DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 410 HE 020 048

AUTHOR	Miller, Richard I.
TITLE	Evaluating Institutional Quality: Some Ways and Some Problems.
PUB DATE	87
NOTE	44p.; Paper presented at a special topic workshop sponsored by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (Paris, France, May 12-14, 1986). Paper collected as part of the American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Assessment; *Educational Quality; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; *School Effectiveness; *Self Evaluation (Groups); Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*AAHE Assessment Forum

ABSTRACT

General directions in evaluating U.S. colleges and universities and problems that might be encountered in evaluating institutional quality are discussed. Eight guidelines for assessing institutional quality are also offered. Appendices consider the following five institutional evaluation approaches: educational audits, external consultant reviews, self-studies for accreditation, self-studies for institutional purposes, and state and federal reviews. Included are a categorization of 45 evaluation statements for an institutional evaluation that cover goals and objectives, student learning, faculty performance, academic programs, institutional support services, administrative leadership, financial management, governing board, external relations, and institutional self-improvement. Suggestions for assessing institutional quality include: making theoretical and operational plans for institutional evaluation compatible with the organizational ethos; communicating an overall plan for enhancing institutional quality; linking models and plans for evaluating institutional quality with resource allocation; and making institutional evaluation studies action-oriented, with plans for moving reports-to-action. (SW)

EVALUATING INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY:

SOME WAYS AND SOME PROBLEMS

Richard I. Miller

One Dupont Circle
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-6440

AAHE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The AAHE ASSESSMENT FORUM is a three-year project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. It entails three distinct but overlapping activities:

--an annual conference
(the first scheduled for June 14-17, 1987, in Denver)

--commissioned papers
(focused on implementation and other timely assessment concerns; available through the Forum for a small fee)

--information services
(including consultation, referrals, a national directory, and more)

This paper is part of an on-going assessment collection maintained by the Forum. We are pleased to make it more widely available through the ERIC system.

For further information about ASSESSMENT FORUM activities, contact Patricia Hutchings, Director, AAHE ASSESSMENT FORUM, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036

EVALUATING INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY:

SOME WAYS AND SOME PROBLEMS*

Institutional evaluation very likely dates back to the early days of formal, Western education, and one can imagine that a robust evaluative dialogue must have taken place in ancient Greece between the merits of Isocrates and his school of orators and Aristotle and his academy.

Institutional evaluation in the United States can be dated back to the early days of Harvard, or even to September 3, 1642. On that day, John Winthrop, Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company, journeyed from Boston to Cambridge and presided over the public final examination given to nine seniors of Harvard College by its external Board of Overseers (Harclerod, 1980. p. 1).

Members of the higher education sector currently have ample opportunity to make a decisive impact upon the growing trend toward program and/or institutional evaluation if we give sufficient attention to meaningful research, if we exercise political savvy, and if we oppose creatively yet vigorously those who propose simplistic and misleading solutions to complex problems. In many cases it is counterproductive for us to propose further study without action expectations. Sometimes the external demands for decisions will not wait very long.

---

* Introductory paper by Richard I. Miller, Higher Education Program, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, U.S.A.; for the OECD's Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education, Special Topic Workshop on "The Role of Evaluation in the Management of Institutions of Higher Education", May 12-14, 1986, Paris, France.

General Directions in Institutional Evaluation

A number of general directions in institutional evaluation in the U.S.A. may be identified.

1. More institutional evaluations will be undertaken, both from external pressures such as business/industry, and from state and federal governmental forces.

The state legislatures in their 1985-86 appropriations for higher education have been more generous than in the previous several years, due largely to the current emphasis on quality education, to reasonably good state level and national economies, and to feelings on the part of state officials that higher education has been squeezed enough--at least for awhile.

But there is another side also, that of increasing restiveness on the part of external forces about accountability, or more precisely, our alleged lack of it among colleges and universities. U.S. colleges and universities may be managed better than the external forces believe is the case, but even with this judgment there seems to be a malaise about effective and efficient management among those in academe who do it for a living. This serendipity may be short lived due to predictions of declines in student enrollments as well as in the economy. With the need for more money for operations and fewer students in the classrooms, the external pressures for accountability will become greater.

2. The United States is experiencing an unprecedented surge of interest in quality education.

Never before in our history has so much attention been concentrated on quality education in reports, television programs, articles, conferences and conversations.

This circumstance augurs well for improving higher education in the United States provided educators take advantage of this groundswell of interest by working more diligently for greater improvements in the quality of education. As yet, we see only the beginnings of qualitative improvements but we hope that the trends will continue in a positive manner. If it is difficult for those who do not live and work in the U.S.A. to understand the plethora of national reports that have been issued to improve our system of higher education, be my guest. I would guess that very few of us fully understand what is happening either. But it is obvious that the current surge of reports and interests in quality education is far greater than any previous one. If only 20 percent of the most prominent recommendations are implemented, which is about the efficiency of a gasoline engine, we should be quite pleased.

3. The very rapid growth in interest in value-added education and in student outcomes measurement will continue for a number of years.

The value-added approach, simply stated, entails measurement at the beginning of a course and/or program and another measurement at its conclusion. The difference is what we call "value-added" because of the program. The term "student outcomes" refers to what knowledge, values, or attitudes that the student has mastered at its conclusion, as measured by some kind of test. Most often the outcomes are knowledge or factual information rather than values and attitudes.

Much discussion and literature in recent years has focused on student outcomes; in other words, what does the undergraduate student take from a college after four years? In a recent article, Peter Ewell wrote: "What should students be expected to know by graduation? Much of the difficulty in establishing assessment programs is the general lack of agreement on the answer to this question" (1985, p. 35).

Some earlier, simplistic approaches have given way to more sophisticated ones. Student outcomes can be measured in a number of ways, including tests for professional certification or licensure. A wide array of these tests can be found in Burros's Mental Measurements Yearbooks, and the latest edition lists standardized instruments for over 40 subject areas.

The current extensive program revisions in the general education component in U.S. colleges and universities is evidence that testing for student outcomes should include greater attention to the broad aesthetic and cultural aspects as well as preparation for one's lifework. The American College Testing Program has developed the College Outcome Measurements Project (COMP) for assessing general education knowledge and skills. The outcomes test covers the six themes of communicating, solving problems, clarifying values, functioning within social institutions, using science and technology, and using the arts. The outcomes assessments at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and at Northeast Missouri State University are making extensive use of COMP test results.

Chambers has written that for outcome measures to be used for evaluating educational quality they should meet two tests: "First, each outcome should represent something that is teachable; that is, it is generally accepted that the particular educational objective adopted can be achieved through an instructional or didactic process. . . . Second, each outcome should measure something judged relevant to the graduate's functioning throughout adult life" (1979, p. 31).

Some individuals have confused the value-added approach and academic standards, and som how have alleged that the value-added approach will lower academic standards. One can make the case, quite to the contrary, as Alexander Astin has done, that considering academic standards as the same as value-added standards can "provide a much more vigorous and far less ambiguous set of standards than current academic standards based solely on relativistic course grades" (1983, p. 136).

4. The rating game will continue.

Every year numerous ratings of U.S. colleges and universities provide information on the best party schools in the nation, campuses with the most active sports programs, those with the prettiest or most handsome students, most beautiful campuses--and other equally significant information on our academic institutions.

Perhaps symbolic of the current popularity of campus ratings is the cover story article in the November/December 1984 issue of Change magazine, which was: "Who Is Jack Gourman: And Why Is He Saying All Those Things About My College?" (The first Gourman report was published in 1967 with little fanfar and even less notoriety.) And the cover story article in the November/December 1985 issue of <u>Change</u> magazine was titled: "Are Colleges Making the Grade?"

To learn more about how students select colleges, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching surveyed 1,000 high school seniors about the sources of information that they used most frequently in deciding on a college. The survey "revealed that nearly 60 percent of all prospective college students read commercial college guides. The students and their parents rated the relevancy and accuracy of these guides higher than college publications. But trying to pick a good guide is almost as complicated as trying to pick a college" (1986, pp. 30-31).

The ratings can provide useful information, however. They can assist parents and counselors in sorting through our over-3000 post-secondary institutions of higher education; they can assist graduate students in making educational decisions; they can provide institutional yardsticks; and they can provide governing boards with comparative information. But they also can provide simplistic and sometimes distorted information about complex problems.

5. <u>We are becoming more proficient in undertaking institutional evaluations</u>.

Our improvement over the past 10 years has been due to considerable practice in this craft. While practice does not make perfect, we have learned from our mistakes. Also, we have begun to use more effectively the technologies at our disposal. The work at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) has provided leadership in developing evaluation systems.

What Kind of Institutional Evaluation?

What kind of evaluation can be most useful? What Kipling once wrote--"There are nine and sixty ways of constructing tribal lays, and-every-single-one-of-them-is-right"--points up the importance of developing an approach to evaluation that is tailored to the specific institution.

Two general types of evaluation can be identified. One type consists of those evaluations that are less than institution-wide in scope, such as the assessments of academic programs, faculty, students, and other areas. However, a systematic and extensive plan for academic program evaluation may become more closely akin to the second type, which is institution-wide evaluation.

The second type of appraisal, that of the entire college or university, has received less attention, although interest in this dimension now is growing substantially in the U.S.A. One can identify at least five approaches to institutional evaluation. These are 1. educational auditing, 2. external consultant reviews, 3. self-studies for accreditation, 4. self-studies for institutional purposes, and 5. state and federal reviews. A brief discussion of these five approaches is included as an appendix.

General Guidelines for Institutional Evaluations

If you are considering or planning to undertake a major study of institutional quality, what are some guidelines that you may want to consider? Eight guidelines are suggested for your consideration:

1. Theoretical and operational plans for evaluating institutional quality should be compatible with the organizational ethos.

Simply put, one should abide by the classic anthropological concept of "Adapt not adopt." The argument for "adoption" is that the internal structure and dynamism of a plan is less likely to be destroyed when the whole concept or model is adopted.

On the other hand, each college or university has a unique history and nature that can result in forcing a square into a round hole if pure adoption is pursued. The U.S.A. experience leans strongly toward modifying and tailoring concepts and plans to fit the circumstances and needs of each situation.

2. Vigorous yet sensitive administrative leadership is essential.

This leadership includes providing the initial impetus for the evaluation, keeping track of progress and/or problems, and seeing that the emphasis is toward some ultimate concrete recommendations for action.

The management of higher education is receiving renewed attention as the skills for managing institutional decline have become more prevalent in recent years than those needed for managing institutional growth. And the matter is made more complicated because today's senior administrative officers have a three ring circus to contend with. In ring one is academic programs that have declining student enrollments, in ring two are those with stable enrollments, and in ring three are programs that are or can be increased in student size. And such adjustments often are made in an overall budget that is only modestly increasing, or in some cases it is decreasing.

But what kind of leadership are we talking about? A debate about the most effective styles of academic leadership has been going on for some time. The 1974 book by Cohen and March, titled, Ambiguity and Leadership, received wide attention in the U.S.A. Its findings were based upon data gathered primarily during the student unrest in the late 1960's. They described the university and the presidency in this manner:

> Decision making in the university seems to result extensively from a process that decouples problems and choices and makes the president's role more commonly sporadic and symbolic than significant . . . . The American college or university is a prototype organized anarchy. It does not know what it is doing. Its goals are either vague or in dispute. Its technology is familiar but not understood. Its major participants wander in and out of the organization (pp. 2-3).

The Cohen and March thesis did, and does, strike a responsive chord for the countless frustrations, uncertainties, and uncontrollables in higher education administration, yet whenever a nation, a family, or a university comes upon hard times, more vigorous leadership is called for. The extensive academic cutbacks in most U.S. colleges and universities in the past 10 years have brought forth the need for more dynamic leadership, which is quite contrary to the sense of presidential helplessness developed by Cohen and March.

Writing on "Effective Administrators", David Whetten categorized administrators as either gatherers or hunters Gatherers forage passively in an immediate area for enough food to satisfy daily needs. Hunters aggressively pursue a quarry as far as necessary and recognize that survival depends upon cunning and strategy." According to Whetten's research, the aggressive leadership style of many academic administrators possesses three distinguishing characteristics:

> First, assertive academic administrators preserve and highlight sources of opportunity within their institutions . . . . A second component of assertive leadership is cultivating a distinctive institutional image. The third component of assertive leadership touches on the role of charismatic leadership, especially in the strategic planning process. Effective administrators recognize that in charting a course for an institution, inspiring vision precedes, rather than is driven by, quantitative analysis (1984, pp. 41-42).

And in his widely read book on Academic Strategy, George Keller strikes a similar tone:

> Retrenchment, constricting finances, new competition, marketing and rapid changes in the academic and demographic areas all spell the end of the traditional, unobtrusive style of organizational leadership on campuses . . . . American higher education needs to transcend the current faculty-administration stalemate, to take its own management more seriously, and to create new forms of institutional decision making if it is to cope with and help shape the new environment in which it finds itself" (1983, p. 39).

In sum, the climate and circumstances in the U.S.A. now favor the kind of vigorous leadership that is a critical factor in improving institutional quality. There are some positive signs that the chief executive officer styles are reflecting this need more now than in the past two decades, but the mills of the Gods grind slowly . . . .

3. An overall plan for enhancing institutional quality should be developed and communicated.

Members of the academic community should have ample opportunity to know that an evaluation effort is underway, with certain individuals having some designated responsibilities, with mandates and/or charges established to guide the effort, with some reporting dates scheduled, with open hearings planned, and with action recommendations anticipated.

Characteristics of institutional evaluation have been developed by a number of groups and individuals. The Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, for example, determined that the self-study process should be flexible and permit different approaches; be attuned to current institutional priorities; utilize recent institutional research or studies; involve as many people as possible; have sufficient breadth and depth to review accountability; focus on results of the educational program; use information and results to improve the document; yield a concise, readable useful document; and foster ongoing self-study and planning (1975, p. 6).

The New York State Education Department project on self-assessment for colleges and universities suggested the following steps in self-assessment:

1. A clear definition of the goals of the assessment, as distinct from the goals of the specific area being assessed, should be made. The main focus of assessment should be on evaluation of educational quality as measured by goal-oriented outcomes.

2. All persons who are affected and interested in the programs under review should be continually made aware of and often involved in the assessment process. Responsibility for setting priorities, designing the assessment, collecting and analyzing data, and evaluating and using them should be assigned to appropriately skilled persons.

3. A determination of how well the goals of the specific area assessed are being met should be made. The appropriate instruments and techniques must be selected and administered to the constituencies involved (for example, administrators, faculty, students, graduates, employers, and outside groups).

4. The process of collecting data should be established in such a way that it can continue beyond the first self-assessment as a routine function of the master planning and decision-making process.

5. Analysis of data, reporting of findings, and recommendations for action should be carefully monitored by the person(s) responsible for the self-assessment. Periodic follow-up of

recommendations is essential to determine if any <u>actual</u> results have occurred.

6. Essential to effective self-assessment is the periodic evaluation of the system itself. The system should be cost-effective in both dollars and human time spent to provide vital information for decision making (1979, pp. 5-6).

4. <u>Models and plans for studying and evaluating institutional quality should be linked to resource allocation and/or re-allocation</u>.

It has been said that ignorance is a great innovator because we never would have undertaken many of our accomplishments if we knew what we were getting into when we started!

Accepting the earthly wisdom of the previous statement does not negate the reality of a French saying, which is translated as: "Power is where the money is, and the rest is theatre." One does not have to agree fully with the statement to appreciate its pertinence to academic institutions.

The importance of careful linking academic plans/models to human and material resources has been forced upon most of us by having to cope with diminishing resources. Still, in the U.S.A. we have a tendency to loosely couple, if we couple at all, academic models and finances. Most collegiate administrators believe they do relate models and plans to finances but upon closer scrutiny this relationship is more often toward the end rather than initially and throughout the process.

5. <u>Institutional evaluation should use objective data where available and purposeful but make no apologies for using subjective data</u>.

Or, it is better to be generally right than precisely wrong (Enthoven, 1970). Objective data is important, yet considerable variation exists in its availability and quality. The absence of objective data should stimulate those responsible for institutional evaluation to devise their own survey instruments, guidelines, and checklists or to use systematically treated judgment as bases for decision making. The lack of "hard" data should not deter careful and systematic decision making about important institutional matters. Solid bases for decision making can be developed by using whatever "hard" data are available along with experience, judgment, and common sense. Important institutional decisions sometimes are made on much less.

6. <u>Those developing models and plans for evaluating institutional quality should have an error-expectation attitude</u>.

With this mind-set it is less likely that one will become discomposed and discouraged when things go awry. It may help if one takes to heart the earthy wisdom found in two of Murphy's laws:

- Nothing is ever as simple as it seems.
- If anything can go wrong, it will.

An accompanying important mind-set is that of retaining the mental dexterity necessary for responding to unexpected opportunities. One of the most dramatic examples of this mental dexterity is the quarterback in American football. Competent ones have the ability to "check off" at the line of scrimmage; that is, they can call an audible play which means changing the upcoming play on-the-spot based upon how he "reads" the defensive formation that is opposing him.

How many potentially excellent models and plans can you recall that were fatally or near-fatally afflicted with the rigor mortis syndrome, that is, we have an outstanding plan that we must follow because we must follow it; or with the blinders syndrome, that is, one can see very well straight ahead but is oblivious to everything that is going on elsewhere?

7. Institutional evaluation studies should be action-oriented, with plans for moving reports-to-action.

"Filed and forgotten" should not be ascribed to most institutional evaluation efforts, considering the investment of thousands of hours and dollars and the importance of keeping the institution abreast or ahead of its problems, but the history of institutional studies does not provide cause for exuberance about effective implementation of recommendations. Today, however, there are a number of excellent case studies of instiutional evaluations that were action-oriented because the times demanded more rigorous approaches to implementing recommendations.

The administrative charge to an institutional evaluation committee should make clear that its work plan is geared toward recommendations-for-action. This position from the outset will remind those involved in the projects, and others, that their efforts are less likely to be filed and forgotten.

8. A plan for evaluating the evaluation should be included.

Most evaluation reports make little or no provision for evaluating their effectiveness. Such evaluations of evaluations can be useful as testimony to the importance of evaluation in future improvement, for providing systematic checkpoints of progress, and for providing a procedure for orderly modifications based upon subsequent findings.

Some Problems in Evaluating Institutional Quality

There are many potential problems involved when one begins a serious effort toward evaluating institutional quality. And I am certain that you can add several problems that you have encountered:

1. Poorly defined goals and objectives can significantly impede the effort.

If we do not know where we are going then any road will take us there.

Statements of goals and objectives may be flawed in a number of ways; some of the common shortcomings are:

A. Project goals and objectives are not related to overall university goals and objectives.

B. They are not closely related to the major tasks to be accomplished.

C. They are too low to challenge, or they are too utopian to achieve.

D. The focus is on activities rather than upon outputs.

E. They are too wordy and full of "academic garbage," and/or they address unimportant matters.

F. They are written more to impress then to implement.

2. Failure to give adequate attention to the processes involved in bringing about improvements can be fatal to the enterprise.

In the U.S.A. we are beginning another cycle of interest in the processes of change. A previous cycle was sparked by the Kennedy-Johnson era in the 1960's when much literature, research, and conversation took place about the "how" dimension. We are moving into this area of interest again, motivated primarily not by growth but by steady-state or decline.

There are differences in the meanings of change that are deeply rooted in academe. At the risk of oversimplification, it is a perceptual problem rooted in differences between academic disciplinarians and administrators. The latter group focuses more on the "bottom line," or on what is produced, while the academicians focus more on the "how" dimension, or the processes involved.

The management of change in U.S.A. colleges and universities has some genuine problems, and these flaws become more apparent when the topic is as complex, important, and sensitive as evaluating institutional quality. The title of one chapter in the book by George Keller, "Slouching Toward Strategy," captures the problem. Also an earlier quotation from Cohen and March's book that spoke of the university as "organized anarchy". These characterizations apply even more to the way academic committees go about their work than to the academic administration of the institution.

Typical academic committees can be defined as gatherings, usually casual, convened late, without agendas, that take minutes but waste hours, although often they do not even take minutes. One faculty member said that when he died he hoped that it would be in a faculty committee meeting because there the transition from life to death would be scarcely perceptible!

3. A "cargo-cult" mentality can cause problems.

Many years ago the natives in the South Seas islands believed that a ship laden with gold and precious gems would some day sail into their harbor and bring a happy ending to all their problems.

Some of our approaches to institutional evaluation bear a resemblance in that we latch upon a single answer to complex problems. The latest example is the tendency on part of some American educators to look to the measurement of student outcomes as the answer to evaluating institutional quality.

In the mid-1970's some individuals looked to fiscal indicators as the answer.

How nice it would be if institutions could be evaluated so simply. Evaluating institutional quality, if it is anything, is a many splendored thing that requires several component parts that form a whole, which we hope will be greater than the sum of the parts.

Returning for a moment to the outcomes or value-added approach: Care must be taken that we do not ascribe values to outcomes test scores that are not intended. On this point, Peter Ewell notes: "Interpreting every score gain that we observe on a test as an actual change in student learning can be a very risky activity (1985, p. 18). And the title of Herbert Spencer's little book in 1848 is quite relevant. It asked: "What Knowledge Is Of Most Worth?"

4. <u>Making too many changes, too fast can be a problem.</u>

Generally speaking, academe is not known for its rapid changes. It has been said that if Ford Motors were a university they would still have a department for the Edsel.

Extensive and complicated changes take time. In his article describing the exemplary value-added program developed at Northeast Missouri State University, Osigweh traces steps in this program back to 1973 (1986, pp. 28-33).

In a world where instant coffee, fast diets, quick divorces, and instantaneous worldwide communications are commonplace, is it any wonder that we might become impatient with multi-year academic improvement efforts? Perhaps we all need to remind ourselves occasionally that crash programs usually crash.

5. Failure to anticipate problems can provide short-term euphoria and long-term extinction.

While "ignorance can be a great innovator," the other side of the coin is that failure to ameliorate weaknesses and problems can be of great advantage to the opposition. Successful athletic coaches spend much time on strengthening weaknesses and problem areas to avoid such an eventuality.

In order to better anticipate problems, it might be useful to consider several reasons why evaluation models and plans fail:

A. An obvious reason, but one that we prefer to overlook is that they are poor plans. Our projects and plans in higher education rarely fail. Crop failure analyses are common in agriculture and autopsies are common in medicine, but in higher education we just write another proposal.

B. The model or plan is not vigorously and consistently supported at the top. A 1974 study by Davis and Batchelor found that only seven percent of college presidents really got fully involved in the planning process (1974, pp. 32-36). Since the study is several years old, one would like to think that some improvement has taken place in the intervening years.

C. Failure of evaluation programs is possible if the enterprise is viewed as the preserve of the institutional planners. Institutional researchers and planners are critical, but their roles are "means" rather than "ends." It is interesting to note what is happening in U.S.A. industry. The September 17, 1984 issue of Business Week magazine titled its front cover and feature story, "The New Breed of Strategic Planner." Many major corporations have cut their planning staffs to the bone, and middle management personnel and some line personnel have been given planning "know-how" and planning responsibilities. This rather dramatic shift is consistent with the growing emphasis on the entrepreneurial spirit in American business and industry that is developed in Rosabeth Kanter's provocative recent book on The Change Masters.

D. Plans for developing institutional quality are failure-prone if they do not carefully consider the iceberg-under-the-surface, the detailed managerial system, that is needed to develop, maintain, evaluate, and modify institutional evaluation plans.

E. Another formula for failure is the misplaced use of evaluation as a smoke screen. A few administrators have sought to keep people busy planning and operating so they cannot turn to the real problems, one of which may be the administrator!

F. Evaluation plans can be flawed if they do not have a built-in and identified "fixer". This is the English translation for a Russian individual that is prominent in the extensively planned Soviet system--the "tolkash." A procurement specialist, this individual is openly known but offically a non-person. He or she adds fluidity, creativity, and success to an often awkward planning system.

A "fixer" in our collegiate planning process may be a senior faculty member, may be someone in the administrative offices, or elsewhere, who is able to add fluidity, creativity, procedural adjustments, and evaluations to our campus planning systems. By leaving nebulous the responsibility for adjustments in the planning processes and systems, we risk significantly weakening their impact.

G. A seventh possible cause for failure is lack of attention to a positive and sustained mind-set. Every middle and senior level collegiate official might replace the IBM slogan of "Think," with "Think Strategically." On this point, King and Cleland wrote: "The ability to 'think strategically' in comprehensive policy terms is perhaps the least homogeneously distributed personal managerial trait" (p. v.).

Finally, a perspective: Those thoughts about improving institutional quality need to be kept in the larger context of a college education. I believe that it must remain more than an accumulation of credit hours or a pipeline to a position as important as are these accomplishments. There is a spirit about a campus that sets it apart as an unique interlude. Its products and its on-going activities account for most of human progress and inventions; its stored and alive sources of knowledge contain and carry forward the magnificent heritage and knowledge of mankind for all to ponder, to question, and to know. Its traditions and mores cause frustrations and misunderstandings among its critics; its freedoms provide an essential bulwark for the democratic way of life; and its concern for idealism and ideas has kindled the hopes and dreams of millions who have found themselves during college days. Most of us are better people because of this brief period, and this is what counts.

References

American College Testing Program. The Institutional Self-Study Service. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1970.

Astin, A. W. "Strengthening Transfer Programs." In Vaughan, G. B. (ed.), Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1983.

Bowen, H. R. "Goals, Outcomes, and Academic Evaluation." In Evaluating Educational Quality: A Conference Summary. Washington, D.C.: Council of Postsecondary Accreditation, 1979.

Carnegie Foundation Survey of the Transition from High School to College, "How Do Students Choose A College." Change, 1986, 18, 29-32.

Chambers, C. M. "What Have We Learned?" In Evaluating Educational Quality: A Conference Summary. Washington, D.C.: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1979.

Cohen, M. D. and March, J. G. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. The Balance Wheel for Accreditation. Washington, D.C.: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1976.

Davis, J. S., and Batchelor, S. A. The Effective College and University Board: A Report of a National Survey of Trustees and Presidents. Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research and Evaluation, 1974.

Enthovan, A. "Measures of the Outputs of Higher Education: Some Practical Suggestions for Their Development and Use." In B. Lawrence and associates (eds.), Outputs of Higher Education: Their Identification, Measurement, and Evaluation. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

Ewell, P. T. "Academe Nervous as Assessment Acquires New Political Meaning: Testing of Students to Evaluate Both Them and Their Institutions." The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 27, 1985.

Ewell, P. T. "Assessment: What's It All About?" Change, 1985, 17, 32-36.

Gourman, J. The Gourman Report: Ratings of American Colleges. Phoenix, AZ: The Continuing Education Institute, Inc., 1967.

Harcleroad, F. F. "The Context of Academic Program Evaluation." In E. C. Craven (ed.) Academic Program Evaluation. New Directions for Institutional Research, Number 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Harcleroad, F. F. Educational Auditing and Accountability. Washington, D.C.: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, 1976.

Harcleroad, F. F., and Dickey, F. G. Educational Auditing and Voluntary Institutional Accrediting. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1975.

Kanter, R. M., "Heralding a Renaissance for Corporate America--Relying on the People." (Excerpted from Kanter's book on The Change Masters) Change, 13:18+, July/August, 1984.

King, R. W. and Cleland, D. I. Strategic Planning and Policy. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1978.

Keller, G. Academic Strategy. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Ladd, D. R. Change in Educational Policy: Self-Studies in Selected Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Manning, B. A. The "Trouble Shooting" Checklist for Higher Educational Settings. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1976.

Marchese, T. "Let's Reward Quality: Tennessee's Bold Experiment." Change, 1985, 17, 37-47.

Mautz, R. D., and Sharaf, H. A. The Philosophy of Auditing. Chicago: American Accounting Association, 1961.

Mayhew, L. B., and Ford, P. J. Changing the Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Miller, R. I. (ed.) Institutional Assessment for Self-Improvement. New Directions for Institutional Research, Number 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Miller, R. I. "Appraising Institutional Performance." In Jedamus, P., M. W. Peterson and associates. Improving Academic Management, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Miller, R. I. The Assessment of College Performance: A Handbook of Techniques and Measures for Institutional Self-Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Newman, F. Report on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971.

New York State Department of Education. A Handbook for Self-Assessment for Colleges and Universities. Albany: New York State Department of Education, 1979.

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Colleges. Accreditation Procedural Guide. Seattle: Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, 1975.

O'Connell, W., Jr., and Meeth, L. R. Evaluating Teaching Improvement Programs. New Rochelle, N.Y.: National Teaching Program, 1978.

Osigweh, C. A. B. "A 'Value-Added' Model of Measuring Performance." College Teaching, 1986, 34, 28-33.

Porter, D. "Developing Performance Indicators for the Teaching Function." Paper presented to the OECD/CERI-IMHE Program fifth special topic workshop. Paris, France, June 5-8, 1978.

Pottinger, P. E. "Some Comments on the Effective Use of Consultant and External Advisors." Paper presented at project directors' meeting of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Boston: Institute for Competence Assessment, Division of McBer and Company, 1975.

"Report of the Visiting Committee to Evaluate the Department of Anatomy." University of Chicago Record, 1975, 3, 109.

Sizer, J. "European Perspectives Suggest Other Criteria." In Miller, R. I., Institutional Assessment for Self-Improvement. New Directions for Institutional Research, Number 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

"The New Breed of Strategic Planner" (cover story) Business Week, September 17, 1984.

Whetten, D. A., "Effective Administrators." Change, 1984, 16, 38-43.

APPENDIX*

This section will consider these five different approaches to institutional evaluation: 1. educational auditing, 2. external consultant reviews, 3. self studies for accreditation, 4. self studies for institutional purposes, and 5. state and federal reviews.

1. Educational Auditing. The Securities and Exchange Commission was established in 1934 in response to serious questions about the conduct and disclosure of business operations. In 1917, the American Institute of Accountants had published a list of standards for the preparation of audits. Although the form and nature of the audits vary, the following eight basic postulates were developed by the American Accounting Association (Mautz and Sharaf, 1961, p. 42):

1. Financial statements and financial data are verifiable.
2. There is no necessary conflict of interest between the auditor and the management of the enterprise under audit.
3. The financial statements and other information submitted for verification are free from collusive and other unusual irregularities.
4. The existence of a satisfactory system of internal control eliminates the probability of irregularities.
5. Consistent application of generally accepted principles of accounting results in the fair presentation of financial position and the results of operations.
6. In the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, what has held true in the past for the enterprise under examination will hold true in the future.
7. When examining financial data for the purpose thereon, the auditor acts exclusively in the capacity of an auditor.
8. The professional status of the independent auditor imposes commensurate professional obligations.

John Sizer asks whether five standards used by the American Accounting Association can be applied to higher education institutions. These five standards are: relevance, verifiability, freedom from bias, quantifiability, and economic feasibility (pp. 75-79). And Porter (1978) proposed that the test of institutional acceptance--are the indicators fair and acceptable--be added to the five standards.

As pointed out by Harcleroad and Dickey (1975, p. 15): "With some slight modification and changes in terminology, these same postulates might very well be applied to the process of

---

* This material is based upon cited references by the author in the bibliography plus lecture notes.

institutional auditing and accrediting. The verifiability of data, determination of adequate sampling, and probability theory would be characteristic of both business and educational institutions."

Of the various differences that exist between the business and educational audits, perhaps the most important one relates to scope. The fiscal audit is only a part of the educational audit, but it is the significant aspect for business. Some individuals, particularly those with business backgrounds, may relate institutional health almost exclusively to fiscal health. Such close equating should be avoided by institutions of higher education because of fundamental differences in purposes and funding procedures.

Harcleroad (1976, p. 18) writes that educational accreditation can profit in a number of ways from some of the experiences of the auditing profession:

> (1) There might be improvement in the total process if more of the work were to be carried on by full-time professionals, without losing the value of having many of the participants serving on a part-time basis as at present. (2) There is a need for a research staff, similar to that of the Financial Accounting Standard Board, to be working on basic principles of assessment and procedures to be followed. (3) Some form of continuity is needed for the institution involved and the main members of the team that will work with it as a representative of the accreditation body. (4) The standards of the regional associations and the specialized associations, and their respective commissions, should be similar enough to discount claims that great differences invalidate the entire process. The business auditing system, even with all its current problems and its many auditing firms, has sufficient comparability in its standards and their application to be quite credible, most of the time.

Private managerial firms are becoming interested in the audit approach to higher education; and the first report by Newman (1971, p. 70) spoke of the creation of "new regional examining universities." In considering the need for evaluating higher education, Bowen (1979, pp. 1-21) wrote that one of the needs of higher education is to find a means of evaluation that is genuinely disinterested and yet takes account of the many intangible elements. Perhaps a new profession of independent judges of productivity and performance should be created to evaluate institutions as well as higher education as a whole.

2. External Consultant Studies. A number of institutions of higher education as well as state systems have chosen to use

external consultants for departmental and institutional studies. The New York Board of Regents study of doctoral program quality, the Illinois Board of Higher Education's Commission of Scholars, and the Louisiana Board of Regents Doctoral Program study all relied upon external consultants as a primary data source. The University of Chicago, for example, makes extensive use of recognized scholars from similar universities in analyzing its various programs. Their reports are printed in an official publication of the university called The University of Chicago Record.

The use of external reviewers/consultants carries the primary advantages of expertise and impartiality. One disadvantage is characterized in the "Report of the Visiting Committee to Evaluate the Deparmtent of Anatomy" (1975, p. 109) of the University of Chicago: "None of us is confident that a single experience, however concentrated, can reveal all the details of a complete system, nor that our responses are the most appropriate ones possible." The use of the phrase "the most appropriate ones" implies another possible disadvantage: institutional repercussions from ill-advised remarks, statements, or conclusions. The reviewers leave on the afternoon airplane, but those remaining must live with the report. The reviewers can create more problems than they solve if their report opens old wounds, makes strong recommendations on extremely sensitive matters that are not subject to solution at the time, or discusses the wrong problems and issues.

O'Connell and Meeth (1978, p. 41) discuss the following advantages and disadvantages for internal and external evaluators: The external evaluator has the advantages of being competent in program evaluation techniques, having no vested interest in the program, and removing the evaluation burden from the existing staff. Disadvantages are that he or she may take longer to understand the program and the evaluation requirements, lacks working relationship with program staff and institutional personnel, and may be regarded with suspicion by program staff. Advantages of the internal evaluator are that he or she is familiar with the program and staff, understands channels of communication within the institution and its larger community, is familiar with program details, and may be able to integrate the evaluation into the life of the program. Disadvantages of the internal evaluator are that he or she may not have the skills required for the evaluation, may have a vested interest in the program, and may be overburdened with other duties.

Based upon a report by Pottinger (1975), I devised the following questions to assist in choosing and using consultants:

1. How do you decide that a reviewer/consultant is needed?
   a. What is the nature of help needed?

b. Is the circumstance specific enough to articulate clearly what is needed in the way of outside assistance? Some possible motivations include sorting out ambiguous problems, instilling motivation, gaining fresh perspectives, and recommending decisions that internal personnel prefer not to make.

2. How do you choose the proper consultant?
   a. Does the consultant have expertise in your specific area of need?
   b. Several questions might be asked of others who have used the consultant:
      (1) Did the consultant help you further articulate your circumstance without prematurely anticipating a solution?
      (2) Did the consultant help identify resources and approaches within your situation that assisted after departure?
      (3) Did you feel more capable of dealing with the problems after the consultant left?
      (4) Knowing what you know now, would you hire the same consultant if you had it to do over again?

3. How do you most effectively use consultation?
   a. Make one person clearly responsible and acountable for the consultant's work.
   b. Take ample time to define the problem clearly.
   c. Explore expectations again about what can and cannot be done. Have a written record.
   d. Use the consultant's time effectively. This requires carefully developed visitation schedules.
   e. Have a clear understanding of what evaluations and reports are expected or required from the consultant and within what time frame.

3. Self-Studies for Accreditation. Self-study for regional accreditation has been in existence throughout the twentieth century, and it takes place through the six regional accrediting associations. The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (1976a, p. 3) gives these historical and current goals of accreditation:

- foster excellence in postsecondary education through the development of criteria and guidelines for assessing educational effectiveness
- encourage improvement through continuous self-study and planning
- assure the educational community, the general public, and other agencies or organizations that an institution or program has both clearly defined and appropriate objectives, maintains conditions under which their achievement can reasonably be expected, appears in fact to be accomplishing them substantially, and can be expected to continue to do so

- provide counsel and assistance to established and developing institutions and programs
- encourage the diversity of American postsecondary education, and allow institutions to achieve their particular objectives and goals
- endeavor to protect institutions against encroachments that might jeopardize their educational effectiveness or academic freedom

4. Self-Studies for Institutional Purposes. Hundreds of institutional self-studies unrelated to accreditation have been initiated in recent years, and dozens are underway at any one time. The national trend is toward institutional evaluation with greater rigor and frequency. Institutional self-study can be an important means for self-improvement. The regeneration of the University of Kentucky in the mid-1960's, sparked by a dynamic and experienced new president, came from an extensive self-study, which then became the basis for a comprehensive master plan. Mayhew and Ford (1971, p. 125) mention that "Stanford University shifted its character from that of a strong regional university appealing to bright, wealthy, underachieving students to a university of international stature primarily as a result of the findings of a self-study. Stephens College undertook self-study when its administration believed that the time had come to minimize the traditions of an earlier era. That self-study was used to loosen the soil of academia so that a new president could have a reasonable chance of exercising academic leadership."

The result of self-studies, however, have not been evaluated to any noticeable extent. An exception is the study undertaken by Ladd (1970), which included self-studies done at the University of California, Berkeley; University of New Hampshire; University of Toronto; Swarthmore College; Wesleyan University; Michigan State University; Duke University; Brown University; Stanford University; and two partial cases: Columbia College and the University of California, Los Angeles. The author reached several conclusions based upon firsthand study of these eleven case studies as well as upon analysis of other self-studies:

> Unhappily, the results of these studies seem to lend support--at least in a negative way--to the efficacy of pressure politics as a way of bringing about change. There is little indication in any of the experiences to support the idea that the study-and-report technique is an effective way of gaining acceptance of the need for change or creating enthusiasm for involvement in developing new policies. Where the study-and-report processes were intended primarily to challenge the status quo, they largely failed to do so. When the essential objective was to develop the details of a change in the status quo after the community had already accepted the need for some

> change, the study-and-report processes were much more effective . . . or where pressures for change from outside the faculties were much in evidence [pp. 197-198, 200].
>
> The cases indicate in both positive and negative ways that strong, skillful leadership is virtually mandatory for the success of any serious effort at educational reform . . . A primary task of academic leadership is to try to counter the pressures favoring the <u>status quo</u> by creating or maintaining an atmosphere of receptivity to change [pp. 205-206].
>
> On the whole the educational policy changes proposed vary considerably in their venturesomeness, and they often seem to speak indirectly--if at all--to the deep malaise that presently affects so much of American higher education. Nevertheless, if the proposals were to be adopted by the institutions concerned, truly consequential changes would be made in the educational policies of those institutions. Generally speaking, the cases demonstrate that the proposals developed in the studies became less venturesome or simply disappeared as they passed through the various centers of decision making except where some form of countervailing power was present [p. 9].

The self-studies chosen by Ladd were undertaken between 1966 and 1969, or during the student unrest days. One suspects some studies were undertaken to alleviate the tense and politicized campus climate at the time. Dressel's (1976, p. 409) words may be relevant: "When the only goal of self-study is the alleviation of pressure, the preservation of accreditation, or the attainment of foundation grant, success or failure in attaining the goals often ends the self-study." One can surmise that results of self-studies conducted under these circumstances would be minimal, yet Ladd's conclusions bear careful study.

Research studies have compared studies made of outside, monitored internal, and strictly internal evaluation reports. According to Chambers (1979, p. 32), "these finding show that internal evaluation is as reliable and accurate a method of depicting the current situation as the other two. This does much to dispel the criticism that the self-study--on its face--is self-serving, biased, and unreliable."

Self-assessment procedures for institutions of higher education also have been developed outside of academe. The American College Testing (ACT) Program (1970) initiated the Institutional Self-Study Service (ISS) to assist a college or university to evaluate the effectiveness of its programs and services. The ACT program was designed to "enable an institution to see itself through the eyes of its students; aid in the quantitative appraisal of college student development; and enable the institution to observe and explore longitudinal trends in student development and opinions on campus" (p. 1). Aspects of student services covered in the survey are faculty advising, counseling, financial needs, extracurricular advising, orientation, housing selections, housing advising, health, and remedial. The ISS survey asks students to indicate the degree of importance they attach to academic vocations and social and non-conventional goods. Instruction, school policies, and physical facilities also receive student evaluation.

The ISS places the student as primary evaluator; and few will disagree with having a significant student input in an institutional self-study, provided students answer questions within their scope of knowledge and experience. The quality of the faculty, academic and institutional leadership, and fiscal management are some essential components in any comprehensive self-study students cannot evaluate effectively. Their opinions may be useful, but data on several key variables in institutional self-study need to be gathered from other constituencies.

Manning (1976), working with the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas, has developed a troubleshooting checklist (TSC) for higher educational settings to assist those concerned with change in their assessment of organizational variables predictive of an institution's potential for successfully adopting innovations. The TSC consists of one hundred Likert-type items grouped in five categories: organizational change, organizational staff, communications, innovative experience, and student characteristics. The diagnostic and predictive instrument is designed to aid users in estimating the effects of particular variables on the adoption/diffusion process. That is, the TSC provides users with a means of systematically organizing descriptive information in a predictive way. The validity of the TSC remains to be determined, although data on reliability are positive.

The following ten general areas and forty-five evaluative statements form the framework for my system of institutional evaluation (Miller, 1979):

<u>Goals and objectives</u>

1. The goals statement serves as an effective guide for the present and future.
2. Objectives reinforce goals.
3. The institution has adequate planning capabilities.
4. Institutional admissions policies and procedures are consistent with institutional goals and objectives.
5. The institution's goals and objectives help it maintain a reasonable identity within a statewide system of institutions.

Student learning

6. Students give a good rating to their advising and counseling system.
7. Retention rates are reasonable.
8. An array of individualized and compensatory learning resources is available.
9. The student affairs administration is effective.
10. Satisfactory progress towrrd learning goals is evident.

Faculty performance

11. Current policies and procedures for evaluating individual faculty members are satisfactory.
12. Current instructional improvement/faculty development programs serve their purpose.
13. Faculty personnel policies and procedures are considered satisfactory.
14. Faculty salary scales and fringe benefits are competitive.
15. The overall quality of the faculty's performance is optimal.

Academic programs

16. The institution has effective policies and procedures for developing new programs.
17. The institution has effective policies and procedures for the review and evaluation of existing programs.
18. The general education component is an intellectually stimulating and integral part of the curriculum.
19. The quality and size of the graduate program are consistent with institutional goals and objectives.
20. The library or learning resources center provides good service to the academic community.

Institutional support services

21. The physical plant and facilities are adequate for the size of the student body and for the nature of the academic program.
22. The institution has a relevant and current long-range plan for developing and maintaining its physical plant.
23. Salaries and other benefits for support personnel are sufficent to attract and retain competent individuals.
24. Systematic procedures are used for evaluating the performence of support personnel.

Administrative leadership

25. The administration gives adequate attention to planning.
26. The chief campus administrator and his or her team have effective working relationships with other campus administrators.

27. Institutional governance policies and procedures allow for effective institutional management.
28. The policies and procedures established for administrative evaluation and for professional development are satisfactory.
29. The institution has an effective affirmative action program.

Financial management

30. The tuition and fee structure is compatible with the institution's needs and with the students' capacity to pay.
31. The institution has an efficient management system for accounting and financial reporting.
32. Costs and expenditures are comparable with benchmark institutions.
33. The investment portfolio is well managed.
34. The instititlon has an effective system for demonstrating its accountability.

Governing board

35. The policies and procedures for conducting board affairs are satisfactory.
36. Trustees understand the differences between policy formulation and policy implementation and apply this knowledge.
37. The governing board works effectively with external constituencies.
38. The board contributes positively to improving the institution.

External relations

39. The institution's activities contribute to the quality of life in its primary service area.
40. The institution has effective relationships with the state higher education (coordinating or governing) office.
41. The instititlon has an effective relationship with the federal government.
42. The institution is able to secure acceptable levels of funding from private sources and foundations.

Institutional self-improvement

43. The institution seeks improvement through innovation and experimentation.
44. Campus groups have positive attitudes toward self-improvement.
45. The institution has established procedures for evaluating its own effectiveness.

5. State and federal reviews. State educational agencies in the U.S.A. have moved aggressively into the area of program evaluation since about 1972, largely in an effort to stem the

tide of new graduate programs that were being developed without careful consideration of their monetary requiremen: ; or of long-range institutional goals. New York, Illinois, Louisiana, Tennessee, and others were prominent in there earlier efforts to develop stateside program evaluation efforts.

Tennessee is one state with a sustained effort, with its Performance Funding Project initiated in 1976 by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. A discussion of the "bold experiment" was reported recently by Ted Marchese. This new element in the state funding formula is that of having five percent incentive funding over and above the regular formula set aside for those public universities that can demonstrate that they are making significant progress toward 14 numeric goals by 1990. These 14 goals are:

- ACT/SAT scores of entrants
- percent of entrants attaining degrees
- "standardized examination scores" of graduates
- scores on the National Teachers Examination
- pass rates on "all parts of professional licensing examinations on the first attempt"
- GRE scores of graduate-school entrants
- the "measured knowledge" of graduate/professional school finishers.

And, as applicable by mission, increases also in:

- gift/grant-based rankings for research activities
- external support for public service programs
- job-placement rated by vocational field
- the match between vocational offerings and service-area job needs
- library holdings.

Plus there is planned to be

- An end to degree-credit remedial courses in public universities, and
- A planned "reduction" in such courses in other institutions (1985, p. 44).

Some recent research has been conducted by Robert Barak, Deputy Executive Secretary of the Iowa Board of Regents, and myself on the role of state level boards of higher education in the review of undergraduate academic program reviews. (I have previously mentioned that the role of state level boards of higher education in review of graduate academic programs is well established.)

Being the first such national study of the undergraduate level, we did not know quite what to expect. We did find that 29 states had some form of statewide undergraduate academic program review and evaluation. This recent trend in the U.S.A. reflects the continuing interest in accountabiliy, the current emphasis on academic quality, and the continuing fiscal constraints on our colleges and universities.

The institutional perspective, however, is different. Just in view of the number of courses and the number of changes the undergraduate program area is much more complicated than the graduate level. And the undergraduate level has been traditionally where the battles over academic freedom have been fought, which means that academics are more sensitive to external influences at the undergraduate level. Perhaps our most disappointing finding was that the state level offices in many states were making little or no use of the results of undergraduate academic reviews to modify and/or improve their programs.

The federal government occupies a complex rôle in higher education. By virtue of the Tenth Amendment to the United States Bill of Rights, education is left to discretion of each state. However, many fields such as agriculture, science, medicine, and health have been and continue to be significantly influenced by the federal government. In these areas as well as in a few others, the federal government has been involved in varying degrees of review and evaluation. But generally speaking the major responsibility for the direction and nature of primary, secondary, and postsecondary education is left to the individual states.

The federal government has been active in a number of other ways that can indirectly or otherwise influence the quality of our colleges and universities. Examples are federal funds and various grants and loan programs and civil rights and affirmative action policies and mandates. It is not surprising, therefore, that the U.S. government should have an interest in educational quality, as illustrated by the highly publicized book on A Nation at Risk. Federal concern, however, is different from federal control or excessive influence. Institutional and state-level officials are willing to work cooperatively with the federal government in achieving mutually desirable goals of better quality control through cooperation and coordination.

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Centre for Educational Research
and Innovation

IMHE/GC/86.01

RESTRICTED

Paris, drafted: 20th Feb. 1986

dist: 25th Feb. 1986

Or. Engl.

PROGRAMME ON INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Twentieth Special Topic Workshop

THE ROLE OF EVALUATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(Paris, 12th-14th May 1986)

This document describes the purpose, content and organisation of the Twentieth Special Topic Workshop of the IMHE Programme. The Workshop will provide participants with an opportunity to examine how institutional evaluation is carried out in a number of OECD countries, discuss the various problems which arise in this context and exchange experience on progress to date.

34850

W/1233v-082v

THE ROLE OF EVALUATION IN THE MANAGEMENT OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

In many OECD countries, institutions of higher education have been preoccupied in recent years with coming to grips with problems posed in the context of economic constraint. The activities of the IMHE Programme have reflected the desire of institutions to respond effectively to these conditions. It is generally recognised that many responses in such conditions tend to be of a short-term nature and a consensus is emerging that steps will need to be taken in order to bring about a restructuring of individual institutions which will ensure their financial viability and academic quality over a longer period of economic stagnation. A precondition for such restructuring is the development of frameworks for institutional evaluation. Such frameworks for evaluation will be the focal point of this workshop.

To some extent, forms of evaluation are always present in academic institutions. There exist in every country individual academics, departments, research institutes and centres of learning which are renowned nationally and internationally. The mechanisms which make it possible to assess the quality of individuals and groups at the level of specific disciplines are based upon a long tradition of peer evaluation by means of scientific publications, national and international conferences, colloquia, etc. The problem of evaluating institutions of higher education for purposes of improving the quality of the institution by means of managerial initiatives has only recently begun to be looked at and this Workshop will explore the current status of this subject.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Workshop will be to examine how institutional evaluation is carried out in a number of OECD countries and discuss the role which evaluation can play in the management of institutions of higher education. Methods of institutional self-assessment as well as evaluation by external bodies will be covered and approaches developed and used in North America and Europe will be analysed and compared, with a view toward assessing the extent to which generalised conclusions may be drawn from these experiences.

PARTICIPANTS

The Workshop should be of particular interest to senior staff in institutions of higher education who are involved in policy formulation and decision-making. This could include executive heads (presidents, rectors, directors, vice-chancellors), heads of administration (registrars, kanzlers, vice-presidents for administration), deans and other senior staff. The Workshop should also be of interest to representatives of national agencies directly concerned with the evaluation of institutions of higher education.

CONTENT AND ORGANISATION

There is a growing need to develop sound, practical approaches to institutional evaluation in the field of higher education. This is in part due to increased demands for institutional accountability which are being made by society. But it is also the result of a recognition by institutions themselves that without systematic methods of self-appraisal it is extremely difficult to manage a complex organisation such as a university, especially in a period of economic stagnation. There is a need to identify both centres of actual and potential excellence as well as areas which call for improvement. Continuing assessments and appraisals are part of the managerial task of ensuring better-run, high-quality institutions.

For purposes of this Workshop, institutional evaluation is meant to cover the development of criteria and procedures for appraising all aspects of the institution, with a view toward assisting management to ascertain the extent to which the institution is going where it wants to go. Among the aspects of the institution which management may wish to evaluate are: goals and objectives, student learning, academic staff performance, academic programmes, institutional support services, administrative leadership, financial management, governance, external relations and institutional self-improvement. The opening paper will provide a framework within which the various cases to be presented during the course of the Workshop can be discussed. To obtain a broad spectrum of current practice, examples of institutional evaluation from France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States will be presented. Due to differences among countries, it is not expected that each experience presented will cover all of the aspects of institutional evaluation cited above. Rather, they will highlight those procedures currently in use to assess institutional performance and enable participants to discuss the state-of-the-art of such procedures both for the external evaluation of institutions as well as institutional self-appraisal.

Among the questions which will be considered during the course of the Workshop are: How can mechanisms for undertaking institutional evaluations be set up? What are the roles of national, regional or other bodies in evaluating institutions? What are the main components of systems of self-evaluation? How can the results of institutional evaluations be used for improving the management of the institution at all levels? How can problems of internal tensions which may arise as part of evaluation exercises be reduced? What are the likely future developments in the field of institutional evaluation?

The Workshop will begin with an overview of approaches to and problems of evaluating institutional quality. The remainder of the first day will be devoted to a presentation and discussion of experiences of institutional evaluation in the United States and France. Additional country experiences from the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and the United States will be presented and discussed on the second day. The last morning will begin with a presentation by the Workshop rapporteur which will be followed by a panel discussion of likely future developments in the field of institutional evaluation. On Wednesday afternoon, a Tutorial will be held at which participants will have an opportunity to examine in greater technical detail several evaluation procedures currently in use at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

PRELIMINARY SCHEDULE

Registration will begin at 9.30 a.m. on Monday, 12th May 1986. Morning sessions are scheduled from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and afternoon sessions from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. The Workshop will end at 12 noon on Wednesday, 14th May 1986. The special tutorial on the use of student outcome information in assessing and improving academic programmes will take place from 2.30 p.m. to 5 p.m. on Wednesday, 14th May 1986.

Monday Morning - A U.S. Perspective on Evaluation

1. Presentation of the Workshop by the Secretariat.

2. Introductory paper: "Evaluating Institutional Quality: Some Ways and Some Problems" - Richard I. Miller, Ohio University, United States.

3. Break

4. Presentation of Case 1 - "Quality Assessment at the University of Tennessee Knoxville" - Trudy W. Banta, Homer Fisher and C.W. Minkel, United States

5. Discussion

Monday afternoon - Recent Developments in Institutional Evaluation in France

1. "The Role and Function of the National Evaluation Committee for Universities" - André Staropoli, Comité National d'Evaluation, France

2. Discussion

3. Break

4. Presentation of Case 2 - To be announced

5. Discussion.

Tuesday morning - Evaluating the Quality of Public Sector Higher Education in the United Kingdom

1. "The Council for National Academic Awards: Peer Review and Partnership" - Alan Hibbert, CNAA, United Kingdom

2. Discussion

3. Break

4. Presentation of Case 3 - "An Institutional Perspective on External Validation and Review" - John Stoddart, Sheffield City Polytechnic, United Kingdom

5. Discussion.

Tuesday afternoon - Institutional Self-Appraisal

1. Presentation of Case 4 - "Improvement of the Quality of Education through the Use of AMED (Analysis Model for Education at the Disciplinary Level)" - Pieter Drenth, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands

2. Discussion

3. Break

4. Presentation of Case 5 - "The Value Added Program at Northeast Missouri State University" - Charles J. McClain, United States

5. Discussion

Wednesday morning - Current Status and Future Developments

1. Summary by the Workshop rapporteur - Michel Bernard, Université de Nantes, France

2. Panel: "Likely Future Developments in the Field of Institutional Evaluation" (Speakers to be announced).

3. Discussion

4. Official closing.

Wednesday afternoon - Tutorial : Use of Student Outcome Information in Assessing and Improving Academic Programmes

During the Workshop, the approach developed by the University of Tennessee Knoxville (UTK) will be presented. On the occasion of the visit by the team of representatives of UTK responsible for the development and implementation of this approach, a special tutorial has been organised at which it will be possible for Workshop participants to examine in more technical detail the methods developed there as well as how the results are used in academic programme review and in planning for programme improvement. Among the topics to be covered are: (i) the use of the College Outcome Measures Project (COMP) examination to assess the "value added" by the collegiate experience in general education and in each student's major; (ii) the use of comprehensive examination results and student, drop-outs and alumni opinions to evaluate and improve curricula and (iii) the design of instruments and methodologies for surveying currently enrolled students and alumni to assess their opinions of the quality of academic programmes and services. In 1984, the University of Tennessee Knoxville received the annual award of the National Council on Measurement in Education for "an outstanding example of the application of educational measurement technology". The Tutorial will be conducted by Professor Trudy W. Banta of the University's Learning Research Center, Executive Vice-Chancellor Homer Fisher and Vice-Provost C.W. Minkel. It will be chaired by Professor Richard I. Miller, author of the Jossey-Bass book The Assessment of College Performance.

PARTICIPATION

Participation at the Workshop is open to representatives of IMHE member institutions as well as to government officials and representatives of national organisations responsible for higher education. Persons wishing to attend are asked to complete and return the enclosed Confirmation of Attendance form to the Secretariat before 10th April 1986. Persons requiring hotel reservations are asked to return their forms as soon as possible.

PARTICIPANT CONTRIBUTIONS

Speakers appearing on the Workshop programme have been invited to document their presentations and their papers will be made available to Workshop participants in English and French. In addition, any particpant wishing to prepare a paper (in English or French) on the subject of the Workshop may do so. Such papers will be considered for inclusion in a future issue of the International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education.

If you wish to prepare such a paper, you should indicate this on your application form. Upon receipt of your form, information pertaining to the preparation of Journal articles will be sent to you. You will also be informed about the expected number of participants in order that you may bring a sufficient number of copies to the Workshop if you wish to distribute your paper at that time.