ED 294 299   EA 019 909

AUTHOR   Pechman, Ellen M.; King, Jean A.
TITLE   Analyzing the School Evaluation Use Process To Make
                Evaluation Worth the Effort.
PUB DATE   Apr 86
NOTE   22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                American Eduational Research Association (San
                Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
                Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation
                Utilization; *Innovation; Longitudinal Studies;
                *Organizational Theories; *School Districts; *School
                Organization; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT
                This paper describes a structure for assessing the
school evaluation use process developed from a longitudinal case
study of districtwide and school level evaluation procedures in a
large urban school district. Two fundamental questions guided the
study: (1) Why isn't the evaluation process more useful to
decision-makers and practitioners? and (2) If it is not useful, is it
worth the effort? In the absence of pertinent literature, research ·
focused on people on the "front lines"--the teachers, principals, and
project implementers. Central office managers, and evaluators were
consulted to determine possible communication gaps. Data were
collected over a 6-year period through formal and informal
observation of activities and interviews with key actors responsible
for implementing evaluation unit functions. Results showed that
program evaluation in schools involves implementing a complex,
innovative concept that for most school staff (including managers) is
unfamiliar, confusing, and even intimidating. This means evaluation
use is not a simple matter of reviewing recommendations and following
through on suggested changes. In reality, the evaluation use process
challenges people to modify their routines and design new ways of
accommodating to changing job demands. After discussing evaluation
and innovation, the structure of school evaluation use is explained
and applications are outlined. As with other innovations, integrating
evaluation into complex school organizations is evolutionary and
likely to cause disruption. Even so, evaluation is well worth the
effort. Included are two appendices and a bibliography of 43
references. (MLH)

ANALYZING THE SCHOOL EVALUATION USE PROCESS

TO MAKE EVALUATION WORTH THE EFFORT

Ellen M. Pechman
Lagniappe Associates
703D Daniels Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27605

Jean A. King
Department of Education
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

This paper describes a structure for assessing the school evaluation use process that was developed out of a longitudinal case study of districtwide and school level evaluation procedures in a large urban school district. Two fundamental questions guided our study: 1) If we know so much about evaluation procedures, why isn't the evaluation process more useful to district level and school site decision makers and practitioners? and 2) If it is not useful, is it worth the effort?

Our intuitive faith in educators and schools, combined with our persistent belief in the rational process, drove us to look for the logical structure of the process of evaluation use that has apparently been missed by evaluation researchers. Our search returned us again and again to school people on the "front lines", the teachers, principals and project implementers. In addition, we listened closely to central office managers to determine where there were communication gaps and, if possible, to learn their sources. Data were collected in three separate years over a six year period through formal and informal observations of activities and interviews with key actors responsible for implementing the functions of the districtwide evaluation units during this period. The investigation centered on the routine evaluation processes typically used in the school system.

A consistent theme that emerged from our interviews was that program evaluation in schools involves implementing a complex, innovative concept that for most school district personnel -- even central office managers and evaluators -- is unfamiliar, confusing, and often intimidating. This contrasts with our expectation that evaluation use is a simple matter of reviewing recommendations and following through on suggested changes. In reality, the use of the evaluation process in school settings is a challenge requiring people to modify their routines and to design new ways of accommodating to job demands that may change as a result of the evaluation process. This involves making behavioral change at a fundamental level, a level that for most of us is difficult to attain.

Our grounded data pointed to two underlying phenomena. First, we observed, as have Lindblom and Cohen (1982), that analytical processes that are second nature to evaluators and researchers are quite foreign and mysterious to child- and school-oriented practitioners. A close observer of the school district shared an alternative rationality for using evaluations that was typical in the system we observed: "The implicit purpose of evaluation and testing in this system is to justify what you want to do and to eliminate what you don't want to see. It's not to solve a problem. It's to meet an agenda. One's frame of reference permits any set of data to be used to make a cogent argument. As a result, you can support your own point of view with almost any information" (Field Notes, December 6, 1985).

Second, organizational learning, like human learning, occurs developmentally, requiring adjustment of the operational processes

within the organization and, at the same time, basic skills acquisition
among individual workers (Comfort, 1982).   As such, the learning
process for individuals and organizations is gradual and needs to be
nurtured, as does any meaningful learning that leads to substantial
growth and change.

Evaluation as Innovation

In examining users' and evaluators' descriptions of their involvement
with the evaluation process, we began to recognize that we had been
misinterpreting what appeared be a systematic abuse of the ideal
evaluation process envisioned by the rational mandates and established
research traditions (see also Hall, 1982). This year's return to the
school district, along with our earlier studies (King, Thompson &
Pechman, 1981; King & Pechman, 1982), showed that the process of
conducting local school evaluations is more baffling to practitioners in
school districts than we had realized (see also Kennedy, Apling, &
Newman, 1980).   Lack of understanding partly explains the resistance to
using the available evaluation models that emerged in the heyday of the
1960s and 1970s (Comfort, 1982; Eash, 1985a; Shapiro, 1985; Stake,
1985).

As we looked more closely at our data and listened to the people in
schools, we began to recognize that conducting and using evaluations in
school settings constitute a major innovative effort and should be
analyzed and understood in that light.   The hesitant, even obstructive,
responses of educational systems to innovation are well documented in
the literature (Comfort, 1982; Havelock, 1971; Popkewitz, Tabachnick, &
Wehlage, 1982; Wolcott, 1977). A longer look at the use of evaluation
in the school system revealed that the impact of evaluation mandates
was, like other major innovations in recent years, very slowly taking
root. As with the earlier innovations, the evaluation "idea champions"
-- in this case the professional evaluation specialists and the
district's policy makers, top managers and federal program monitors --
had greater expectations for the evaluation process than did either the
evaluators or users who had to resolve the practitical day-to-day
implementation problems, and, not surprisingly, the practitioners' more
gradual approach controlled what we actually observed in schools.

The developmental evolution of school innovation adoption has been
described by Hall and his colleagues at the University of Texas R & D
Center (Hall, Wallace, & Dossett, 1973; Hall et al., 1975). It begins
with users' concerns about a particular innovation and involves
adjusting their feelings, attitudes and worries as a first step in the
adoption process. As the personal concerns of individual practitioners
are addressed, they evolve through several stages, from a lack of
knowledge about the innovation and how to use it to the development of
skills necessary for the routine use of the innovation.   Ultimately,
the use of the innovation is refined and incorporated into the ongoing
structure of the system.

Implementing evaluations that use rational analytical processes requires a good deal of on-site program staff. For many, it means new skills need to be learned and practiced, and there are inevitable mistakes to be made. This process is painful, particularly because there is not much tolerance for learning by mistake in bureaucratic systems. Thus, when the evaluation process is incorporated into a new program, its successful use depends on the staff's openness to working closely with the process. The ideal of evaluation use envisions school site personnel coordinating closely with evaluation teams, applying rational and analytical procedures at all levels of instructional decision making to support continual school and program improvement, but the practice falls far short of the ideal.

How do we move people and systems beyond their current levels of understanding of the evaluation use process? Where do we begin?

The Structure of School Evaluation Use

This return after three years to look at the evaluation use process in a large school district revealed a more optimistic picture of evaluation use in school districts if we expect a developing process, rather than a static ideal. We can better comprehend apparent failures to use evaluation information in predictable ways that adhere to a scientific rationality when we see the process as continually evolving, at different paces in each program, and in unique patterns depending on the individuals responsible for implemention.

The original naturalistic data from our sample district, gathered between 1980 and 1982 (King & Pechman, 1982; 1984), and this year's return to the study site defined the evaluation use problem and allowed us to see the underlying rational structure. The evolutionary process we observed is described in The Structure of School Evaluation Use --SSEU (Appendix A), the framework we developed from our grounded data . The SSEU is an instrument that considers school evaluation use as an innovation. We combined our findings about the process of evaluation use in schools with the way innovations are received as described in Hall and Loucks' Levels of Use of Innovations -- LoU (see Appendix B; Hall, 1982; Hall and Loucks, 1975). Our purpose is to identify accurately the evolutionary stages in which the evaluation process is implemented so, ultimately, we can help schools use the evaluation process more rationally.

This framework describes the behvior of individual users of the evaluation process and of evaluation information in schools and school systems. It shows the evolutionary structure that users follow in developing sophistication in their use of evaluations. Our longitudinal data, combined with the observations reported in numerous studies of school evaluation use, indicated a whole range of responses to the process of implementing and using school evaluations (Alkin, Daillak, & White, 1979; Comfort, 1982; Cooley & Bickel, 1986; Cousins & Leithwood,

1985; King & Pechman, 1982). By seeking and defining consistencies in the ways practitioners use the evaluation process, we will have a better understanding of how to conduct evaluations to assure they respond to each user's needs.

The Structure of School Evaluation Use consists of six major levels of evaluation use that go from "nonuse" of evaluation to "renewal." We examined our three years of field notes and set them against the LoU to arrive at the specifications for stages of evaluation use, the "decision points" that mark a user's movement between stages, and the behavioral indicators describing the key functions characteristic of users at the highest levels of use. Our focus was on the evaluation activity of program coordinators and directors, and, only to a limited degree, on teachers.

Nonuse is defined as a preliminary stage in which the user is unaware of the potential usefulness of evaluation and the evaluation process and does not look for information to support program implementation. This level of use is not particularly common in schools, since school people have become increasingly sensitive to the expectation that schooling should be involved in a continuing evaluation process.

Once potential users take action to learn more about the requirements or procedures for conducting an evaluation, they have moved to Stage I, Orientation. At this stage, users are exploring the ideas about evaluation and are considering how evaluation might fit the needs of their own programs. When they initiate the evaluation process by a specific action, such as calling for a design or the consultation of an evaluator, they have moved to Stage II, Preparation.

Preparation continues the preevaluation process. The users may recognize the need to collect data for an evaluation but, not knowing quite how to do it, they assign the task to a staff person, vaguely expecting to receive feedback, but not quite certain what to expect. When users take their first steps toward reviewing the data and combine that review with a serious effort to use the information, even informally and simply, they have moved toward Stages IIIA and IIIb, Mechanical Use and Routine Use.

Mechanical Use and Routine Use are two substages within this phase. They are similar, but represent increasingly sophisticated uses of the evaluation process. These two levels are the levels of evaluation use that we most frequently observed in our study among experienced project directors. The latter substage, Routine Use, consists of a more complex application of the basic data that is collected in the Mechanical Use phase. As in the LoU framework, Routine Use is the minimal desired level of achievement. But Routine Use of the educational evaluation process is short of the most ideal form of use because it does not reach into the daily teaching or managing structure of program implementation. Routine Use employs evaluation in a unidimensional manner, as an

indicator or signal to external sponsors that programs are proceeding according to timelines.

At the highest levels of use, there is a continuing evaluation process in place that is consistent with more rational models of evaluation-based decision making. Stage IV, Refinement, begins to incorporate the use of evaluation information to make substantive program changes, but, at this stage, the use of information is restricted. This type of evaluation use has been called "charged use" -- like ions in a chemical equation, evaluation information takes on a charge -- and has the potential to cause a reaction in the system or program being evaluated (King & Pechman, 1982; 1984). Evaluators and users work collaboratively at this stage and at other higher stages, designing evaluations to fit program need's more closely.

Stage V, Integration, occurs when a user tries to make more specific program changes in direct response to the evaluators' feedback. The entire process of evaluation, from its inception through the systematically planned use of evaluation, is better coordinated than in earlier stages. The program coordinator designs the program to incorporate evaluation throughout, but has not yet succeeded in fully institutionalizing it into the program and still personally guides most of the staff's practical applications of the evaluation process.

Finally, Stage VI, Renewal, describes the user who continually evaluates the evaluation process itself to assure it is adequately serving programmatic needs and adjusts and modifies the evaluation when necessary. The evaluation process is continuous and well integrated into the program's structure. It is comprehensive and reaches all levels of management, staff and clients. Political realities and limitations notwithstanding, Renewal decision makers -- who can include any leader, teachers, project coordinators, principals, district level managers, superintendents, and school board members -- expect evaluation information, routinely take action to obtain it, analyze its application and practicality, and, in some rational way, use it.

Data from our study of this sample district indicated an interesting pattern of evaluation use. There were many users, especially new principals and teachers, at the Orientation and Preparation levels and only a few users were at the higher levels. The actions of principals and directors or coordinators of special programs programs typically fit the Preparation stage and did not reach Mechanical Use except in cases of project directors who had lengthy experience in federal programs. Nevertheless, arrival at the stage of Preparation shows that there has been growth in this system during the years we have observed. Nonuse of evaluation was the standard when our study began, although, at that time, evaluation had been mandated in the district by federal and local school administrators for almost ten years.

While there is still a predominance of the Routine or lower levels of
use, the data document gradual changes in the ways that primary users in
this district view evaluation and incorporate it into their program
management functions. Test score use is a good example of this
evolution. At the beginning of this study, there was wide variation in
the interest in test scores, with many school principals simply shelving
them as they came, never really certain what "those computer sheets"
said, and not very interested in finding out. Now, all the principals
and teachers we interviewed expect tests in the spring and scores in
September. The scores are sought in chart form so they can be
distributed at start-up fall meetings. Although the upper levels of use
are still uncommon, the most successful school principals and teachers
use test data creatively and proactively, along with other supportive
information about individual children, special groups, and programs --
at the Renewal level.

This instrument is designed to describe the evaluation use behavior of
individuals, but it can also be applied to the district level. In our
sample district, Routine use of evaluation has often been accomplished,
at least in regard to the basic instructional program in reading and
mathematics. School years are planned around testing cycles; associate
superintendents call for accountability plans that include reviewing
test information and targeted goals that reference test data. Many
routine meetings now include the use of surveys and evaluations of how
well agendas are accomplished. These surveys are usually very simple
and may neglect to elicit critical evaluations of substance.
Nevertheless, their use indicates beginning understanding of the ways
evaluation can contribute to program development.

In addition to defining the six stages of evaluation use, this draft of
the Structure of School Evaluation Use also sets out an initial list of
behavioral indicators -- Categories of Use -- that describe different
components of the evaluation use process (Appendix A, Part II). Still
building on the Texas R & D system, we observed seven categories similar
to those identified by Hall and Loucks (Ibid.). Each category
describes key actions that are specific to the evaluation use process.
They are: planning, assessing, acquiring, knowing, managing,
collaborating, and committing. Part II of Appendix A gives examples of
the behavioral indicators within each category that are characteristic
of individuals at the highest levels of evaluation use. As this
research continues, we will return to the original data base to identify
the additional behaviors within each category that are typical of
individuals functioning at each of the six stages.

Applications of the Structure of School Evaluation Use

The next steps in the development of the Structure of School Evaluation
Use are to determine its applicability through pilot testing and to
refine it for practical use. We submit it at this phase in its
development for comments and suggestions from colleagues who have been

close to the issues related to the limits of school evaluation use. We
believe it can be most helpful to evaluators and decision makers in
determining the type of evaluation that would best suit a given school
program context.

Training of evaluators to assess clients' levels of potential ability to
use the evaluation process will increase the likelihood that evaluations
will be designed and conducted so they more closely meet users'
abilities and awareness. If staff level coordinators, directors, and
principals are not able to use evaluation information except at initial
use levels, only modified and limited evaluation designs are required.
Evaluators will be in a better position to promote increasingly
constructive evaluations if they can assess the context and work at the
various developmental stages of their users. Over time, understanding
and working collaboratively within an individual's readiness to use the
evaluation process assure that the evaluations in schools will be more
effectively and continually used.

To experienced school district evaluators, this structure and the
observations we make here .ay state the obvious. We have seen that
most effective LEA evaluators intuitively understand and spontaneously
use a developmental framework to assess the evaluation context and to
design their evaluations accordingly (Patton, 1978). Successful
evaluators know that when project directors and evaluators, or
evaluation directors, superintendents, and school boards work
collaboratively, in well-matched relationships, they develop mutual
understandings of how best to incorporate the evaluation process into
the organization and program structure. The "levels of evaluation use"
concept is therefore not new to experienced and effective evaluators,
but, like much street level knowledge, its reality is only informally
recognized in the evaluation use literature.

Evaluation Is Worth the Effort

This approach to understanding and assessing the process of school
evaluation use assumes that adopting evaluation processes within school
districts requires a new way of doing things. As with other
innovations, integrating evaluation into complex school organizations is
evolutionary. When the evaluation process becomes fully used, carefully
established equilibria among individuals and subsystems in the
organization will inevitably be disrupted, and disruption is never easy.

Although we lament school systems' resistance to the rational use of the
evaluation process, we have recognized that, in spite of our frustration
with the pace, the process has been incorporated gradually and in
piecemeal fashion into many aspects of school life, in the classroom and
at district levels. Progress is evident if we look back to the 1960s
when evaluation was first mandated as part of the program implementation
process. Evaluation units in school districts are increasingly .ccepted
components of the school bureaucratic structure; instructional

assessment and standardized testing are routinely expected by children,
teachers and the community; program evaluation training is provided in
universities and colleges; and state legislatures are mandating
evaluation procedures much as did the federal government in the late
1960s. Principals, even teachers, now occasionally pick up the phone to
invite the district's evaluation specialist to help interpret test
information or to design a simple evaluation for a pet program. Even
more exciting is the increasing number of complex and longitudinal
evaluation studies reported each year by school district evaluation
units. Look, for example, at the annual submissions of district level
evaluations sponsored by AERA's Division H. The number and quality of
submissions grow annually.

The improvements we have seen in evaluation methodology and in the
technology that supports the evaluation process show the potential value
of continuing to require that educational programs be evaluated.
However, we have to become more adaptable and creative in our use of the
process. Although bottom line recommendations and changes that respond
directly to evaluation findings may be the exception, not the rule, a
broader understanding of the evaluation process and its evolution among
individual users recognizes that, given the opportunity and the proper
support, the evaluation process will, indeed, become gradually
structured into educational and program development routines.

A systematic evaluation model such as the Structure of School Evaluation
can help in assessing the status of evaluation use in school settings.
Used diagnostically by evaluators, decision makers, trainers, and change
agents, it can direct planning so that program activities are designed
to move individuals and the organization towards more complex stages of
evaluation use.

Our longitudinal study of evaluation use in process allows us to more
optimistically answer the questions with which we began. But, to do so
requires that we recognize the incremental ways that school evaluation
processes are contributing to the evolution of more rational educational
decision making. The key is, first, to design mechanisms that assure
the evaluation use process is implemented routinely into school programs
and, ultimately, to build into accountability models the expectation and
requirement that educational systems refine and renew the evaluation
process continually.

Looked at with this developmental perspective, recognizing the
evolutionary nature of the process, we see that the evaluation process
in schools can be worth the effort and that it falls to the evaluator to
make it so.

APPENDIX A

THE STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL EVALUATION USE   (SSEU)

Ellen M. Pechman and Jean A. King

(Adapted from Hall, 1982, and Hall & Loucks, 1975)

Introductory Note:

The levels of evaluation use defined below assume that users and
evaluators are ethicial, motivated by good intentions, and adhere to
established professional norms and standards. Intentional abuse and
misuse are independent levels of evaluation use that have been
documented as part of the evaluation process (Ginsberg, 1984; King &
Pechman, 1982; Lipsky, 1978) and are always potentially a problem. We
recognize abuse and misuse of the evaluation process as a predictable
side effect of unreasonable, irrational, or rigid bureaucratic
expectations and requirements regarding program performance and/or
evaluation. When "street level" (Lipsky, 1978) staff are called upon to
demonstrate their program's success through excessive record keeping or
arbitrary data collection requirements and without sufficient personal,
professional, or resource support, evaluation abuse or misuse can easily
occur (Ginsberg, 1984).

Evaluation abuse refers to the behaviors of evaluation users that break
professional norms and use the evaluation process inappropriately.
Abuse includes actions that are altruistically intended, but misdirected
(e.g., erasing students' test answers or artificially reducing pretest
scores), and those prompted by personal weakness and/or fear.
Malevolent use of evaluation information has also been observed and is
included in this category.

The reality of evaluation abuse and misuse must be acknowledged and
explored, and we should seek the reasons for their occurrence so steps
can be taken to minimize such destructive fallout or "side effects"
(Ginsberg, 1984) of the evaluation process.

STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL EVALUATION USE

Part I: Levels of School Evaluation Use

O Nonuse

> User ignores evaluation process or is unaware of its potential
> use and does not seek it out. Evaluation information is not
> integrated into program implementation.

Decision Point I: User takes action to learn more about the
     requirements and procedures for conducting an evaluation.

I. Orientation

> User begins to explore the potential value of the evaluation
> process and takes steps to acquire information about how to
> conduct an evaluation. Orientation may be initiated because
> of a grant or program mandate for an evaluation component in a
> new program; requirements established by a higher level
> manager; or user awareness of the potential value of the
> evaluation process to support, defend, or demonstrate the
> success of an ongoing program.

Decision Point II: User decides to initiate the evaluation process by
     calling for a review of an evaluation design and by taking
     action to determine what must be done to meet the requirements
     of the evaluation design.

II. Preparation

> User recognizes the need to collect data and directs staff to
> begin data collection, but remains aloof from the process,
> disregarding it during implementation, except when required to
> approve procedural activities or requirements. The evaluation
> is assigned to staff to implement, and data may be included in
> reports, but user is not aware of how to analyze or apply data
> other than as a signal to be reported as mandated.

Decision Point IIIA: User begins first use of evaluation by reviewing
     data, requesting assistance in interpreting evaluation, or
     including information from evaluation in conversations with
     staff and in staff meetings, reports, or planning.

IIIA. Mechanical Use

> User employs evaluation in required ways -- e.g., mandated
> reporting, distributing simple summaries of information and
> key data with other program documents. Allows evaluation
> process to proceed, but does not attend to quality of data
> collection process, giving only lip service to the place of
> evaluation in program implementation, planning or change.

Decision Point IIIB: Routine of evaluation implementation and use is
        established within program. Data collection and simple
        evaluation reporting for signal purposes are regular features
        of annual program implementation timelines and activity.

IIIB. Routine Use

> User routinely employs the signal function of the evaluation
> process and reports information regularly at mandated or
> logical points. Program planning and implementation include a
> skeleton evaluation process in which simple quantitative
> reports are submitted at required intervals to higher
> managerial levels and to staff. User fails to implement a
> systematic organizational use of the evaluation process and
> employs the information generated by the process in limited,
> nondynamic ways.

Decision Point IV: This marks the beginning of charged use. Managers
        change program elements, planning procedures, and/or program
        components on the basis of formal or informal evaluation
        information to improve the program and increase client
        outcomes.

IV. Refinement

> Beginning of charged use, i.e., data are systematically used
> to make program changes. There is an attempt to mold the
> evaluation process to provide information needed for
> program-specific decisions. The evaluation process is altered
> as needed to meet the client's needs and to assure data are
> available to guide program changes. Decision makers begin to
> seek out usable evaluation information by modifying the
> evaluation design as necessary and by providing staff time and
> personnel to assure that data are systematically generated and
> dependably reported.   In short, the decision maker's stated
> commitment to evaluation use is turned into initial action
> (beginning stages of putting theory into practice).

Decision Point V: User initiates use of evaluation information by
          coordinating with staff and/or colleagues to take action for
          program changes that are recommended or implied in the
          recommendations from the evaluators' informal feedback and
          from more formal evaluation data and reports.

V. Integration

          Implements higher levels of charged use by supporting the
          evaluation process both verbally and through managerial
          actions. Evaluation information that is collected is
          carefully determined on the basis of realistic assessments of
          available staff time to collect, analyze and actually use
          information obtained. User carefully collects data that is
          relevant and accurate and modifies reports for practical use
          by various audiences. Data are routinely disseminated and
          responded to by audiences; colleagues collaborate to assure
          that evaluation information is interpreted, understood and
          distributed. Program changes are monitored and, to the extent
          possible, are made in light of the evaluation findings.

Decision Point VI: User begins exploring program alternatives or major
          modifications called for by the evaluation and the evaluation
          process: Initiates major planning efforts; recommends
          substantive curricular; budget, or staffing changes on the
          basis of evaluation data; and includes extended and
          well-integrated evaluation process as a center-core of the
          program's functioning.

VI. Renewal

          User continually evaluates the evaluation process, assuring
          that evaluation is the basis of action at every stage, from
          design planning through data definition, collection
          procedures, reporting, and program modification. A delicate
          balance is struck that recognizes practical limitations and
          possibilities and weighs them against bold actions so that the
          'most evaluation for the buck' is obtained from the resources
          that are available. Evaluator or decision maker knows what
          the evaluation process can yield and works to assure that
          information is available and of high quality. User and
          evaluator routinely confer to obtain continual information on
          new developments from the field and in the literature, and
          collaboratively recommend ways to improve program, whether the
          news is good or bad. The evaluation process is comprehensive
          and attempts to reach all levels (top managers through
          front-line staff implementers and audiences/clients). Ideally,

at all levels, from teacher-child interaction through
directors to the top manager-director interaction, <u>both</u>
<u>quantitative and qualitative</u> evaluation data, combined with
sensitive and practical interpretation -- recognizing
political realities and limitations -- are the foundations of
actions.

STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL EVALUATION USE

Part II: Categories of Use and Sample Behavioral Indicators

The following categories of behavioral indicators are based on those
presented in the Levels of Use (Hall, et al.,1975). These categories
are specific to the evaluation use process and have been developed on
the basis of field data from the longitudinal study of school evaluation
use. The evaluation categories describe the key functions
characteristic of users at the highest levels of use.

1: Planning - Designs and outlines short and/or long range steps to be
taken during process of evaluation, that is, aligns resources, schedules
activities, and meets with others to organize and/or to coordinate
evaluation use. This effectively initiates the institutionalization of
the evaluation process by committing resources and time.

2: Assessing - Examines potential or actual use of evaluation or some
aspect of it; designs the evaluation processes, products, and uses;
analyzes data, and conducts meta evaluations. This can be a mental
assessment or can involve actual collection and analysis of data.

3: Acquiring-- Solicits information about evaluation in various ways,
including questioning resource people, corresponding with resource
agencies, reviewing printed materials, and making visits; collects
available products; reviews reports; seeks additional data and
evaluation information as needed.

4: Knowing -- Refers to the information that the user has about
evaluation and the evaluation process, how to use it, and consequences
of its use: awareness of information needs; evaluation potential; how
to collect, interpret and use data; technical issues; and knowledge of
the evaluation process. This category refers to cognitive knowledge
about the evaluation process and about how to use the evaluation
information. Feelings or attitudes are not included in this category.

5: Managing (*Hall's 'Performing') - Carries out the actions and
activities entailed in operationalizing evaluation: puts theory into
action; uses clout and political context continuously and effectively;
turns information into action; through effective monitoring and
directing, teaches others to do same; follows through on implementation
of evaluation at all levels; and uses organizational roles and functions
to affect evaluation process.

6: Collaborating (*Hall's 'Sharing') - Discusses evaluation with
others. Shares plans, ideas, resources, outcomes, and problems related
to evaluation use: collaborates with key institutional units and with
key personnel; reports to others; and holds meetings to exchange
information and to facilitate use of evaluation results.

7: <u>Committing</u> (*Hall's Status Reporting) - Describes personal stand in
relation to evaluation use: demonstrates willingness to take a stand,
uses information with key audiences and personnel, and advertises
program evaluation process as key component.

APPENDIX B

LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION

From: The LoU Chart. Austin: Research and Development Center for
Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1975.

0 NONUSE State in which the user has little or no knowledge of
the innovation, no involvement with the innovation,
and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.

Decision Point A Takes action to learn more detailed information
about the innovation.

I ORIENTATION State in which the user has recently acquired or is
acquiring information about the innovation and/or has
recently explored or is exploring its value orienta-
tion and its demands upon user and user system.

Decision Point B Makes a decision to use the innovation by estab-
lishing a time to begin.

II PREPARATION State in which the user is preparing for first use of
the innovation.

Decision Point C Changes, if any, and use are dominated by user needs.

III MECHANICAL USE State in which the user focuses most effort on the
short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with
little time for reflection. Changes in use are made
more to meet user needs than client needs. The user
is primarily engaged in a stepwise attempt to master
the tasks required to use the innovation, often
resulting in disjointed and superficial use.

Decision Point D-1 A routine pattern of use is established.

IVA ROUTINE Use of the innovation is stabilized. Few, if any,
changes are being made in ongoing use. Little prep-
aration or thought is being given to improving inno-
vation use or its consequences.

Decision Point D-2 Changes use of the innovation based on formal or
informal evaluation in order to increase client
outcomes.

IVB REFINEMENT State in which the user varies the use of the innova-
tion to increase the impact on clients within the
immediate sphere of influence. Variations are based
on knowledge of both short- and long-term consequences
for clients.

Decision Point E Initiates changes in use of innovation based on
input of and in coordination with what colleagues
are doing.

V INTEGRATION State in which the user is combining own efforts to
use the innovation with related activities of col-
leagues to achieve a collective impact on clients
within their common sphere of influence.

Decision Point F Begins exploring alternatives to or major modifica-
tions of the innovation presently in use.

VI RENEWAL State in which the user reevaluates the quality of
use of the innovation, seeks major modifications of
or alternatives to present innovation to achieve in-
creased impact on clients, examines new developments
in the field, and explores new goals for self and the
system.

18

Bibliography

Alkin, M.C., Daillak, R. & White, P. Using Evaluations: Does
Evaluation Make a Difference? Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979.

Bank, A. & Williams, R.C. Evaluation In School Districts:
Organizational Perspectives. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation, No.
10. Los Angeles: Center for Study of Evaluation, 1981.

Benveniste, G. The design of school accountability systems. Educational
Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 261-279.

Berman, P. The study of macro- and micro-implementation. Public
Policy, 26(2), 1978, 170-174.

Berman, P. Thinking about programmed and adaptive implementation:
Matching strategies to situations. In H.M. Ingram & D.E. Mann (Eds.),
Why Policies Succeed or Fail. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980,
205-228.

Berman, et al., Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vols. I
- VIII. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1974-1978.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational
Change. Vol. 1: A Model for Educational Change. Santa Monica: Rand
Corporation, 1974.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Implementation of educational innovation.
Educational Forum, 40, 345-370.

Borman, K.M. & Spring, J.H. Schools in central cities: Structure and
process. New York: Longman, Inc., 1984.

Braskamp, L.A. A definition of use. Studies in Educational Evaluation,
8(2), 169-174.

Brinkerhoff, R.O., et al. Program Evaluation: A Practioner's Guide for
Trainers and Educators (Sourcebook). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff
Publishing, 1983.

Cohen, D.K. & Lindblom, C.E. Solving problems of bureaucracy: Limits
on social science. In C.H. Weiss and A.H. Barton (Eds.), Making
Bureaucracies Work. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications,
1980, 125-138.

Comfort, L.K. Evaluation as an instrument for educational change. In
H.M. Ingram & D.E. Mann (Eds.). Why Policies Succeed or Fail. Beverly
Hills: Sage Publications, 1980, 35-57.

Comfort, L. K.   Education Policy and Evaluation: A Context for Change.
New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.

Cooley, W. & Bickel, W.   Decision-Oriented Educational Research.
Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff, 1986.

Cousins, J. B. & Leithwood, K.A.   The state of the art of empirical
research on evaluation utilization.   Prepublication draft.   Ontario
Institute for Studies in Evaluation, 1985.

Eckstein, H. & Gurr, T.R.   Patterns of Authority: A Structural Basis
for Political Inquiry.   New York: Wiley, 1975.

Eash, M.J.   Evaluation research and program evaluation: Retrospect and
prospect.   Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985a,
237-252.

Eash, M.J.   A reformulation of the role of the evaluator.   Educational
Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985b, 237-238.

Ginsberg, P.E.   The dysfunctional side effects of qualitative indicator
production: Illustrations from mental health care (A message from
Chicken Little).   Evaluation and Program Planning, 7, 1984, 1-12.

Hall, G.E.   Viewing evaluation utilization as an innovation.   Studies
in Educational Evaluation, 8(2), 1982, 185-196.

Hall, C.E., et al. Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for
analyzing innovation adoption.   Journal of Teacher Education, 26(1),
1975, 52-56.

Hall, G.E. & Loucks, S.F.   A developmental model for determining whether
the treatment is actually implemented.   American Educational Research
Journal, 14(3), 263-276.

Hall, G.E., Wallace, R. C., & Dossett, W.A.   A Developmental
Conceptualization of the Adoption Process within Educational
Institutions.   Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher
Education, The University of Texas, 1976.

Havelock, R.G.   Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination and
Utilization of Knowledge.   Ann Arbor: University of Michigan,
Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1971.

Hood, P.D.   The view of a program director. Educational Evaluation and
Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 238-242.

Jackson, P.W.   Life in Classrooms.   New York: Holt, Rinehart and
Winston, C.,, 1968.

Joint Committee on Standards fc- Educational Evaluation. Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981.

Kennedy, M.M., Apling, R. & Neumann, W. F. The Role of Evaluation and Test Information in Public Schools. Cambridge: The Huron Institute, 1980.

King, J.A. & Pechman, E. M. Pinning a wave to the shore: Conceptualizing evaluation use in school systems. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6(3), 1984, 241-251.

King, J.A. & Pechman, E. M. The Process of Evaluation Use in Local School Settings. Final Report. National Institute of Education Grant (81-0900). New Orleans, Louisiana: New Orleans Public Schools, 1982.

Lindblom, C.E. & Cohen, D.K. Usable Knowledge: Social Science and Social Problem Solving. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Lipsky, M. The assault on human services: Street-level bureaucrats, accountability and the fiscal crisis. In D. Greer, R. Hedlund, & J. Gibson. Accountability in Urban Society: Public Agencies Under Fire. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978, 15-38.

Merwin, J.C. & Wiener, P.H. Evaluation: A profession? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 253-259.

Olsen, L.M. & Gordon, A.C. Reflections on Ginsberg's Paper. Evaluation and Program Planning, 7, 1984, 19-21.

Patton, M. Utilization Focused Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1978.

Perloff, R.M., Padgett, V.R., & Timothy, C.B. Sociocognitive biases in the evaluation process. New Directions for Program Evaluation, 7, 1980, 11-26.

Popkewitz, T.S., Tabachnick, B.R. & Wehlage, G. The Myth of Educational Reform: A Study of School Responses to a Program of Change. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

Sabatier, P. & Mazmanian, D. The implementation of public policy: A framework of analysis (Xerox copy, No date).

Shapiro, J.Z. Where we are and where we need to go. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 7(3), 1985, 245-248.

Stake, R.E. A personal interpretation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 243-244.

Wolcott, H.F.   Teachers Versus Technocrats: An Educational Innovation
in Anthropological Perspective.   Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational
Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1977.