

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 810

95

TM 005 903

**AUTHOR** Speiss, Madeleine; And Others  
**TITLE** Program To Operationalize a New Training Pattern for Training Evaluation Personnel in Education. Final Report. Part E - Report Synthesizing Evaluation of Development and Implementation of Model Training Program.

**INSTITUTION** Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Research Foundation.  
**SPONS AGENCY** National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.d  
**BUREAU NO** 09039  
**PUB DATE** 30 Jun 73  
**GRANT** OEG-0-71-1051  
**NOTE** 53p.; For related documents, see TM 005 901-904

**EDRS PRICE** MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.  
**DESCRIPTORS** Consortia; \*Educational Programs; \*Educational Researchers; \*Evaluation; Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; \*Program Evaluation; Standards; Technical Reports; \*Training Objectives

**IDENTIFIERS** \*Ohio State University Model Training Project

**ABSTRACT**

A major problem inherent in the synthesis of the Model Training Project (MTP) evaluation reports cited herein is the absence of the following: (1) a formal project evaluation design, (2) a set of adequate specifications or standards upon which to assess project activities, (3) concensus among project staff on specific criteria for project evaluation. Consequently, most evaluation efforts were ad hoc, lacking in overall continuity, and based on very general standards for evaluation. These problems were recognized internally by the staff, and were noted in a number of MTP documents. The continuity that did exist was of two types: first, the external review teams had repeat members; second, the external review team findings were followed up to attempt to document project responsiveness; and third, the quarterly and yearly reports to USOE used a reporting format that summed the project activities chronologically. Thus, although there was some continuity, the lack of an overall evaluation design made the task of compiling a cohesive synthesis impossible. Therefore, this document reports numerous evaluation efforts that are little related to each other, which reflects the conditions of ad hoc evaluation that characterized the MTP. (Author/MV)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished \*  
 \* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort \*  
 \* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal \*  
 \* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality \*  
 \* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available \*  
 \* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not \*  
 \* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions \*  
 \* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

ED135810

PROGRAM TO OPERATIONALIZE A NEW TRAINING PATTERN  
FOR  
TRAINING EVALUATION PERSONNEL IN EDUCATION

Final Report  
Project Number 09039  
Grant No. OEG-0-71-1051  
National Institute of Education

Part E - Report Synthesizing Evaluation of Development  
and Implementation of Model Training Program

Prepared by:

Madeleine Speiss  
Paul Carlson  
David Navo  
John Evers

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

June 30, 1973

The Ohio State University Research Foundation  
1314 Kinnear Road  
Columbus, Ohio 43212

JM005 903

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1

CLASSIFICATION PROCESS OF EVALUATION DOCUMENTS . . . . . 2

    List of Documents . . . . . 2

GENERAL OBJECTIVE 1

    Standards (A) - (H) . . . . . 5

GENERAL OBJECTIVE 2

    Standards (A) - (H) . . . . . 9

GENERAL OBJECTIVE 3

    Standards (A) - (G) . . . . . 29

GENERAL OBJECTIVE 4

    Standards (A) - (I) . . . . . 36

GENERAL OBJECTIVE 5

    Standards (A) - (C) . . . . . 44

## INTRODUCTION

A major problem inherent in the synthesis of the MTP evaluation reports cited herein is the absence of the following:

1. A formal project evaluation design
2. A set of adequate specifications or standards upon which to assess project activities.
3. Concensus among project staff on specific criteria for project evaluation.

Consequently, most evaluation efforts were ad hoc, lacking in overall continuity, and based on very general standards for evaluation. These problems were recognized internally by the staff, and were noted in a number of MTP documents such as the In-House Quarterly Report (Eye, et al., 1972, C<sub>1</sub>). The continuity that did exist was of two types: first, the external review teams had repeat members; second, the external review team findings were followed up to attempt to document project responsiveness; and third, the quarterly and yearly reports to USOE used a reporting format that summed the project activities chronologically. Thus, although there was some continuity, the lack of an overall evaluation design made the task of compiling a cohesive synthesis impossible. Therefore, this document reports numerous evaluation efforts that are little related to each other, which reflects the conditions of ad hoc evaluation that characterized the MTP.

## CLASSIFICATION PROCESS OF EVALUATION DOCUMENTS

This report has as its organizational base a physical classification of documents which is as follows:

- A. MTP Reports are any evaluation report produced by the project for an external agency or individual, other than the consortium.
- B. Proposals are a contractor's request for continued funding.
- C. Internal Evaluation Reports are any reports produced by the project for any Evaluation Center staff member.
- D. Site Visits and External Reports are evaluation documents produced by any external source.
- E. Consortium Reports are any reports produced by the project for any consortium staff member.

The documents classified by the five groups were then analyzed for evaluation material pertinent to the MTP's initial proposed objectives, and the Standards under each Objective. The reporting format uses the left column for a brief content statement of material. The right column gives the bibliographic citation. For complete information, the reader needs the following list:

### List of Documents

#### A. MTP Reports

- A<sub>1</sub> - Program to Operationalize a New Training Pattern for Training Evaluation and Innovation Process Personnel in Education, Technical Progress Report, October 11, 1971.
- A<sub>2</sub> - Project to design New Pattern for Training Research, Development, Innovation Process, and Evaluation Personnel in Education, Semi Final Report, November 13, 1970.
- A<sub>3</sub> - Proposal to Design New Patterns for Training Research, Development, Demonstration/Dissemination and Evaluation Personnel in Education, Context Evaluation Report, April 13, 1971.
- A<sub>4</sub> - Proposal to Design New Patterns for Training Research, Development, Demonstration/Dissemination and Evaluation Personnel in Education, Progress Report #2, Context Evaluation, September 10, 1970.

- A<sub>5</sub> - Program to Operationalize a New Training Pattern for Training Evaluation Personnel in Education, Technical Progress Report, January 31, 1972.
- A<sub>6</sub> - Program to Operationalize a New Training Pattern for Training Evaluation and Innovation Process Personnel in Education, Technical Progress Report, June 18, 1971.
- A<sub>7</sub> - Program to Operationalize a New Training Pattern for Training Evaluation and Innovation Process Personnel in Education, Technical Progress Report, March 18, 1971.

#### B. Proposals

- B<sub>1</sub> - Proposal to Design New Patterns for Training Research, Development Demonstration/Dissemination, and Evaluation Personnel in Education, May 22, 1970.
- B<sub>2</sub> - Proposal to Design New Patterns for Training Research, Development, Demonstration/Dissemination and Evaluation Personnel in Education, Final Report and Proposal, December 18, 1970.

#### C. Internal Evaluation Reports

- C<sub>1</sub> - In-House MTP Quarterly Report, March 29, 1972.
- C<sub>2</sub> - Decisions Based upon In-House MTP Quarterly Report: Student Survey (no date).
- C<sub>5</sub> - PRDB (no date).
- C<sub>6</sub> - Barger Model/Placement Sub-System (no date).
- C<sub>7</sub> - Barger Model/Sub-System Processes (no date).
- C<sub>8</sub> - Barger Model/Learning Experiences Sub-System (no date).
- C<sub>9</sub> - MTP Position Paper on Student Selection (R. R. Barger), May 26, 1972.
- C<sub>10</sub> - Problems, Observations, Solutions? (D. Reinhard), April 6, 1972.
- C<sub>11</sub> - Profiles of the Programs of Evaluation Majors, February 1, 1972.
- C<sub>17</sub> - Profile of New Students, November 23, 1971.
- C<sub>18</sub> - In-House MTP Quarterly Report: Student Survey, March 28, 1972.
- C<sub>20</sub> - Student Attitudes Toward Educational Evaluation, MTP Internal Evaluation Unit, August 11, 1972.

- C<sub>21</sub> - Internships - Student Attitude (no date).
- C<sub>25</sub> - MTP Scope of Work Process Evaluation Report, February 1, 1972.
- C<sub>28</sub> - Proportion of Credit Hours in Four Technical Areas to Total Number of Credit Hours Accumulated Since Autumn 1971 Through the Present Quarter (no date).

#### D. Site Visits and External Reports

- D<sub>1</sub> - OE Site Visit October 26-27, 1971, Exit Interview.
- D<sub>2</sub> - MTP Recommendations from HEW Team, Michael Scriven, Frank Chase, Eva Baker (no date).
- D<sub>4</sub> - Egon G. Guba, Consultant's Report (covering visit of May 25-27, 1971), June 11, 1971.
- D<sub>5</sub> - MTP Responses To Outside Evaluation, February, 1972.
- D<sub>6</sub> - Letter from John C. Egermeier and Susan S. Klein to Daniel L. Stufflebeam, November 17, 1971.
- D<sub>7</sub> - Michael Scriven, MTP Outside Review Panel, visit of July 29-30, 1971, Report of September 7, 1971.
- D<sub>8</sub> - Eva Baker, MTP Outside Review Panel, visit of July 29-30, 1971.
- D<sub>9</sub> - Francis S. Chase, Report on the Site Visit to the MTP in Evaluation of the Evaluation Center of OSU, 1971.
- D<sub>10</sub> - John B. Peper, Chairman's Report of the Site Visit to OSU Model Training Project, October 13-14, 1972.

#### E. Consortium Reports

- E<sub>2</sub> - MTP Consortium Meeting, Columbus, Ohio, July 10-11, 1972.
- E<sub>4</sub> - The Council of the Great City Schools Site Visit Report (Jack P. Taylor and others - no date).
- E<sub>5</sub> - Saginaw Site Visit Report (Marvin Dawson and others - no date).
- E<sub>7</sub> - The Cincinnati Public School System Site Visit Report (Marvin Gervirtz and others - no date).
- E<sub>9</sub> - Institute for Educational Development Site Visit Report (Jerry R. Baker and others - no date).
- E<sub>10</sub> - MTP Consortium Meeting, December 1-3, 1971: Process Evaluation Report, December 11, 1971.
- E<sub>12</sub> - Evaluation of Shanty Creek Meeting, July 20, 1971.

General Objective 1: TO CONCEPTUALIZE A GENERAL MODEL FOR TRAINING EDUCATIONAL EVALUATORS.

- (A) SPECIFY THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES: RECRUITMENT, APPLICATION, SELECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE, PROGRAM DESIGNING, PROGRAM EXPERIENCE AND MONITORING, PROGRAM COMPLETION, PLACEMENT, AND RE-ENTRY.

Figure 1 contains the general model which will be the basis for the proposed training program. . .includes five major stages in the training process. . .supported by five program components.

" . . .no national symposium will be held to assess the Bargar model. . .".

Standards of evaluation are presented.

Context information is presented as a basis for this standard.

Baseline information for developing a training program is presented.

- (B) PROVIDE WELL DEFINED BASES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES, DOCUMENTS, AND ACTIVITIES NECESSARY FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION.

Program development section will consist of following: 1) work breakdown of activities and 2) time sequency description.

The model does not specify materials, however, it sets cut areas. . .few people

Semi-Final Report  
Objectives  
Input Evaluation  
Structuring Decisions  
November 13, 1970  
p. 227 ff. A<sub>2</sub>

In-House Quarterly Report  
March 24, 1972  
p. 1  
C<sub>18</sub>

Technical Progress Reports  
Volume 1  
October 11, 1971  
p.98  
A<sub>1</sub>

Context Evaluation Report  
April 13, 1971  
Section II, Part II  
p.63 ff. A<sub>3</sub>

Progress Report #2  
September 10, 1970  
p. 1 ff. A<sub>4</sub>

Semi-Final Report  
November 13, 1970  
p.248 ff. A<sub>2</sub>

In-House Quarterly Report  
March 24, 1972  
p.1  
C<sub>18</sub>

other than Bargar understand the intricacies of the model.

Flow charts of training system are presented.

The model is not communicable in it's present form.

Standards for evaluation are presented.

- (C) WILL BE SUFFICIENTLY GENERALIZABLE SO THAT IT CAN BE INSTALLED AND OPERATED BY GROUPS OF FIELD AND UNIVERSITY AGENCIES BEYOND THE CONSORTIUM OPERATING THE PRESENT PROJECT.

One test for generalizability was to be the national symposium that will not be held.

Standards for evaluation are presented.

- (O) WILL BE GENERALIZABLE FOR TRAINING OF PERSONNEL IN THE AREAS OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND INNOVATION PROCESSES, IN ADDITION TO EVALUATION.

The training component pictured in Figure 4 shows blocks for four types of training: evaluation, innovative processes (diffusion), research, and development.

Bargar Model papers  
Learning Experiences Sub-System  
C6, C7, C8

MTP Consortium Meeting  
Process Evaluation Report  
December 11, 1971  
p.17

Technical Progress Report  
Volume 1 of 11 Volumes  
October 11, 1971  
p.98  
A1

In-House Quarterly Report  
March 24, 1972  
p.1  
C18

Technical Progress Report  
Volume 1 of 11 Volumes  
October 11, 1971  
p.99  
A1

Final Report  
Volume 1 of 11 Volumes  
p.17  
B2

There is no evidence that the model has been adopted by any outside system or agency. Revised model has yet to be subjected to an outside review.

Standards for evaluation are presented.

(E) WILL BE INTERNALLY CONSISTENT.

Assessment of this standard is not being done.

Standards of evaluation are presented.

(F) INTERPRETABLE TO GENERAL EDUCATION AUDIENCES.

There is a lack of understanding by educational specialists at the December, 1971 Consortium meeting. This strongly suggests less sophisticated audiences would not fare any better (in understanding).

Standards of evaluation are presented.

(G) SUGGEST CRITERIA FOR OPERATIONAL TESTING.

Criteria have not been stated for this standard.

In-House Quarterly Report  
March 24, 1971  
p.2  
C18

Technical Progress Report  
Volume 1 of 11 Volumes  
October 11, 1971  
p.100  
A1

In-House Quarterly Report  
March 24, 1972  
p.2  
C18

Technical Progress Report  
Volume 1 of 11 Volumes  
October 11, 1971  
p.101  
A1

In-House Quarterly Report  
March 24, 1971  
p.2  
C18

Technical Progress Report  
Volume 1  
October 11, 1971  
p.101  
A1

In-House Quarterly Report  
March 24, 1971  
p.2  
C18

Standards of evaluation are presented.

Technical Progress Report  
Volume I  
October 11, 1971  
p.102  
A<sub>1</sub>

(H) WILL BE VIABLE BOTH IN TERMS OF FUNDING AND THE USUAL ACADEMIC CONSTRAINTS TO BE FOUND IN GROUPS OF FIELD AND UNIVERSITY AGENCIES OTHER THAN THOSE PRESENTLY INVOLVED IN THE MODEL TRAINING PROJECT.

Alternative Strategies for the Support of Students and Payment of Instructional Fees

Semi-Final Report  
November 13, 1970  
p.308 ff. A<sub>2</sub>

are presented.

Data reported by agencies Relating to Training is shown.

Context Evaluation Report  
April 13, 1971  
p.44 ff. A<sub>3</sub>

There is no data to relate to this standard.

In-House Quarterly Report  
March 24, 1972  
p.2  
C<sub>18</sub>

Standards of evaluation are presented.

Technical Progress Report  
Volume I  
October 11, 1971  
p.102  
A<sub>1</sub>

**General Objective 2: TO OPERATIONALIZE A  
GENERAL MODEL FOR TRAINING EDUCATIONAL  
EVALUATORS.**

- (A) THE MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS THIS WILL  
REQUIRE WILL INVOLVE REALISTIC AND  
EFFECTIVE RECRUITMENT PROCEDURES  
AND MATERIALS TO BE DEVELOPED.

During the October, 1971 USOE exit  
interview, John Hopkins indicated that re-  
cruitment procedures were "missing a poten-  
tial pool of highly talented prospects" for  
the MTP. The present composition of MTP  
students indicated that recruitment procedures  
were probably aimed at drawing students who  
were already involved in educational evaluation.

D<sub>1</sub>  
A  
p.2

Recruitment materials (brochures,  
transparencies, and a slide and tape presen-  
tation) were revised, based on student,  
faculty, and consortium personnel feedback,  
and prepared for distribution.

A  
p.37

During 1972, recruitment procedures  
were informal and heavily relied on the  
subjective judgement and experience of  
adjunct professors.

A<sub>5</sub>  
A  
p.22

- (B) THE MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS THIS WILL  
REQUIRE WILL INVOLVE SELECTION PROCEDURES  
AND MATERIALS.

John Egermeier touched upon the student  
selection problem probably to be encountered  
during the USOE October, 1971 visit. He

D<sub>1</sub>  
B  
p.2

indicated that educators have a long tradition of training only other educators to work in education and that the MTP could probably "pick up a lot of strength by increasing the diversity of our group."

While special materials and systems were developed to aid selection, these were never well integrated with University materials.

A5  
B  
p.22

The position paper on student selection indicated student attributes that were considered important to educational evaluators. These attributes were informally identified through several sources, including general readings, discussions with the colleagues in evaluation, and through the author's personal perceptions of those factors that appeared to be most important. The attributes were subsequently classified into four categories: 1) cognitive characteristics, 2) affective characteristics, 3) professional-orientation characteristics, and 4) work characteristics.

C9  
B  
p.2,3

The student survey collected some unanticipated data regarding the selection of students into the MTP as opposed to the Library Project. During the course of the interview, it was discovered that MTP students

Student Survey C<sub>18</sub>  
B  
p.15

on the Library Project felt separated from the MTP students working under Darrell Root's jurisdiction. The perceptions of Library Project students were unanimous. It was also noted that all students on the Library Project were members of ethnic minorities. The evaluators concluded that while the ratio of ethnic distribution was statistically possible, it was socially intolerable.

(C) THE MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS THIS WILL REQUIRE WILL INVOLVE INSTRUMENTS FOR TRAINEE DIAGNOSIS.

Diagnosis of student learning needs have largely been conducted individually by the traditional advisement procedures.

Other than SAES, developed largely over the spring and summer of 1972, trainee diagnosis was primarily an informal process attended to by the trainee's advisor. Evaluation of SAES does not appear in any MTP documents prepared prior to the phase-out period.

(D) THE MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS THIS WILL REQUIRE WILL INVOLVE SPECIFIC CURRICULUM MODULES PERTAINING TO CONTENT OF THE TRAINING MODEL THAT MIGHT BE TRANSMITTED TO STUDENTS VIA INSTRUCTIONAL PACKAGES, FIELD TESTING, OR SHORT-TERM INSTITUTE-TYPE TRAINING.

C2

C

p.38

"Diagnosis of student learning needs have been conducted individually by students' major advisors."

A Context and Input evaluation found that there was a lack of readily available, systematically developed, validated materials for training educational researchers of any type.

Prototype versions of the three slide/tape presentations were viewed by adjunct professors at the Dallas consortium meeting. This enabled the developers to obtain Formative feedback for refinement purposes. Input was also acquired by soliciting critiques from audio visual specialists, content experts, and consortium staff members. These data were additionally used for further developmental modifications.

During a July, 1971 site visit, Michael Scriven pointed out that planning materials would improve greatly if they simulated the needs of new students. Scriven also underscored the urgent need to write behavioral specifications and then tests and content for a couple of core modules explicating evaluation skills.

B2

D

p.145

"the systematic study and planning that resulted in the proposed MTP clearly identified requirements for successful development and operation of the program. As the study and planning evolved, it became obvious that field agencies consistently lacked sets of materials for training staff for evaluation, development, and innovative processes."

A6

D

p.9

D7

D

p.4

"The planning materials under both headings are substantial and useful or promising, but I think they too would be improved more quickly as a result, not of further cycles of staff discussions of them as planning documents, but as a result of simulating the needs of the entering students, role-playing entering students, and asking what it is that they are going to need on Day 1 when they enter the door for the first time." (Scriven, D7, D. p.2)

Scriven also noticed a discrepancy between an MTP goal and the adopted teaching strategies.

D7  
D  
p.8

He discovered that MTP training materials were using a deductive approach to training by initially sequencing basic concepts and theories prior to putting the students to work when materials indicated that students would be exposed to an inductive approach. Scriven's final commentary on instructional materials focused on the urgency for developing modules which would eliminate much of the redundancy and irrelevance in a course-work approach.

Eva Baker, a second member of the advisory site team, also addressed some of her comments to the nature and developmental status of the materials development component during the July, 1971 advisory panel site visit. She indicated that the planned development procedures were much too complex for available resources. She recommended that reference to a simpler developmental model, with fewer decision points, would be more consonant with project resources.

D7  
D  
p.10

A panel discussion among MTP staff and the advisory site visit members lead to an examination of criteria for MTP materials

D7  
D  
p.4  
"Such a requirement is both ill-thought-out and unjustified.

selection. The discussion revealed that the first criterion was compatible with the CIPP model. Scriven's report expressed concern with this criterion which could potentially limit diversity of student exposure to other evaluation models.

During another site visit, Egon Guba noted that the materials development component failed to give a high priority to tailoring materials to the particular audience for which they were intended. His assessment was made subsequent to viewing two slide/tape presentations which he felt failed to address their primary audience.

While Guba forecasted serious problems for the instructional development component, these were primarily attributable to highly inadequate budgetary allocations and staffing problems.

Guba presented a rationale for adopting flexible modular training materials. He recommended inclusion of explicit performance objectives and that "the levels of the program be linked in some kind of explicit career lattice structure." Guba's report showed concern for the absence of these attributes

Accepting the Center's verbal assurance that the actual situation encourages much more diversity than this suggests, its worth explicated the difficulty. Some training programs must absolutely not be indoctrination programs and this one is an example." (D7, D, p.4).

D4

D

p.17

"the two examples of slide/tapes which I saw missed this mark materially. Part of the problem is, I believe, traceable to the low budget." (D4, D, p.17)

D4

D

p.16

"I have already registered several doubts about the potential of this component for productive operation, due primarily to the low budget allocation and the staffing problem." (D4, D, p.16)

D4

D

p.10

"Where is the explicit commitment that the materials to be developed should be modular in form? Where is the listing of performance objectives (or where is the process spelled out whereby the performance objectives will be derived)? Where is the career lattice spelled out? How is the individualization to occur?

underscoring that these considerations should have been delineated in advance of production.

Identification of curriculum packages pertaining to content of the training model was made based on four principle points involving: 1) a determination that the information contained in the packages will need to be presented at the first general consortium meeting, 2) a need for consortium representatives to present similar information to individuals within their own agencies, 3) a determination that a knowledge of the content of these modules will be needed by all trainees, and 4) the desirability of these modules for explicating the training program to a wide variety of interested people. A slide/tape format was selected for the packages in order to facilitate use by an individual or by an entire group.

The materials development component undertook the development of three seminar packages based on the conclusions of a consortium task force. These were: 1) a module on Evaluation of Institutionalization

These steps seem to me to be necessary to delineate in advance as much as possible, to avoid the production of training materials that are randomly generated and that will not fit together in any articulated way." (D4, D, p.10)

A7  
D  
p.5

A5  
D  
p.23  
'Responding to the expressed needs of a consortium task force commissioned to develop initial seminars for all MTP project trainees, Jack Sanders scheduled three "seminar packages" for production." (A5, D, p.23)

and Change Strategies, 2) a survey of the Theories, Functions and Methods of Evaluation, and 3) seven interrelated modules for an introductory measurement course.

During a later USOE site visit, John Hopkins, synthesizing the teams comments regarding the materials development operation, noted that in view of the relative lack of resources it would indeed be wise to put less emphasis on materials development. It was then suggested that available talent concentrate on the production of a few high quality modules deemed of central importance to the operation of this particular training program.

D1  
D  
p.3

(E) THE MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS THIS WILL REQUIRE WILL INVOLVE MATERIAL FOR PLANNING STUDENTS' PROGRAMS.

The absence of an accepted process-product evaluation design resulted in fragmented ad hoc evaluations of the materials and systems developed to facilitate student program planning. Attempts to interrelate these isolated assessments would produce an artificial and deceptive picture of the evaluation endeavors.

One of the earliest attempts to help students plan their programs involved feedback from consortium adjunct professors. They

were requested to reflect upon their perceptions of the core evaluation staff needs of their agencies. Thier feedback revealed that there was almost an equal number of positions calling for skills in the problem delineation and providing role, as there were in roles requiring the more traditional types of technical obtaining skills.

Profiles of the Programs of Evaluation majors was a document composed of raw data detailing individual program profiles of Evaluation majors. It was compiled with the express purpose of facilitating program planning for MTP students. The document is devoid of a descriptive text.

C11  
E

During an indepth student survey, students surveyed repeatedly pointed out that Center staff do not have an adequate cognizance of university offerings or their appropriateness. This was undoubtedly attributable to the fact that staff advisors were new to Ohio State. About fifty percent of the respondents felt there was little to no formal advisement procedure.

C18  
E  
p.4  
"You find out what you think you want to take and get your advisor to sign it." (C27, E, p.4)

A later analysis of coursework in the technical areas of evaluation among MTP students programs was undertaken to determine whether

C28  
E

students were engaged in those types of courses on campus. The analysis divided technical coursework into the general areas of:

1) statistics and design, 2) evaluation, 3) measurement, and 4) research. The data revealed that MTP students coursework involved an average of seventy-two percent across the four areas. The largest proportion of coursework was in statistical and design courses. The smallest portion of coursework occurred in research. The accuracy of subcategory course classification was somewhat ambiguous, however, the overall analysis did confirm that MTP students were taking a good number of courses in the more technically oriented areas.

The PRDB operation attempted to help students plan their programs by shepherding the evaluation of O.S.U. courses by MTP students in order to provide students with a more indepth look at courses relevant to their career goals.

(F) THE MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS THIS WILL REQUIRE WILL INVOLVE THE PROJECT RESOURCE DATA BANK.

C<sub>5</sub>  
E<sup>5</sup>

p.4

"the subjective assessment of over one hundred courses which students have taken are compiled in two notebooks to assist future students in program planning. A coordination of the PRDB and the new evaluation instrument has occurred during the past two months to insure continuity of services." (C<sub>5</sub>, E, p.4)

The PRDB engaged in a series of evaluational activities to assess its users' needs. Among these were structured interviews, questionnaires, frequency tabulations of use, etc. It has also directed and maintained the systematic evaluation of courses. An external evaluation of the Data Banks' utility for planning student programs, among its other functions, was undertaken by an information specialist.

A major function of the PRDB involved trying to facilitate planning of student programs. For example the PRDB had:

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <p>1) set up and maintained a file on individual consortium members.</p> <p>It was composed of data on an array of variables, such as consortium training needs.</p>                              | <p>A<sub>1</sub><br/>F<br/>p.23</p> |
| <p>2) set up an ongoing course evaluation file containing such data as instructional mode descriptions, lecture outlines and course relationships to the Taxonomy of Content and Skills, etc.</p> | <p>A<sub>1</sub><br/>F<br/>p.23</p> |

3) conducted a needs assessment of existing instructional materials which yielded a cadre of complimentary articles and books and a great deal of information increasing the awareness of available materials.

A<sub>1</sub>  
F  
p.23

4) identified and maintained a file on evaluation or evaluation related university based courses. Of those, approximately thirty were evaluated with regard to course attributes. Other opportunities for training were also sought, identified, and evaluated. These were kept in folders for potential use in planning student programs.

A<sub>5</sub>  
F  
p.28

A letter from HEW, July, 1971, to the Project Director synthesized the previous USOE site visit and noted the utility of the PRDB to the Model Training Program. John Egermeier reported that the reviewers felt the Data Bank concept had great utility, especially in a consortia.

D<sub>6</sub>  
F  
"It would be good, desirable, and imperative that these different views be reconciled so that the PRDB facility in fact serves the needs of the training program." (D<sub>6</sub>, F, p.2)

However, a later site visit proved to be less favorable to the PRDB's function.

D<sub>1</sub>  
F  
p.2

John Egermeier, commenting on the PRDB's relevance

to the program during the October, 1971, exit interview, indicated that there were discrepant views of the PRDB's function within the program. He said the site team noted two aspects of the PRDB: 1) that it had a library function, and 2) that it had an information function to serve the faculty, the students and the administrators of the Training Project. It was recommended that the MTP split off as much of the library function as possible and use the O.S.U. library staff and facility for that purpose.

(G) THE MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS THIS WILL REQUIRE WILL INVOLVE PROCEDURES AND MATERIALS FOR PLACEMENT OF STUDENTS, BOTH IN INTERNSHIP AND REGULAR JOB SITUATIONS.

A synthesis of a 1971 USOE site visit recommended the internship and work experience opportunities were a strong component of the MTP. One suggestion for improvement, however, entailed imposing a bit more structure on the procedures for instructional purposes.

D6

G

p.2

"Your internship and work experience opportunities are a strong component of your program. It is possible that these situations may be improved if they are more structured (engineered internship idea) for instructional purposes." (D6, G, p.5)

A number of student and adjunct professor assessments were undertaken in order to more closely tailor the students' career goals to agency needs for internship and/or full-time placement. For example, a three page unsynthesized evaluation of MTP student needs was

C21

G

done regarding internships and was reported in tabular form. Students were largely queried regarding their 1) internship plans, 2) internship awareness, and 3) ideas solicited on how information regarding internships could best be publicized.

During the December, 1972, consortium meeting, adjunct professors were requested to list the names of agencies similar to their own relative to goals and products. A wide array of organizations, centers, etc., were generated which gave the project additional leads for potentially placing students in internships or full-time post graduate positions.

An assessment by the Consortium Liaison Director for the PRDB suggested that the PRDB adopt a set of objectives, one of which corresponded to student internships.

The Student Survey attempted to acquire some data regarding the students' perceptions of internships and placement. These data revealed a lack of student knowledge about the consortium.

C25  
G  
p.

C5  
G  
p.2  
"Based on information collected by Diane Reinhard on the PRDB questionnaire and conversations with agency personnel, the following objectives are suggested"  
. . .one of these was "to provide agencies with (with students approval) information on students seeking internships." (C5, G, p.2)

C18  
C  
p.15  
"The student perception of the consortium coupled with the open reluctance of students to go out into internships expressed in the Purdy, Lash, McFarland internship paper, indicates a basic contradiction with the basic project

objective to create field-based training for evaluators to be trained in the real world of evaluators." (C18, C, p.15)

Some student response, regarding the consortium, included in the report were:

- 1) "I don't know very much about it."
  - 2) "The consortium agencies are not doing their share."
  - 3) "The internships are not meeting our needs."
  - 4) "It's a great idea, but it's not working."
- (C18, C, p.15)

In an attempt to increase the accuracy of planning for student placement, students were asked about their career projections. The data were synthesized in regard to the frequency of MTP students that saw themselves becoming evaluators. Out of eighteen students interviewed, five indicated that they expected to become evaluators, three indicated 'maybe', and ten said 'no'. Subsequent to making this estimate, the Process Evaluator cross-checked the estimate with responses on a previous product evaluation undertaken by a different evaluator. These data revealed that out of nineteen students, eight projected that they would become evaluators, six said 'maybe', and five said 'no'.

C18

G

p.14

"tabulations suggest that the current student selection procedures are partially effective, and that an improved procedure would probably serve a critical project objective." (C18, G, p.14)

MTP staff present during the December, 1972, consortium meeting, indicated a need for MTP students to flow into agencies to make room for agency people to come into the university. However, the evaluation of field agency adjunct professors indicated that the MTP is faced with too many students on board to place on an individualized basis in 1972.

E10  
G  
p.11

Very little, if any, formal evaluation occurred in regard to full-time student placement. This was undoubtedly related to the fact that the greatest proportion of students were not facing that decision point during the program's duration.

- (H) THE MATERIALS AND SYSTEMS THIS WILL REQUIRE WILL INVOLVE COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE BEHAVIORS THAT STUDENTS AT EACH LEVEL OF THE TRAINING PROJECT WILL BE ABLE TO EXHIBIT FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF TRAINING.

Because the MTP never institutionalized an evaluation design, specifications by which it assessed its accomplishments were largely inadequate. This unfortunately was true of student assessment. Of necessity, student evaluation proceeded in an ad hoc manner and was fragmentary. The multiple criteria, which was in the process of being operationalized in the SAES instrument, was not ready

for actual use. Consequently, formal cognitive student assessment was never executed. There were, however, a series of affective measures used throughout the project's duration to tap student attitudes. These were administered upon entry, during interim periods, and upon exiting the program.

Several student assessments were undertaken solely to acquire descriptive profile data. One such undertaking reported in tabular form, was compiled early in the program and contained information on the following areas:

- 1) degree sought, 2) age, 3) sex, 4) membership in minority group, 5) grade point average,
- 6) previous work experience, 7) honors, and
- 8) publications.

C17  
H

Early in the MTP, during the December, 1971, consortium meeting, O.S.U. centered staff, assessing the system for obtaining cognitive and affective data on students, indicated that the present procedure was ineffective for both planning and diagnosing student development. Within a period of eight weeks, a decision was made to adopt the CIRCE Attitude Scale to assess the students' attitudes toward evaluation and a complimentary semantic differential was developed at this time.

E10  
H  
p.11  
"There is a very ineffective procedure for obtaining direct or indirect feedback about student development for both planning and diagnostic purposes."  
(E10, H, p.11)

The CIRCE Attitude Scale and the semantic differential were two structured instruments which were adopted and applied for the purpose of assessing MTP student attitudes toward 1) evaluation in general, 2) the improvement of education from evaluation efforts, and 3) the student's self perception of his evaluational capabilities. These were administered upon entry and scheduled for reapplication upon the students' exit. The sudden curtailment of program development naturally precluded a complete assessment of exiting students. Pre-testing results were interesting since students generally had had only limited exposure to evaluation, and yet they evidenced a surprising degree of convergence regarding their attitudes toward evaluation. Post-testing revealed a discernable shift in attitudes among exiting students.

Responses to two semantic differential scales administered with the CIRCE Scale indicated that students felt that the state of the art (i.e., evaluation) was still inadequate. The wide divergence of response to the instrument precluded a meaningful synthesis.

C20

H

p.1

"A noticeable shift in student attitudes occurred on 1) the judgement scale--exiting students showed greater receptivity to judging the worth of a program as perceived by the program affiliates than they did during the pre-test, and 2) the research scale--exiting students were more receptive to relying on precise measurement and statistical analysis to gain general understanding of why programs do or do not succeed. Students also exhibited an increased receptivity to the objective orientation to evaluation. Downward trends are notable in "evaluation as a service orientation." (C20, H, p. )

C20

H

p.

The project additionally provided for the collection of informal open ended interviews from exiting MTP students concerning their attitudes toward the total program. The majority of questions focused on student perceptions of program adequacy and their immediate and future plans. Respondents indicated that their most productive, program affiliated, learning experiences were non-classroom activities. The majority of negative experiences were associated with the student's initial contact with the program. However, most respondents indicated that these dissipated within a short time. In the cognitive area, a need for diagnosis during entry was expressed. Additionally, the majority of respondents indicated a lack of technical competencies resulting in a feeling of discomfort in anticipation of an evaluation position.

There was dissatisfaction with the program itself. At least half of the students indicated a discrepancy between their expectations prior to entry and their actual experiences.

C20

H

"The respondents indicated that a need for assessment of student capabilities during entry would allow each student to adjust smoothly to the program requirements." (C20, H, p. )

C20

H

p.

"They expected a program which achieved a higher degree of sophistication in development than they found." (C20, H, p. )

"Student orientation to the MTP is not always tailored to meet individual needs and tolerance." (C20, H, p. )

During the December, 1972, consortium meeting, adjunct professors were requested to suggest instrumentation and focal behaviors for assessing intern performance during their enrollment in field based training. Most responses were vague, suggesting areas such as the students evaluation skills, his "sense" of responsibility, human relation skills, etc. Some of the more specific suggestions entailed a focus on the student's acquisition of cognitive knowledge, such as knowledge of 1) who is who in the unit and parent agency, 2) measurement, 3) reporting, and 4) design. Suggestions regarding the means of assessing these skills varied from student and staff self-evaluation to interviews, questionnaires, and the application of structured field observation schedules.

C25  
H  
p.4

The Model Training Program was terminated too early, or it was implemented too late, to allow a sound evaluation of its implementation at this point of phase out. Together with the most enthusiastic impressions of outside reviewers such as Egon Guba, Michael Scriven, Frank Chase and OE site visitors, there is partial evidence of various problems in the process of implementation. One possibility is to perceive this partial evidence as an indicator of some other problems that were never uncovered; another possibility is to disregard it in the light of the highly significant efforts made by this program during its short life span.

The following presents some "fractions of evidence", regarding the implementation of the Model Training Program, according to the Standards defined for this Objective.

General Objective 3: TO IMPLEMENT THE GENERAL MODEL FOR TRAINING EDUCATIONAL EVALUATORS.

- (A) A SIZABLE POOL OF POTENTIAL TRAINEES FOR THE MODEL TRAINING PROJECT WILL BE IDENTIFIED.

In the "In-House MTP Quarterly Report" of March 24, 1972, we find that "a pool of 85 potential trainees has been identified which is for in excess of the number the program can accept."

In-House MTP Quarterly Report,  
March 29, 1972  
C1  
p.7

No information is available on the quality of the potential trainees or the procedure used to identify them.

- (B) QUALIFICATIONS OF APPLICANTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE MODEL TRAINING PROJECT WILL BE ASSESSED TO IDENTIFY THOSE STUDENTS WHO ARE MOST LIKELY TO PURSUE AN EVALUATION CAREER AND PERFORMABLY IN SUCH A ROLE.

An internal evaluation report of March 24, 1972, evaluates this standard as "partially met" due to the lack of appropriate procedures.

The OE site visitors in October, 1971, were satisfied with the quality of the MTP students but have questioned some of the recruitment criteria: "There is a long tradition of training only educators in education. However, there are a lot of people advocating that we can pick up a lot of strength by increasing the diversity of our group."

In the formal letter from OE to the Director of the Evaluation Center, following the site visit is stated: "It appears that you are solving many problems associated with the recruitment and selection system, but we would like to urge that you develop the system to also aid in the recruitment of people outside of education and outside of the consortia agencies."

In-House Quarterly Report,  
March 24, 1972

C1

p.7

"It will be part of future task force effort relative to recruitment and advisement procedures."

D1

p.2-3

"Our impression was they (the students) are alert, capable, and we don't have any concern about their being able to perform in the roles for which you are training people." (OE site visit, October 26-27, 1971)

D6

p.1

A letter to Dr. Daniel L. Stufflebeam, from Drs. John C. Egermeier and Susan S. Klein, November 17, 1971.

- (C) THIS WILL INVOLVE SELECTING OUTSTANDING APPLICANTS FOR TRAINING WHO ASPIRE TO BECOME GENERALIST EVALUATORS, DIRECTORS OF EVALUATION OFFICES PROFESSORS OF EVALUATION, AND EVALUATION-ORIENTED EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

The In-House MTP Quarterly Report states that the "evaluation roles" are unclear and it is still early to decide what actual positions the students will fulfill after they graduate.

This report presents also the following data taken from a student questionnaire that asked about MTP students' plans for the future:

- evaluation career - 8 students
- non-evaluation career - 6 students
- undecided - 5 students

- (D) EACH STUDENT WILL BE HELPED TO DIAGNOSE HIS TRAINING NEEDS, TO PROJECT A RELEVANT PROGRAM OF UNIVERSITY AND FIELD TRAINING EXPERIENCES, AND TO INTERACT SYSTEMATICALLY WITH A COMMITTEE OF FIELD AND UNIVERSITY BASED PROFESSORS.

In the In-House MTP Quarterly Report of March 24, 1972, this standard is reported as "not met" although efforts are made to develop procedures that seem likely to succeed.

In a student survey reported at March 28, 1972, it was found that "about one half of the interviewees (n=16) felt there was little to no formal advisement procedure."

C<sub>1</sub>  
p.7

C<sub>1</sub>  
p.8  
"The efforts of Bob Lange, as interim students advisor, and of Mary Anne Bunda, Darrell Root, and Bob Lange in conducting the MTP seminar has resulted in positive student feedback about the problem solving efforts."

C<sub>18</sub>  
p. 4  
"One of the reoccurring statements was that new Center staff do not know enough about university offerings. . .advisors outside the MTP cannot give clear direction

relative to evaluation goals or the specific need of MTP students"

Eva Baker observed that "the number and function of formal coursework has not been decided upon", whether offered by the university or by off campus adjunct professors. She suggests that "procedures for consortium-wide consideration of coursework should be given accelerated development."

D8  
p.67  
Dr. Eva Baker, MTP Outside Review Panel, visit of July 29-30, 1971

Chase suggested that "the differentiation of roles and the allocation of responsibilities among the regular university faculty, Evaluation Center staff, and the adjunct professors requires further attention."

D9  
p.9  
Report by Francis S. Chase on the site visit to the MTP of the Evaluation Center of OSU.

On the OE site visit of October, 1971, John Hopkins made the following observation:

D1  
p.2  
OE Site Visit, October 26-27, 1971

". . . as I talked with students I was not able to discern that you had as yet put into effect the individual diagnosis, individual counseling, and individual programing of students that promises to be one of the really important characteristics of this program."

John Peper, on the OE site visit of October, 1972, made the following statement:

D10  
p.3  
John B. Peper, Chairman's Report of the site visit to OSU MTP, October 13-14, 1972.

"All of the review team observed that the student training model developed by Bargar was excellent. We were dismayed to find that students

were not being given an opportunity to experience the full potential of the model because of overemphasis on project assignments."

- (E) STUDENTS WILL PARTICIPATE IN SPECIALLY DEvised SEMINARS AND PARTICIPATE MEANINGFULLY IN EVALUATION WORK EXPERIENCES.

The In-House MTP Quarterly Report of March 24, 1972, states that this standard was partially met: "some seminars available and more to come; the work experience is seen as least desirable by most students because it is mostly developmental instead of evaluative" (C1, p.9)

A similar opinion was expressed by Eva Baker. She criticized the involvement of trainees in material development within MTP. "The expected dependence upon trainees to perform tasks required for the development of the Model Training Program itself, e.g., for material development, seems unwise." Although her main concern is the quality of materials that will result from the involvement of students in their development, she also questions the merit of such experience for students as part of their training program.

A completely different opinion is expressed by Chase in his report on the site visit to MTP. He points out the experience provided at

C1

p.9

In the student survey (reported March 28, 1972) "nine out of thirteen students felt that their Center job had little or no bearing on their long-term evaluation goals." (C23, p.7)

D8

p.7

Dr. Eva Baker, MTP Outside Review Panel, visit of July 29, 30, 1971.

D9

p.1

Report by Francis S. Chase on the site visit to the Model Training Program in Evaluation of the

the Evaluation Center as one of the notable strengths of the training program. "Perhaps the most significant aspect of this setting is that it will enable the trainees to become active members of a group that is deeply committed to improvement of the concepts and technologies of evaluation in education."

The fact that students are involved in developmental experiences is perceived by Chase as another source of strength in the MTP: "Trainees themselves will be actively involved in creating and improving a program of training instead of being treated as recipients of ideas worked out by others."

This idea is stressed also by the OE site visitors of October, 1971: "We endorse the concept that you have developed for this program of using the students in the developmental capacity of refining, developing, and improving their program."

But the OE site visit of October 1972 came to a different conclusion. In the report of the chairman of this team we read: "It is further recommended that less program development responsibility be given to students. . . priority should be given in those tasks to developing and testing the content model!"

Evaluation Center of OSU.

C9  
p.2  
Report by Francis S. Chase on the site visit to the Model Training Program in Evaluation of the Evaluation Center of OSU.

D1  
p.1  
"We would join Egon Guba in urging you, or perhaps it was Frank Chase to continue to use the students in this capacity even after you have a first cut program."

D10  
p.3  
(Peper)

Some explanation of the discrepancy between the opinions of outside reviewers and MTP students may be suggested by Scriven, in spite of his general impression of the MTP as an "extraordinary well-thought out and well implemented organization plan", he found that "there appears to be inadequate success in explaining to the student the significance of the work he undertakes as part of his training."

D7  
p.6  
Michael Scriven, MTP Outside Review Panel, Report of September 7, 1971.

- (F) STUDENTS WILL EXHIBIT DESIRED TERMINAL BEHAVIORS AND ATTITUDES FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF THEIR TRAINING PROGRAM, AS SPECIFIED IN THE OVERALL TRAINING MODEL.

This standard has not been assessed.

- (G) STUDENTS WILL BE PLACED IN SATISFYING PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF THEIR TRAINING PROGRAMS.

This standard has not been assessed yet.

General Objective 4: TO DEVELOP A CONSORTIUM OF FIELD AND UNIVERSITY AGENCIES THAT WILL IMPLEMENT THE TRAINING MODEL IDENTIFIED IN OBJECTIVE 1.

- (A) THE CONSORTIUM WILL INCLUDE AGENCIES THAT HAVE TAKEN LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION AND THAT REPRESENT SCHOOLS, STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTIONS, NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, AND UNIVERSITY AGENCIES.

The acceptance of an agency into the consortium was contingent upon meeting a list of criteria developed by the Model Training Project. Agencies were contacted to see if they were interested in becoming a member of the consortium and in cases where there was an indication of interest a visit to the agency was carried out to determine the agencies evaluation capability and commitment.

Outside reviewers commenting on the strength of the consortium generally gave high marks to the consortium membership. Several recommendations were made to improve the representation of various educational agencies within the consortium. It was the concern of several reviewers that the consortium include one or two state departments. Although several were reviewed, only the State Department of Michigan was finally accepted. With the acceptance of this one state department all

D5  
p. 22

The reviewers noted that you seem to be developing a strong, viable consortia and urge that you continue your efforts in this direction by using your newsletter, liaison person, well defined contracts, Adjunct Professors and other resources or mechanisms which may prove beneficial in strengthening the consortia.

D9  
p. 3

This observer shares that feeling and believes that further information should be sought from the Office of Education, the Commission of the States, and other sources in regard to the commitment and capability of the several state departments for planning

of the agencies specified in the above standard were included in the consortium.

In enumerating the responsibilities of a consortium liaison officer, Guba suggested that such an individual could assist in the recruitment of consortium members. However, the major responsibilities of the appointed officer was to help provide communication linkages within the consortium. Evaluations of those responsibilities are included under a different standard.

The site visits revealed that there are some agencies within the consortium incapable of fulfilling the criteria for Consortium membership. For example, the Council of the Great City Schools had no evaluation unit and apparently the staff did not support the basic concept of evaluation.

It was the judgement of several outside evaluators that the consortium represented the strongest part of the overall program. In both the 1971 and 1972 Federal Site Visits the development of the consortium for the Model Training Project received strong support. It was the consensus of the reviewers that the institutions in the consortium represented a

and evaluation. Out of this search five or six likely prospects might be identified and from these prospects two selected as added members of the Consortium.

D<sub>4</sub>  
p. 8

E<sub>4</sub>  
p. 3-4

D<sub>10</sub>  
The strongest single element of the OSU Model Training Project is the consortium development. This developmental effort attests dramatically not only to the feasibility of consortium notion, but also to the exemplary credit due Dr. Stufflebeam and his management staff.

diversified membership and that they had become an intergal part of the operation providing useful input as to the direction of the project.

- (B) THE CONSORTIUM WILL DEVELOP A NATIONAL FACULTY OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED EVALUATION LEADERS WHO CAN OFFER BOTH UNIVERSITY AND FIELD BASED TRAINING AND WHO ARE THOROUGHLY ACQUAINTED WITH AND INVOLVED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MODEL TRAINING PROJECT.

The general reaction to the national faculty of adjunct professors was very favorable. The major concern of reviewers revolved around the relationship between the central project staff and the consortium members. Guba considered this to be one of two major factors which could make the MTP an outstanding success. However, he felt that the responsibility for insuring a proper relationship fell mainly on the staff. (It was partly this reasoning which led him to suggest a Consortium Liaison Officer). A proper relationship required that the adjunct professors perceive their roles in such a way as to involve the members and full facilities of their organizations in the training program.

D<sub>7</sub>  
p. 13  
The Adjunct Professor idea is an exciting new try at making work-study part of the academy.  
D<sub>4</sub>  
p. 8  
E<sub>2</sub>  
Fig. 1

The desire to actively involve adjunct professors in the training program led to a series of activities in which these representatives of consortium organizations were brought to the Center to work on specific development tasks. In addition, the adjunct professors were involved in work efforts during Consortium Decision making meetings. The last of these meetings (July, 1972) proved in the opinion of the adjunct professors to be generally productive. Agenda changes leading to a more productive involvement in this latter meeting resulted from expressed dissatisfaction with the previous agenda.

Although an attempt was made to work closely with the adjunct professors in order to build a sense of identity with and a commitment to the program there was a lack of systematic effort in accomplishing this purpose.

C10  
p. 4-5

(C) THE CONSORTIUM WILL BE BOUND TOGETHER BY APPROPRIATE LEGAL AGREEMENTS.

This standard was met in that the consortium was bound together legally by contractual agreements.

(D) THE CONSORTIUM WILL DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT A FEEDBACK NETWORK AMONG CONSORTIUM MEMBERS THAT WILL MAINTAIN GOOD COMMUNICATION WITHIN THE CONSORTIUM AND AMONG THE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL EVALUATION FACULTY.

The need to design a communications network was delineated early in the program and several suggestions were offered to meet it. The suggestion was made that a consortium newsletter be established as an immediate linkage between members. In addition, an Occasional Paper Series concerned with relevant conceptual issues was proposed as a means of keeping members informed and also as a vehicle for genuine contributions to scholarship. The major recommendation proposed to strengthen communication between agencies was the appointment of a Consortium Development Staff Officer (Consortium Liaison Officer). This officer would have the following responsibilities:

1. General liaison with consortium members.
2. Building a sense of commitment and identity within the adjunct professor group.
3. Providing information to the central staff and the members about each of the agencies.

The above recommendation was given wide spread supported by the central staff, adjunct professors and the Office of Education. A self evaluation by the Consortium Liaison Director provided the following assessment:

1. Frequent and intense contact with adjunct professors was not possible due to budgetary and time limitations.
2. Involvement of adjunct professors in MTP activities is limited.

D<sub>9</sub>  
p. 4

Intervisitation, consultation, and communication among Consortium members should involve not just one but many individuals from each member organization if the full potential of the Consortium is to be realized.

D<sub>4</sub>  
p. 5

D<sub>9</sub>  
p. 3

D<sub>4</sub>  
p. 9

It is my recommendation that full-time Consortium development staff officer be appointed at once to undertake this vital mission. I regard this recommendation as the major recommendation that I will make anywhere in this report.

D<sub>1</sub>  
p. 6

We agree it was a good move as, Mr. Guba suggested, to appoint the Director of Consortium. I won't use the common title, but this is Diane's position. And we think that should serve to keep the consortium strong, help it to grow, and to maintain the influence which it apparently has now.

C<sub>10</sub>  
p. 4

3. The gathering of information from consortium agencies for the central staff was minor. The major emphasis in this activity was in the identification of internship positions. Site visit reports and a portfolio of information on each agency was distributed to the various agencies.

Although the Liaison Officer was limited in her activities by funding and time constraints the adjunct professors considered her activities helpful to them as members of the consortium. Overall they expressed satisfaction for the manner in which the position was handled.

E<sub>10</sub>  
Fig. 1  
E<sub>2</sub>  
Fig. 1

The consortium newsletter was established and a survey of seven adjunct professors indicated that six read the newsletter and found it useful.

C1  
p. 13

The quarterly consortium meetings provided a direct opportunity to communicate information and assess the adequacy of that communication. The December, 1971 meeting resulted in dissatisfaction on the part of the adjunct professors with the agenda. Feedback for the adjunct professors resulted in several constructive suggestions being offered and adopted. Particularly it was decided to involve

E<sub>10</sub>  
p. 15-16  
Adjunct Professors should be consulted about agenda items. Possible Darrell Root should call each member 1 week prior to each meeting to confirm and reach consensus on agenda items.

the adjunct professors to a greater extent in the planning of agendas and to minimize activities which could be handled outside of the consortium meeting.

Student perceptions concerning the consortium differed with those of the fulltime staff. An evaluation of student attitudes revealed a lack of information concerning the consortium. It was suggested that the Consortium Director also address student information needs as well as Center and inter-agency needs.

(E) THE CONSORTIUM WILL SERVE AS A MECHANISM FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS INTO THE FIELD OF EVALUATION.

A total of five students were recruited through the consortium agencies. Mechanisms were developed to help identify students in consortium agencies and the Consortium Liaison Officer spent a great deal of time attending to student matters.

The consortium agencies were not able to supply enough students which necessitated the recruitment of students from outside the field of education. This, however, proved to be a desirable activity and one which was supported by USOE.

C18  
p. 15

The following are a series of student statements that reveal a lack of information about the Consortium:

1. "I don't know very much about it."
2. "The Consortium agencies are not doing their share."
3. "The internships are not meeting our needs."
4. "It's not useful."
5. "It's a great idea but it's not working."

C10  
p. 6

Close examination of Consortium Liaison Director's Site Visit Reports seem to reinforce my perception that the majority of my time is spent in student matters at the agencies.

D5  
p. 1

It appears that you are solving many problems associated with the recruitment and selection system, but we would like to urge that you develop the system to also aid in the recruitment of people outside of education and outside of the consortia agencies.

- (F) THE CONSORTIUM WILL SERVE AS A FIRST-LINE NETWORK OF AGENCIES FOR PLACING TRAINED EVALUATORS.

An evaluation of potential agency staff needs indicated that approximately 34 positions would be available between 1972 and 1974.

C.255  
p. 5

The majority of these positions were to be available in 1973.

- (G) THE CONSORTIUM WILL PROVIDE SITES FOR FIELD TESTING OF THE GENERAL TRAINING MODEL AND SPECIFIC TRAINING MATERIALS.

No evaluation is available on field testing carried out in the consortium. However, the following materials were field tested in one or more agencies.

1. the recruitment brochure
2. the Student Handbook
3. the "Institutionalization of Evaluation" seminar package.

- (H) THE CONSORTIUM WILL PROVIDE A NETWORK OF AGENCIES THAT ACCEPT, SUPPORT, AND IMPLEMENT EFFECTIVE EVALUATION PROCEDURES.

The degree of effective evaluation implementation has been assessed minimally by the site visits to consortium agencies. The synthesis of these assessments are more properly presented under Objective 5.

- (I) THE CONSORTIUM WILL DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT LONG-RANGE PLANS FOR COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS OF THE CONSORTIUM AGENCIES IN THE IMPROVEMENT OF EVALUATION THEORY, PRACTICE, AND TRAINING.

No evaluation is available.

General Objective 5: TO ASSIST AGENCIES OF THE CONSORTIUM TO INSTITUTIONALIZE EVALUATION THROUGH PLACEMENT OF MODEL TRAINING PROJECT GRADUATES AND THROUGH IN-SERVICE TRAINING ACTIVITIES IN THE CONSORTIUM AGENCIES.

- (A) SUCCESSFUL INSTITUTIONALIZATION EFFORTS WILL BE CHARACTERIZED BY THE ABILITY OF THE MODEL TRAINING PROJECT TO TRAIN ADDITIONAL ON-SITE PERSONNEL VIA IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN EACH OF THE CONSORTIUM AGENCIES.

Although the training of on-site personnel was gaining a great deal of momentum in the latter stages of the project there was little attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of this training. Many seminars were being offered by adjunct professors and subordinates either on their own initiative or in response to materials developed by the staff at O.S.U. Special inservice training was provided at Shanty Creek in the institutionalization of evaluation. In addition, 70 central office administration personnel and building principles received special in-service training at Saginaw, Michigan.

Evaluation accomplished under this standard was mostly in the form of a needs assessment. Several evaluations discussed the necessity of inservice training and specified the direction in which it should go. The need to provide inservice training which focused on actual agency problems was frequently underscored.

B<sub>7</sub>  
p. 57  
D<sub>9</sub>  
p. 10

How effective are the provisions for continuing staff development of the organizations in the Consortium? It seems to me that one of the most important returns on the investment which Consortium members make in the training program should be the upgrading of the competence of their own staffs in evaluation.

C<sub>10</sub>  
p. 9

I would venture to submit... that all adjunct professors at all agencies would prefer short inservice type training (three days) and would prefer limits of seminars to actual discussions of problems within internships.

(B) SUCCESSFUL INSTITUTIONALIZATION EFFORTS WILL BE CHARACTERIZED BY THE ABILITY OF THE MODEL TRAINING PROJECT TO ASSIST CONSORTIUM AGENCIES TO DIAGNOSE AND RESPOND TO THEIR EVALUATION NEEDS AND PROBLEMS.

Initial response to this standard was a needs assessment which pinpointed problem areas in the institutionalization of evaluation. In addition each agency was screened prior to admittance to determine the degree to which they had established a viable evaluation capability.

During the Shanty Creek Meeting each adjunct professor prepared a plan for the institutionalization of evaluation in his agency and assessed his plan against a paper by Guba and Stufflebeam concerning strategies for installing evaluation systems. A synthesis of common concerns and strategies was prepared and distributed to all adjunct professors to assist them in achieving the goal.

A survey of adjunct professors designed to determine whether help had been received from the MTP in diagnosing evaluation needs and problems produced a variety of responses. Most respondents cited the site visit as a source of help and tended to view the visit as a catalyst for constructive action. One

E11

C25  
p. 6

agency, in close proximity to the Evaluation Center indicated that its staff received specific informal input in the form of consultations. The Guba, Stufflebeam paper on "Strategies for Institutionalizing the CIPP Model" was also cited as a desirable input. One agency specifically indicated that no input had occurred.

Site visits were carried out by the MTP at the following agencies.

1. Saginaw Public School System
2. The Council of Great City Schools
3. Institute for Educational Development
4. Cincinnati Public School System

The site visits revealed that the majority of agencies had not clarified adequately, their organizational goals and the criteria for achievement of those goals. In addition, poor internal communications was a common concern and problem within the organizations and frequently contributed to the lack of clarity. A lack of formal policies for handling routine procedures was also cited as a frequent problem within the agencies. Dependence upon "soft money" presented problems which could not easily

E7  
p.8

'Assessment by the task force team members of goals and the priority of goals as related to projects the division is engaged in indicates a vagueness in documentation. Further investigation of PR & O staff operations indicates a lack of goal direction as a standard in guiding project activity.'

Eg  
p.4

"Another weakness noted was that IED had not been able to secure "hard money" to provide a core of support to facilitate systematic long-range planning and development.

be solved. Lack of commitment on the part of parent organizations made dependence on "soft money" a necessity.

Generally, the strengths of the different agencies were found in the commitment and energy of the staff. Strong administrations and capable personnel provided a positive indication of future growth and stability. In two agencies, the efforts to establish strong communication with other departments in the organization was commended.

Specific recommendations to the agencies visited were provided on all major concerns. In addition to the recommendations which resulted from the problems listed above, the site reviewers also concerned themselves with the following items:

- 1) Information storage and retrieval systems were examined and recommendations for improvement included:
  - a) making the baseline data more accessible to project personnel,
  - b) clarifying purposes for information systems,
  - c) improving the overall technical capability of available systems.

E7  
p.2

"In the same sense, the task force was impressed with the quality of the staff and the personnel in leadership positions within the division. The task force needs also to mention the high regard in which most personnel, with whom we talked to outside the division, hold for the work and leadership of the division. . ."

E5  
p.6

"There should be some attempt to move to a storage system that does not require professional intervention, and a greater use of the computer capabilities."

E5  
p.7

"It was felt that the staff of the Evaluation Unit was not taking full advantage of the Model Training Project or that the Adjunct Professor on site was not providing adequate leadership. There was no evidence of in-service training.

E9  
p.8

"Poor inter-office communication was obvious. A definite lack of protocol of formal channels of communication was noted. No regularly scheduled feedback or sharing of information was evident among the staff members."

- 2) Staff training inadequacies were identified in three of the four agencies. In general, it was felt that agencies were not taking advantage of training possibilities offered by the MTP.
- 3) Communication seemed to be a problem shared by most agencies. Two agencies were particularly cited for poor inter-office communication. In the majority of cases, regular scheduled information sharing sessions were either absent or inadequate. Recommendations included a variety of formal and informal mechanisms for maintaining better communications at all levels.

The Cincinnati Site Visitation Team provided the most comprehensive analysis and recommendations for improvement. Critiques of their "Local School Program Development and Evaluation Model" and "School Information System" provided evaluative information on two programs which are integral to the agencies future viability. In addition, specific recommendations were made for administrative

E7  
pp. 7-13

and staff reorganization in order to increase work efficiency and goal achievement.

Assessment of site visit effectiveness indicated that they were not serving their function relative to Objective 6, Institutionalization. Critical problems in instrumentation, methodology, and commitment minimized the effectiveness of the visits. Specific recommendations to improve instrumentation and a clearer definition of the responsibility of participating observers was offered in order to insure effectiveness in future site visits. However, funding restrictions and the unwillingness of some agencies to be visited ended work in this area.

C<sub>1</sub>  
p.17

- (C) SUCCESSFUL INSTITUTIONALIZATION EFFORTS WILL BE CHARACTERIZED BY THE ABILITY OF THE MODEL TRAINING PROJECT TO ASSESS THE MOVEMENT OF EACH CONSORTIUM AGENCY TO WORK TOWARD INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF EVALUATION.

The site visits provided the only formal opportunity to assess the degree to which evaluation had been institutionalized. Since only one site visit was accomplished for four of the agencies the movement of an agency toward institutionalization was not recorded. In addition, the contact with agencies through

either the Consortium Liaison Director or the Quarterly Consortium meetings was not used to measure such a movement.

Comprehension of the institutionalization problems to be dealt with by the agencies moved from "undecided" to "agree" on a likert scale instrument administered at the Shanty Creek and Columbus (71) consortium meetings.

E10  
F16.2