (San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980), Chapter 4.</td>
<td>The author addressed Components II, III, V, XIX, XXI, XXV, and XXVI. He supports the notion that the why, who, what, and questions should be clearly identified and defined at the onset of the evaluation. With regard to the need to define each program, the author contends that a thorough definition and description are both necessary and difficult tasks which many organizations leave incomplete. As a result, program evaluations are also incomplete. In addressing the need for evaluation planning, the author cites Brophy, Grotelueschen and Gooler (1976), Stake (1974a), Grotelueschen, et al. (1974), and Cronbach (1978) to support his contention that effective evaluation requires evaluation planning before implementation in order to identify the evaluation purposes, the evaluation audience, the evaluation participants, etc. The author also notes that evaluations are also conducted to support already-made political decisions. In such cases, the evaluator is usually selected on the basis of his biases against a particular program. In addressing meta-evaluation, the author notes that the accountability factor requires that the evaluation and the evaluator be evaluated. He cites Stufflebeam (1975) and Stake (1969-1976) who agree with his notions. With regard to the levels of program evaluation, Grotelueschen ascribes to the micro level...</td>
<td>PL-94-142; The State of Georgia Monitoring Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Source</td>
<td>Basic Thrust of Document</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, Robert L.</td>
<td>Hammond expressed his views regarding Component XX in relation to the assessment of student change with regard to the need to evaluate the unique qualities of the individuals involved in the education process. He noted that each individual in the education process will have a direct influence on a given program.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe, Clifford and Fitzgerald, Marigail</td>
<td>These authors called attention to the special considerations which program evaluation should give to Component XV—the individual education program. They posit that the individually tailored program in special education might best be evaluated in terms of goal attainment scaling, a technical approach which appears to have the highest likelihood of yielding useful data to use in decision-making.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman, Roger and Stakenas, R.</td>
<td>The authors' views regarding Component XIX provide some confidence to the researcher's inclusion of curriculum development as a desirable component of program evaluation. They call for the local school system to identify the levels of educational goals with regard to the system, course, daily instruction,</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Source</td>
<td>Basic Thrust of Document</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Maher, Charles A. &quot;School Psychologists and Special Education Program Evalu...</td>
<td>Maher called attention to the need for special education program evaluation with regard to two major aspects of Components VI and VII. He noted that support staffs have much to contribute to special education program evaluation, yet these staffs are not being utilized. He cited the works of such authorities as Bernauer and Jackson (1973), Barclay and Wertheimer (1978), and Prost and George (1978) who share his views regarding the desirability of including support staffs in the special education evaluation process.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Olson, Thomas and Marvin, Lelia. &quot;Evaluation: One State's Approach.&quot; American Education, Vol. 6. (May, 1970): 33-34.</td>
<td>These authors addressed Component XXIII—the utilization of evaluation results. They reported that evaluation results had been utilized effectively to humanize local evaluation practice, to identify staff development needs, to plan appropriate in-service workshops, to improve school and community relationships, to improve relationships between local and state staffs, to influence programmatic decisions, and to increase the desire of the local and state staffs to expose their activities for gainful advancement of knowledge. Thus, one can see that these authors, in addressing the utilization factor, point to the desirability of the evaluation program focusing its activities upon staff development—Component XIII, and the dissemination of the results—Component XXII.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Olsten, John C. &quot;Implementing the Master Plan for Special Education—Myth or Reality.&quot; Thrust. The</td>
<td>Olsten, in addressing Components X and XI, concluded that there was a need for an assessment of PL-94-142 with regard to mainstreaming and separate classes or schools for the handicapped. He contends that local school administrators need only produce</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Source</td>
<td>Basic Thrust of Document</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of California School Administrators. Vol. 4. No. 4 (March, 1975): 16-18</td>
<td>evidence in the form of evaluative data that the program delivery model used by the school system is warranted by the evaluation data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ornstein, Alan C. Race and Politics in School/Community Organizations. (Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1974).</td>
<td>The author addressed Components XXIII, XXIV, and XXV—the politics of program evaluation, the dissemination of the evaluation results, and the utilization of the results. He concluded that evaluation efforts are being impeded by political pressures and Black Militants who insist that unfavorable results regarding Blacks not be reported, or that they not be reported honestly and accurately. He contends that until the researchers and evaluators are free to assess the value of education programs without reprisal, one need not expect evaluation nor educational practices to improve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Representatives Burton of the 47th, Patten of the 147th, and Nobel of the 48th Districts of Georgia. House Bill 671 (Atlanta: Georgia House of Representatives, 1976),</td>
<td>House Bill 671 requires the completion of a minimum of five college credits or fifty-two clock hours training in a survey course with regard to the education of the handicapped in order for new teachers to be eligible for certification. In addition, all professional certificate renewals or upgrades are dependent upon evidence that the applicant has either met the requirements of the five-hour college credits or fifty-two clock hours in inservice training. This law addresses the major concerns of Component VII.</td>
<td>PL-94-142 requires the local school systems to make similar provisions for staff development through inservice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Shepard, Lori. &quot;A Checklist for Evaluating Large-Scale Assessment Programs.&quot; in Occasional Papers Series, No. 9 (Kalamazoo,</td>
<td>Shepard addressed Component IV with regard to evaluation staff training. She concluded that it is essential for the evaluation staff to be &quot;knowledgeable about all aspects of an assessment&quot; in order to make valid judgments. However, she concedes that program evaluators need not be professionally trained or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Source</td>
<td>Basic Thrust of Document</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1974</td>
<td>Tyler addressed the major issues regarding Component XIX— curriculum development. He notes that there has been a shift in the &quot;locus of responsibility for curriculum development. He cited the dissatisfaction of local school personnel with the interference of the federal government and college and university experts in the development of the curriculum for the local schools. He contends that local school staffs, parents and students, and interested observers of the local school must be able to participate in curriculum development efforts in order to localize the curriculum to meet the interests, needs, and objectives of the local school community. He adds, however, that the local school community should not divorce itself from curriculum experts and course specialists.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tyler, Ralph. &quot;Curriculum Development since 1900.&quot; Educational Leadership. (May, 1981): 599-601.</td>
<td>Wayson addressed the need for local policy (Component I) for program evaluation as he observed the problems of evaluation requirements established by legislation. He noted that local school personnel frequently resented the federal interference in local school matters which created added responsibilities without compensation. In addressing Component IV he noted that local staffs were not provided the kind of training that is necessary for effective program evaluation. It was these type criticisms that prompted the researcher to recommend that local school systems adopt and implement a localized evaluation policy to give direction and purpose to local evaluation efforts.</td>
<td>PL-94-142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weiss in addressing the utilization of evaluation results—Component XXIII—contends that the organization must provide the total organization with useful information in order for the organizational system to identify the inconsistencies between desired and actual performance. Clearly the author is addressing the concept of effective utilization of evaluation results as a desirable practice.

These authors addressed Components XIII, XXII, and XXIII. The authors investigated the local evaluation practice within a selected state with regard to staff development, dissemination of evaluation results, and the utilization of the results. They recommended that the state direct some attention toward inservice staff development activities and that the state explore ways of enhancing the use of evaluation results at the local level.

In addressing Component III with regard to long-range planning, these authorities state that the long-range plan should address evaluation concerns. They note that long-range planning provides the opportunity for the local organization to work with the various school publics to facilitate the process of setting priorities, identifying promising directions, assessing client needs, locating resources, acquiring resources, and increasing understanding and support for the program. Citing Cohen and Garet (1975) and Ziegler (1970), the authors contend that in order to chart future direction for the programs, consideration must be given to alternative futures so that current efforts will increase the likelihood that desirable futures occur.
The Joint Committee of Standards for Education Evaluation addressed Components I, II, V, XXII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, and XXVIII. The Committee reached the following decisions regarding the components identified by the author as desirable for effective evaluation:

I. The purposes and procedures of the program evaluation should be described in specific details so that they can be appropriately identified, monitored, and assessed.

Further, the evaluation procedures should be practical. (pp. 52 and 107)

V. The program to be evaluated should be clearly defined. (p. 12.)

XXII. Evaluation results should be disseminated to clients and such right-to-know audiences as those who commissioned the evaluation, those legally responsible for the object being evaluation, those who funded the evaluation through taxes, gifts, money or time, those who supplied the evaluation data, professional staffs, students, parents and representative of the media. (pp. 40 and 77)

XXIV. Advisory committees should be utilized to facilitate the evaluation process and to enhance the possibility of wider acceptance of the results even though they might not be completely palatable to some of the school publics. (p. 80)

XXV. The political viability of program evaluation warrants careful consideration. The evaluation, in order to be successful "should be planned and conducted with
XXVI. The meta-evaluation provides accurate descriptions of the evaluation process regarding what the evaluators did, how they did it, their intentions for doing it, etc., so that the findings and recommendations can be judged and interpreted accordingly. Further, the practice of evaluating the evaluation provides information for improving the evaluation program. (pp. 9, 108, 153)

XXVII. The thirty evaluation standards are organized in four groups—utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. The committee recommends the application of these standards in program evaluation, noting that each should be considered equally important.

XXVIII. Budgeting for the evaluation should be addressed in terms of the information scope and section, cost effectiveness, formal obligations, fiscal responsibility, object identification, and the described purposes and procedures. (pp. 27, 60, 65, 93, 99, and 107.)
The Evaluation Outline

Evaluation for special education should gather and process data in the following categories:

I. Special Education Program Evaluation Policies and Procedures
   A. Organization and Administration
   B. Authority and Responsibility
   C. Staffing
   D. Funding

II. Philosophy and Purpose of Special Education Program Evaluation
   A. Why Evaluate
   B. Who and What to Evaluate
   C. When to Evaluate
   D. Who Will Be Involved in the Evaluation
   E. How Will the Evaluation Be Conducted
   F. Who Will Receive the Evaluation Results
   G. What Uses Will Be made of the Evaluation Results
   H. Standards or Criteria for Program Evaluation

III. Program Evaluation Planning
   A. Long Range Planning
   B. The Local Plan
   C. Range of Participants (Committee Membership)

IV. Evaluation Staff Development Training
   A. Orientation for Evaluation Staff Regarding the Evaluation Purposes and Procedures
   B. Training in Writing Program Definitions
   C. Training in Writing Program Objectives
   D. Training in Identifying Pertinent Evaluative Data and Information
   E. Training in Collecting Evaluative Data and Information
   F. Training in Analyzing the Collected Data and Information
   G. Training in Writing the Final Evaluation Report

V. Special Education Programs
   A. Program Name/Title
   B. Program Definition
   C. Program Objectives
   D. Program Offerings
   E. Course Content
   F. Individual Education Program (IEP)
VI. Special Education Administrative, Instructional, and Support Staffs
   A. Number (Ratio to Students)
   B. Certification and Specialization
   C. Assignment
   D. Performance
   E. Working Conditions
   F. Staff Motivation (Satisfiers/Dissatisfiers)
   G. Attitude Toward the Handicapped
   H. Working Relations with Regular Staffs
   I. Staffing Pattern

VII. Regular Program Administrative, Instructional, and Support Staffs
    A. Certification and Specialization
    B. Assignment (Mainstreaming Interactions)
    C. Performance
    D. Working Relationships with Special Education Staffs
    E. Staff Motivation (Satisfiers/Dissatisfiers)
    F. Attitude Toward the Handicapped
    G. Staffing Pattern

VIII. Child Find, Protection in Evaluation, and Due Process
   A. Informing Parents, Surrogate Parents, and Students of Their Rights
   B. Parental Consent for Evaluation
   C. Reporting Evaluation Results to Parents
   D. Parental Involvement in Staffing Conferences
   E. Parental Involvement in Developing IEP's
   F. Legal Rights and Appeal Procedures
   G. Written Notification to Parents Regarding All Activities and Actions Taken on Behalf of the Child
   H. Policies and Procedures
   I. Needs
   J. Selection
   K. Evaluation Process, Instruments, and Schedule
   L. Legal Rights, Due Process, and Appeal Procedures
   M. Appropriateness of Tests and Other Evaluative Tools, Techniques, and Strategies
   N. Comprehensiveness of Evaluation
   O. Frequency of the Evaluation

IX. Individual Education Program (IEP)
   A. Comprehensiveness of the Program
   B. Staffing Conferences
   C. Level of Participation of Local School Staff, Parents of the Handicapped Child, and the Handicapped Child
   D. Rights of Parents to be Represented by Attorney
   E. Proper Notification to Parents
   F. Objectives, Goals, Curriculum, Support Services

X. Provisions for a Free and Appropriate Education
   A. Meeting Timeliness Established by PL-94-142
B. Inclusion in Appropriate Programs and Activities
C. Accessibility of Facilities
D. Appropriateness of the Facilities
E. Free and Appropriate Transportation

XI. Provisions Regarding a Least Restrictive Environment
   A. Mainstreaming Policies and Procedures
   B. Separate Classes and Schools for the Handicapped
   C. Presence of IEP's
   D. Monitoring Procedures
   E. Annual Review for Effects and Quality

XII. Confidentiality of Records
    A. Policies and Procedures
    B. Parental Review of Records
    C. Copying of Records
    D. Amending Records
    E. Releasing Information

XIII. Comprehensive System of Personnel Development
    A. The Working Plan: Description, Procedures, and Implementation
    B. Administrative Staffs
    C. Special Education Staffs
    D. Regular School Staff
    E. Support Personnel
    F. Related Services Staffs

XIV. Utilization of PL-94-142 Funds
    A. According to Federal Regulations
    B. According to the State Plan
    C. According to the Local Plan
    D. Monitoring Procedures
    E. Evaluation

XV. The Local Plan
    A. Administration
    B. Staffing
    C. Funding
    D. Educational Programs
    E. Advisory Committees
    F. Instructional Supplies and Equipment
    G. Support Services

XVI. Coordination with Private Schools
    A. Policies and Procedures
    B. Administration
    C. Supervision
    D. Monitoring
    E. Evaluation
    F. Contract Services
    G. Parental Involvement
    H. Evaluation
XVII. Interagency Cooperation and Coordination.
A. Policy and Procedures
B. Communication Network
C. Shared Services: Special Educators and Regular Educators, Special Educators and Vocational Educators, Special Educators and Support Staffs
D. Support Personnel
E. Documentation

XVIII. Intra-agency Cooperation and Coordination
A. Policy and Procedures
B. Cooperative Agreement Document
C. Shared Services Between Two or More School Systems (Such as Program Evaluation)
D. Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation
E. Special Education and Community Service Agencies

XIX. Curriculum Development
A. Definitions, Objectives, and Procedures
B. Performance Objectives
C. Curriculum Guide
D. Course Objectives
E. Learning Modules
F. Course Outline
G. Course Content

XX. Assessment of Student Change
A. Academic Growth
B. Social Skills Growth
C. Independent Living Skills
D. Motor Skills Development
E. Attitudes
F. Personality

XXI. Levels of Evaluation
A. Global - Across Publics
B. Micro - Focus on Different Programs
C. Specific-Products-Focus on Behavior and Academic Skills

XXII. Dissemination of Evaluation Results
A. Policies and Procedures, Methods
B. School Superintendent
C. Local School Board
D. State Education Office
E. Local School Administrator
F. Special Education Administrators
G. Special Education Teachers, Regular Teachers and Support Personnel

---

H. Cooperating Agencies
I. Parents of Handicapped Students
J. Students
K. The General Public - School Community
L. Other Interested Observers - Legislators, Senators, County Commissioners, City Councilmen, Mayors, and Governors
M. Tax Reform Groups

XXIII. Utilization of Program Evaluation Results
A. Policies and Procedures
B. Program Improvement
C. Staff Development Efforts
D. The Informing of Administrators
E. The Informing of Parents and Other Interested Observers
F. Course Improvement
G. Curriculum Development
H. Student Assessment
I. Evaluating Staff Performance
J. Discontinuation of Program
K. Implementation of New Program
L. Cost Analysis Assessment
M. Support Funding Requests

XXIV. Advisory Committees
A. Policy and Procedures
B. Qualifications for Membership
C. Philosophy and Purpose
D. Authority
E. Responsibility
F. Meeting Schedule
G. Communication Network

XXV. Politics and Program Evaluation
A. Conceptualization of the Politics of Education at the Local and State Levels
B. Communication Network
C. Local School Systems' Relationships with Local and State Power Structures
D. Reporting Evaluation Results
E. Utilizing Evaluation Results to Influence Political Decisions Regarding Education

XXVI. Meta Evaluation
A. Technical Adequacy of the Evaluation
B. Utility of the Evaluation
C. Cost Effectiveness of the Evaluation

\^{1}Daniel Stufflebeam. Meta Evaluation.
XXVII. Program Evaluation Standards for Special Education
   A. Utility Standards
   B. Feasibility Standards
   C. Propriety Standards
   D. Accuracy Standards

XXVIII. Program Evaluation Budgeting
   A. Range and Scope of the Evaluation
   B. Type of Evaluation: Purposes and Procedures
   C. Cost Effectiveness/Cost-Benefit Analysis
   D. Fiscal Responsibility
   E. Legal Obligation (Federal Regulations)
   F. Staffing

1The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, Daniel Stufflebeam (chairperson) Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects and Materials (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981) has produced a comprehensive set of thirty standards which comprise these four major areas.
3. That the results of this study be used by the state department of education in the state in which the study was conducted for focusing the annual administrators' conference.

4. That the state department encourage state departments of education in sister states to examine the study results for possible application to their evaluation efforts.

5. That studies be conducted on the quality of the academic preparation of special education and general administrators who are being attracted to administer special education programs.

6. That studies be conducted which investigate the effects of program evaluation results on program improvement.

7. That studies be conducted to investigate the effects of parent and community involvement on student growth among handicapped students.

8. That followup studies be conducted which investigate the effects of use of the evaluation outline as applied to local special education settings.

9. That local school systems further study the barriers to locally conducted evaluation of special education and devise ways to minimize or alleviate them.
EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT
OF 1975 (PL-94-142)

EVALUATION

The section of PL-94-142 regarding the evaluation of special education programs has been copied in its entirety.

"Sec. 618. (a) The Commissioner shall measure and evaluate the impact of the program authorized under this part and the effectiveness of State efforts to assure the free appropriate public education of all handicapped children.

"(b) The Commissioner shall conduct directly or by grant or contract, such studies, investigations, and evaluations as are necessary to assure effective implementation of this part. In carrying out his responsibilities under this section, the Commissioner shall—

"(l) through the National Center for Education Statistics, provide to the appropriate committees of each House of the Congress and to the general public at least annually and shall update at least annually, programmatic information concerning programs and projects assisted under this part and other Federal programs supporting the education of handicapped children, and such information from State and local educational agencies and other appropriate sources necessary for the implementation of this part including—
"(A) the number of handicapped children in each State, within each disability, who require special education and related services;

"(B) the number of handicapped children in each State, within each disability, receiving a free appropriate public education and the number of handicapped children who need and are not receiving a free appropriate public education in each such State;

"(C) the number of handicapped children in each State, within each disability, who are participating in regular educational programs, consistent with the requirements of section 612 (5) (b) and section 614 (a) (1) (c) (iv), and the number of handicapped children who have been placed in separate classes or separate school facilities, or who have been otherwise removed from the regular education environment;

"(D) the number of handicapped children who are enrolled in public or private institutions in each State and who are receiving a free appropriate public education, and the number of handicapped children who are in such institutions and who are not receiving a free appropriate public education;

"(E) the amount of Federal, State, and local expenditures in each State specifically available for special education and related services; and

"(F) the number of personnel, by disability category, employed in the education of handicapped children, and
the estimated number of additional personnel needed to adequately carry out the policy established by this act; and

"(2) provide the evaluation of programs and projects assisted under this part through—

"(A) the development of effective methods and procedures for evaluation;

"(B) the testing and validation of such evaluation methods and procedures; and

"(C) conducting actual evaluation studies designed to test the effectiveness of such programs and projects.

"(c) In developing and furnishing information under subclause (E) of clause (1) of subsection (b), the Commissioner may base such information upon a sampling of data available from State agencies, including the State educational agencies, and local educational agencies.

"(d) (1) Not later than one hundred twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall transmit to the appropriate committees of each House of the Congress a report on the progress being made toward the provision of free appropriate public education to all handicapped children, including a detailed description of all evaluation activities conducted under subsection (b).

"(2) The Commissioner shall include in each such report—

"(A) an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of procedures undertaken by each State educational agency, local educational agency, and intermediate educational
unit to assure that handicapped children receive special education and related services in the least restrictive environment commensurate with their needs and to improve programs of instruction for handicapped children in day residential facilities;

"(B) any recommendations for change in the provisions of this part, or any other Federal law providing support for the education of handicapped children; and

"(C) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the procedures undertaken by each such agency or unit to prevent erroneous classification of children as eligible to be counted under section 611, including actions undertaken by the Commissioner to carry out provisions of this Act relating to such erroneous classification.

In order to carry out such analyses and evaluations, the Commissioner shall conduct a statistically valid survey for assessing the effectiveness of individualized education programs.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Ms. Lorraine H. Walton  
Atlanta Area Technical School  
1560 Stewart Avenue, S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30310  

Dear Ms. Walton:  

Thank you for your letter requesting a copy of a special education program evaluation.  

The Office of Special Education does not have an evaluation assessment instrument for special education programs. The quality of special education programs is determined by the local school districts and State education agencies set the standards for education programs in each respective state.  

This office conducts periodic compliance monitoring review activities to determine the State education agency's compliance with federal requirements. The procedures for these activities are accomplished through the review of documents specifying the State education agency's policies and procedures and through the implementation of on-site interviews with program implementors, consumers, and other service providers.  

Specific information regarding program evaluation should be addressed to the Georgia State Education Agency. The person to contact is Dr. Arthur E. Bilyeu, Director, Program for Exceptional Children, State Department of Education, 156 Trinity Avenue, S.W., Room 306, Atlanta, Georgia 30334, Telephone: (404) 656-2425.  

I hope this information will be of help. If you should need further assistance from this office, please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Ed Sontag, Director, Division of Assistance to States, Office of Special Education, Donohoe Building, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202, Telephone: (202) 472-4825.  

Thank you for your concern in assessing special education programs.  

Sincerely,  

Percy Bates  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
Office of Special Education
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PART I

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED BY LORRAINE H. WALTON IN REFERENCE TO LOCAL EVALUATION PRACTICES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION WITHIN THE SELECTED STATE DURING 1980 WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION MODEL.

December 3, 1980
Mr. Larry Gallaway, Program Monitor
State Department of Education
Special Education Division
Atlanta, Georgia

November 1, 1980
Ms. Nan Hughes
Fulton County Schools
Special Education Administrator
Atlanta, Georgia

November 4, 1980
Mr. James Stiltner
Executive Associate Director
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Atlanta, Georgia
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PART I

PERSONAL INTERVIEW FORMAT FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATORS AND EDUCATORS VERY FAMILIAR WITH SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INTERVIEWER: Mrs. Lorraine H. Walton, researcher for the study entitled: A Study of Local Evaluation Practices in Special Education Programs and the Development of A Model for Evaluation of Special Education Programs

SETTING OF INTERVIEW: The interview occurred in the office of the interviewee

Anticipated Time of INTERVIEW: One Hour

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. What is your definition of program evaluation?

2. What are the major goals and purposes of your evaluation program?

3. Would you classify your evaluation as formative, summative or ex post facto? Please explain your response?

4. Describe the procedures used by your agency to evaluate special education programs.

5. Describe some specific methods, techniques, and strategies, used by your agency in the evaluation process.

6. Describe some major problems your agency encounters in program evaluation.

7. What are some major evaluation tools and resources used by your agency to conduct the evaluation?

8. Explain or describe your meta evaluation program.

9. What are some common practices regarding the SACS evaluation throughout the southern region?

10. What organizations or agencies have education program evaluation responsibilities within the state?
TABLE
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11. Why is your agency involved in program evaluation and who initiates the involvement?

12. What are some of the evaluation activities that your agency conducts?

13. Who participates in your local evaluation activities?

14. How have your agency's program evaluation results been utilized?

15. Who has received your program evaluation results, and how have you presented the results to the various audiences, i.e., school staff, students, parents, and the general public.

... Do you have some additional comments that you would like to make regarding special education program evaluation that might provide some insight as to current special education program evaluation practices?

... Do you have any questions for me regarding program evaluation practices?

NOTE: Questions nine and ten were designed for the SACS administrators. However, each of the interviewees responded to all fifteen questions. When appropriate the questions were rephrased or omitted.

The author expressed her appreciation to the interviewee for providing very significant primary data for the "Independent Field Experience" which led to this study.
THE IDENTITY OF THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE STUDY WILL NOT BE REVEALED. CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESPONSES IS ASSURED.

SURVEY OF LOCAL EVALUATION PRACTICES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

DIRECTIONS
PLEASE CHECK ALL ITEMS THAT PERTAIN TO YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM. ALSO FEEL FREE TO COMMENT OR ELABORATE ON ANY ITEMS YOU WISH WHICH MAY CLARIFY YOUR RESPONSES.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. WHAT IS YOUR JOB TITLE?
   ___ Assistant Superintendent
   ___ Director of Special Education
   ___ Director of Transportation
   ___ Coordinator of Special Programs
   ___ Coordinator of Special Education
   ___ Teacher
   ___ Other (List)

2. IN WHAT REGION OF THE STATE IS YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM LOCATED?
   ___ South
   ___ Middle
   ___ North
   ___ Other (Please be specific)

3. WHAT IS YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM'S HANDICAPPED STUDENT ENROLLMENT? (INCLUDE ONLY THOSE THAT YOU HAVE REPORTED TO THE STATE)
   ___ less than 100
   ___ 100 - 500
   ___ 501 - 1,000
   ___ 1,001 - 1,500
   ___ 1,501 - 2,000
   ___ 2,001 - 2,500
   ___ 2,501 - 3,000
   ___ 3,001 - 3,500
   ___ Other (Please be specific)

4. WHAT GRADE LEVELS DO YOUR SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE HANDICAPPED SERVE?
   ___ K - 3
   ___ 3 - 6
   ___ 6 - 8
   ___ 8 - 10
   ___ 10 - 12
   ___ Other (Please be specific)

5. HOW LONG HAS YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM PROVIDED SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED?
   ___ 0 - 5 years
   ___ 5 - 10 years
   ___ 10 - 15 years
   ___ 15 - 20 years
   ___ 20 - 25 years
   ___ Other (Please be specific)

w: 1981
6. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY STATE POLICY REQUIRING EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No (if no, go to question 9)

7. HOW DID YOU LEARN ABOUT THE STATE POLICY?
   ___ State in-service
   ___ Local school superintendent
   ___ letter from state officials
   ___ Other (Please list)

8. IN WHICH CATEGORIES DO THE STATE'S REQUIREMENTS FOR EVALUATION FALL?
   ___ Developing an evaluation system
   ___ Least restrictive environment
   ___ Protection in evaluation procedures
   ___ Parent and community involvement
   ___ Identification of academic competencies
   ___ Individual education plan
   ___ Student attainment of objectives
   ___ Due process
   ___ Child find
   ___ Staff development
   ___ Funding
   ___ Academic success
   ___ Cost/outcome analysis
   ___ Other (List)

9. DOES YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM HAVE A POLICY FOR THE CONDUCT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION?
   ___ Yes (Please return copy with this study)
   ___ No (If no, go to question 13)

10. HOW DID YOU LEARN ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM'S SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION POLICY?
    ___ Participated in policy design
    ___ Local school superintendent
    ___ Attended school board meeting
    ___ School board published minutes
    ___ Other (Please be specific)

11. WITH WHOM HAVE YOU SHARED THE LOCAL SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION POLICY?
    ___ Have not shared the policy
    ___ Regular classroom teachers
    ___ Special education teachers
    ___ School principals
    ___ Special education supervisors
    ___ General public
    ___ Special education administrators
    ___ Other (List)

: 1981
Parents of handicapped students
Local school superintendent

12. HOW DID YOU SHARE THE LOCAL SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION POLICY WITH
THE AUDIENCES IDENTIFIED IN ITEM 11 ABOVE?
___ Separate meeting with each group
___ Joint meeting with all groups
___ Letters to individuals
___ Other (Please list)

PRACTICES

13. WHICH SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION ACTIVITIES HAVE YOU CONDUCTED?
___ Developing an evaluation system
___ Cost/outcome analysis
___ Evaluation of academic achievement
___ Evaluation of instruction
___ Assessment of student services
___ Evaluation of curriculum
___ Assessment of instructional materials
___ Evaluation of facilities
___ Evaluation of career and vocational programs
___ Student follow-up survey
___ Child Find
___ Personnel performance evaluation
___ Personnel development
___ Other (Please list)

14. WHAT WAS (WERE) THE REASON(S) OR PURPOSE(S) FOR CONDUCTING THE ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED ABOVE?
___ Meet state requirements
___ School system policy
___ Administrative directive
___ PL-94-142
___ Interest in improving program
___ Need to improve program
___ On-site visitation suggestion
___ Justify program
___ Funding purposes
___ Other (Please list)

15. WHO WAS INVOLVED IN THE EVALUATION ACTIVITIES?
___ Special education teachers
___ Regular school counselors
___ Regular classroom teachers
___ School principals
___ Vocational rehabilitation counselors
___ Parents
___ Special education supervisors
___ Students
___ Vocational education teachers
___ General public
___ Career education personnel
___ Just me

v: 1981
16. **WHO HAS RECEIVED THE RESULTS OF YOUR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES?**

- Local school superintendent
- State Department of Education
- Special education teachers
- Special education administrators
- Special education supervisors
- Local school board
- Local school principals
- School counselors
- Parents
- Regular teachers
- General public
- Other (Please list)

17. **HOW HAVE THE RESULTS OF YOUR LOCAL EVALUATION BEEN PRESENTED TO VARIOUS AUDIENCES?**

- Written report
- Local plan document
- Results not shared
- Oral report
- Five year plan document
- Other (Please list)

18. **HOW HAVE THE RESULTS OF YOUR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES BEEN USED?**

WHAT SUCCESS HAS BEEN ACHIEVED? (PLEASE CIRCLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Making curricula changes
- Informing administrators
- Informing parents
- Informing general public
- Discontinuing program
- Supporting equipment request
- Expanding support services
- Staff development efforts
- Program improvement
- Other (Please list)
19. WHAT OBSTACLES OR BARRIERS EXIST WITHIN YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM THAT INHIBIT OR IMPede THE INITIATION AND CONDUCT OF LOCAL EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

- Faculty time
- Lack of higher level administrative support
- Inappropriateness of existing evaluation model
- Controversy about what constitutes evaluation
- Failure to see how evaluation would lead to improvements
- Funding
- Faculty attitude
- Fear of results
- Lack of local policy
- Lack of evaluation expertise
- Lack of competent consultant assistance
- Other (Please list)

20. WHEN DO YOU CONDUCT LOCALLY DIRECTED SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION ACTIVITIES?

- Annually
- Every three years
- Every five years
- Other (Be specific)

21. WHAT TYPE(S) EVALUATION(S) DO YOU CONDUCT?

- Context evaluation
- Input evaluation
- Process evaluation
- Product evaluation
- Other (Be specific)

22. WHEN DID YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM CONDUCT ITS FIRST LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

- Prior to 1975
- 1975 - 1976
- 1976 - 1977
- 1977 - 1978
- 1978 - 1979
- 1979 - 1980
- 1980 - 1981

23. HOW DO YOU COLLECT EVALUATION DATA FOR LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS?

- Mechanical devices, i.e., audio or video tape
- Written accounts; observation forms completed by independent observer
- Self reports, i.e., checklist, diary, rating scales, questionnaires and interviews
- Personal products, i.e., samples of work, tests
- On-site visiting committee conducts personal interviews
- Review an analysis of existing data
- Other (List)
24. WHICH EVALUATION MODELS HAVE YOU USED TO CONDUCT LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATIONS?

- Locally developed model
- Commercial model
- Adapted another's model
- Model developed by consultant
- SACS Model
- State developed model
- Other (Please be specific)

STAFFING PATTERN

25. WHO HAS MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION IN YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM?

- Local school superintendent
- Assistant superintendent
- Director of Special Education
- "I do"
- Research and development
- Coordinator of special education
- Special education teachers
- Other (Please list)

26. DOES YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM HAVE A TRAINED PROGRAM EVALUATOR?

- Yes, (Three or less years experience)
- Yes, (More than three years experience)
- No

27. DOES YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM EMPLOY EXPERT CONSULTANTS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION?

- Yes (peers)
- Yes (other than peers)
- No
- Other (please list)

BUDGET

28. WHAT IS YOUR SCHOOL SYSTEM'S TOTAL BUDGET FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION?

- No budget
- $0 - $1,000
- $1,000 - $5,000
- $5,001 - $9,000
- $9,001 - $13,000
- $13,001 - $17,000
- $17,001 - $21,000
- Other (Be specific)
29. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT BUDGET FOR LOCALLY DIRECTED SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION?
   __ No budget __ $4,001 - $5,000
   __ $0 - $1,000 __ $5,001 - $6,000
   __ $1,001 - $2,000 __ $6,001 - $7,000
   __ $2,001 - $3,000 __ $7,001 - $8,000
   __ $3,001 - $4,000 __ Other (Be specific)

30. WHAT IS (ARE) THE SOURCE(S) OF YOUR FUNDS FOR LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS?
   __ Local school system __ U. S. Office of Education
   __ State Department of Education __ Other (List)

31. IF GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPEND A LIMITED AMOUNT OF RESOURCES, WHAT WOULD YOU CHOOSE? (PLEASE RANK YOUR TOP THREE CHOICES, 1 BEING YOUR FIRST CHOICE).
   __ Program evaluation __ Program improvement
   __ Course evaluation __ Community improvement
   __ Using advisory committees __ Student counseling
   __ Student assessment __ Materials and supplies
   __ New equipment __ Other (Please list)
   __ New program planning

SPECIAL NOTE:

Thank you for your assistance. Please check the appropriate item below.

( ) I wish to receive the results of the study.

( ) I do not wish to receive the results of the study.
APPENDIX F
January 20, 1981

Lorraine H. Walton
4621 Lanark Drive S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30331

Dear Ms. Walton:


I will contact you by telephone in the near future. In the meantime, I hope these materials provide you with the information you need as you are preparing for your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Tim L. Wentling
Associate Professor
and Director
APPENDIX G
County School Systems Within the
Selected State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appling County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Atkinson County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bacon County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Baker County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Baldwin County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Banks County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Barrow County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bartow County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ben Hill County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Berrien County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bibb County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bleckley County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Brantley County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Brooks County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Bryan County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Bullock County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Burke County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Butts County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Calhoun County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Camden County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Candler County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Carroll County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Catoosa County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Charlton County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Chatham County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Chattahoochee County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Chattooga County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Cherokee County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Clarke County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Clay County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Clayton County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Clinch County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Cobb County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Coffee County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Colquitt County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Columbia County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Cook County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Crawford County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Crisp County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Dade County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Dawson County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Decatur County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. DeKalb County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Dodge County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Coweta County Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. Dooly County Schools
47. Dougherty County Schools
48. Douglas County Schools
49. Early County Schools
50. Echols County Schools
51. Effingham County Schools
52. Elbert County Schools
53. Emanuel County Schools
54. Evans County Schools
55. Fannin County Schools
56. Fayette County Schools
57. Floyd County Schools
58. Forsyth County Schools
59. Franklin County Schools
60. Fulton County Schools
61. Gilmer County Schools
62. Glascock County Schools
63. Glynn County Schools
64. Grodon County Schools
65. Grady County Schools
66. Greene County Schools
67. Gwinnett County Schools
68. Habersham County Schools
69. Hall County Schools
70. Hancock County Schools
71. Haralson County Schools
72. Harris County Schools
73. Hart County Schools
74. Heard County Schools
75. Henry County Schools
76. Houston County Schools
77. Irwin County Schools
78. Jackson County Schools
79. Jasper County Schools
80. Jeff Davis County Schools
81. Jefferson County Schools
82. Jenkins County Schools
83. Johnson County Schools
84. Jones County Schools
85. Lamar County Schools
86. Lanier County Schools
87. Laurens County Schools
88. Lee County Schools
89. Liberty County Schools
90. Lincoln County Schools
91. Long County Schools
92. Lowndes County Schools
93. Lumpkin County Schools
94. Macon County Schools
95. Madison County Schools
96. Marion County Schools
97. McDuffie County Schools
98. McTosh County Schools
99. Meriwether County Schools
100. Miller County Schools
101. Mitchell County Schools
102. Monroe County Schools
103. Montgomery County Schools
104. Morgan County Schools
105. Murray County Schools
106. Muscogee County Schools
107. Newton County Schools
108. Oconee County Schools
109. Oglethorpe County Schools
110. Paulding County Schools
111. Peach County Schools
112. Pickens County Schools
113. Pierce County Schools
114. Pike County Schools
115. Polk County Schools
116. Pulaski County Schools
117. Putnam County Schools
118. Quitman County Schools
119. Rabun County Schools
120. Randolph County Schools
121. Richmond County Schools
122. Rockdale County Schools
123. Schley County Schools
124. Seminole County Schools
125. Spalding County Schools
126. Stephens County Schools
127. Stewart County Schools
128. Sumter County Schools
129. Screven County Schools
130. Talbot County Schools
131. Taliaferro County Schools
132. Tattnall County Schools
133. Taylor County Schools
134. Telfair County Schools
135. Terrell County Schools
136. Thomas County Schools
137. Tift County Schools
138. Toombs County Schools
139. Towns County Schools
140. Treutlen County Schools
141. Troup County Schools
142. Turner County Schools
143. Twiggs County Schools
144. Union County Schools
145. Upson County Schools
146. Walker County Schools
147. Walton County Schools
148. Ware County Schools
149. Warren County Schools
150. Washington County Schools
151. Wayne County Schools
152. Webster County Schools
153. Wheeler County Schools
154. White County Schools
155. Whitfield County Schools
156. Wilcox County Schools
157. Wilkes County Schools
158. Wilkinson County Schools
159. Worth County Schools
City School Systems Within the Selected State

1. Americus City Schools
2. Atlanta City Schools
3. Bremen City Schools
4. Buford City Schools
5. Calhoun City Schools
6. Carrollton City Schools
7. Cartersville City Schools
8. Chickamuga City Schools
9. Commerce City Schools
10. Dalton Public Schools
11. Decatur City Schools
12. Dublin City Schools
13. Fitzgerald City Schools
14. Gainesville City Schools
15. Hoganville City Schools
16. Jefferson City Schools
17. LaGrange City Schools
18. Marietta City Schools
19. Pelham City Schools
20. Rome City Schools
21. Social Circle City Schools
22. Thomaston City Schools
23. Thomasville City Schools
24. Trion City Schools
25. Valdosta City Schools
26. Vidalia City Schools
27. Waycross City Schools
28. West Point City Schools
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