4582

A VYGOTSKIAN PERSPECTIVE OF A HYBRID MODEL OF

PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION AND SCHOOL-BASED EVALUATION

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

MAY 2005

By
Terry Ann F. Higa

Dissertation Committee:
Paul R. Brandon, Chairperson
Ann S. Bayer
Morris K. Lai
Lois A. Yamauchi
Joanne E. Cooper

Abstract

This study examines the influence of three factors on school staffs' learning about program evaluation: (a) aspects of the professional development (PD) about evaluations, (b) characteristics of the PD participants, and (c) characteristics of the participants' school environment. The PD was based on participatory evaluation literature and school-based evaluation. The participatory evaluation literature stated that evaluations are enhanced by collaborations between evaluation experts and school staff (Cousins & Earl, 1995). Based on the participatory evaluation and school-based evaluation literature (Nevo, 1995), three PD components were implemented. CRDG provided workshops, small group or individual consultations, and written materials to the participants.

Vygotskian principles were used as the lens through which the research questions were addressed. The connection between Vygotskian principles and adult learning is vital because all participants were adults. Three important principles are common to Vygotskian and adult learning theories: (a) learning occurs within the learners' zone of proximal development, (b) educators must consider the adults' social context of learning, and (c) instructors and learners need to find common understandings about language, the learning tasks, and value for the tasks.

A trained interviewer used a standardized open-ended interview guide when interviewing 15 administrators and school personnel who participated in CRDG's PD. Two reviewers used codes representing Vygotskian concepts to categorize the comments. There were distinctions between the administrators and school personnel's responses that became the structure for interpreting the findings.

The strongest finding was that the small group and individual consultation best facilitated learning for both groups. Possibly, administrators learned more than the school personnel because they had more positive attitudes and prior experience with evaluations. Also, it may have been easier for administrators to collect data because more of their school personnel were involved in the evaluation over the school year.

This study can be used as the basis for many other studies, for example, studies that replicate this study to examine the validity of the findings, a study that replicates the structure and methods of this study with the changes suggested by the findings, or studies using Vygotskian concepts as a lens to examine other teaching-learning processes.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is submitted to the graduate faculty of the Department of Educational Psychology to fulfill the requirements for a PhD in Educational Psychology.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to answer three questions that have not been addressed in the evaluation literature. This study will address the questions through a Vygotskian perspective: (a) What aspects of the professional development (PD) that was provided to a sample of public-school administrators and personnel in how to conduct summative evaluations influenced their learning of program-evaluation skills? (b) What characteristics of school administrators and personnel who participated in the PD sessions accounted for learning program evaluation skills? and (c) What aspects of the school environment of the administrators and personnel who participated in the PD sessions accounted for learning program evaluation skills?

Relevance of the Study to Educational Psychology

This study will contribute to the existing literature on participatory program evaluations, school-conducted program evaluations, and Vygotskian learning principles—three areas that are integral parts of the field of educational psychology. This study will examine the viability of the hybrid model of participatory and school-based evaluations. The data analyses method will illustrate the use of Vygotskian learning principles for analyzing interview data.

Overview of the Study

The study examines the effects of PD for administrators and school personnel who were conducting summative evaluations of their site-managed projects. The purpose of the PD was to provide representatives of participating schools with sufficient skills and knowledge to conduct several steps of the summative evaluation.

In the study, retrospective interviews were conducted with the administrators and school personnel who had participated in the PD sessions. The PD sessions were provided during School Year 1997–98; the administrators and school personnel who participated in the sessions applied their PD during the year. The sample of schools from which interviewees were selected were the Oʻahu schools where staff participated extensively in the PD. Resource constraints for this study limited the interview group to administrators and school personnel at Oʻahu schools. Staff from three Oʻahu schools were also excluded from the interview group because they did not fully participate in the PD or were not primarily responsible for the evaluation. The number of staff interviewed at each school varied between one and three, for a total of 15 administrators and school personnel. There was one representative from each of five schools, two representatives from each of three schools, and four representatives from one school (interviewed in one group of three interviewees and one interview with one interviewee). The interviewees are further described in the methods section.

Vygotskian social learning principles were used to interpret the interview data. The interview data were assigned codes representing Vygotskian concepts. The codes defined the type or quality of the (a) interaction between the evaluation experts and the

administrators and school personnel who participated in the PD sessions, (b)

characteristics of the administrators and school personnel, and (c) aspects of the school

environment of the administrators and school personnel that may have influenced the

administrators and school personnel's learning to conduct evaluation tasks. Then, the

coded data were examined for patterns of responses.

Background of the Study

In School Year (SY) 1997–98, Curriculum Research & Development Group

(CRDG) was contracted by the Hawaiʻi Department of Education (DOE) to provide PD

about conducting summative evaluations and assistance to Hawaiʻi public schools that

were funded by the Incentive and Innovation Grants (IIG) or Special Needs Schools

(SNS) programs. I was the Evaluation Project Director at CRDG for both the IIG and

SNS evaluations. The purpose of the PD and assistance was to help schools learn

program evaluation knowledge and skills and apply their learning in summative

evaluations of their IIG or SNS projects. Projects in both programs were site-managed by

the schools (Brandon, 1997; Brandon & Higa, 1997a, 1997b). Brief descriptions of the

IIG and SNS programs are provided below.

The Incentive and Innovation Grants (IIG) Program

The Incentive and Innovation Grants (IIG) program was established by the

Hawaiʻi State legislature to provide project start-up funds to Hawaiʻi public schools that

propose to improve their students' achievement through innovative methods (Incentive

and Innovation Grants Program, H. B. 2156, 1993). A DOE administrator and a panel

representing various stakeholder groups for Hawaiʻi public education made decisions

about funding new projects and continuing funding for existing projects. Projects were awarded funding for one to four years.

As specified in the SY 1997–98 DOE-CRDG Memorandum of Agreement, 13 IIG-funded schools were invited to participate in the evaluation PD (Office of Accountability and School Instructional Support, 1997a).

The Special Needs Schools (SNS) Program

The Special Needs Schools (SNS) program provided funds to schools with high percentages of students who were at-risk or potentially at-risk for low-level performance in school (Office of Instructional Services, 1989). Schools used SNS funds at their discretion for school improvement. Seventy-three schools received SNS funding in SY 1997–98. For SY 1997–98, the DOE and CRDG agreed that CRDG's evaluation services would focus on seven schools that (a) were willing to participate in project summative self-evaluations and commit "sufficient school resources to conduct adequate project self-evaluations" and (b) used their "project funds to support well-defined projects...that have the potential to improve student or teacher performance" (Office of Accountability and School Instructional Support, Exhibit A, 1997b, pp. 1–2). CRDG provided evaluation PD to the seven SNS-funded schools and provided assistance to administrators and school personnel in conducting evaluation activities in each of the summative-evaluation phases.

The Evaluation Professional Development (PD)

To prepare for the evaluation professional development (PD), CRDG staff distributed a memorandum informing DOE district administrators, school principals, and project coordinators of the purpose of the PD, CRDG's role, and expected efforts from

administrators and school personnel. A timeline that included PD dates and expected progress of evaluations was attached to the memorandum. The content of the memorandum and its attachments was discussed at the beginning of the first evaluation-PD workshop.

CRDG staff prepared evaluation-PD materials (Brandon & Higa, 1997a) to distribute to schools at the workshops. The materials were based on program evaluation literature and CRDG staff's experience in providing PD to IIG-funded schools in SYs 1995–96 and 1996–97. The materials focused on providing guidelines for conducting evaluations that would be "psychometrically and methodologically adequate" (Wang, Brandon, Higa, & Saka, 1996, p. 8).

A Description of the Evaluation Professional Development (PD) Sessions

CRDG provided evaluation services during SY 1997–98 in such a manner that participating school administrators and faculty would be given opportunities to learn program evaluation skills in didactic and interactive formats at group workshops or at individual schools. CRDG purposefully provided opportunities for interaction with participating administrators and school personnel to promote shared meaning (mutual understanding) with the administrators and school personnel about the evaluation tasks and the purposes of the PD to conduct adequate evaluations. The PD addressed (a) writing project descriptions to use when evaluating the projects, (b) developing evaluation designs based on the project description, (c) developing or selecting appropriate data-collection instruments, and (d) distributing the data-collection instruments to the appropriate response group and collecting the completed instruments.

The first two topics were addressed in the workshops, and the third was addressed during consultations at individual schools. CRDG and administrators and school personnel contacted each other by phone, facsimile, e-mail, or in in-person meetings as needed to decide on procedures for distribution and collection of data-collection instruments. CRDG analyzed the data and met with administrators and school personnel to review the analyses and ask for administrators and school personnel's input to interpret the findings.

The workshops began with lecture-style presentations of basic information, followed by break-out sessions in which CRDG staff provided intensive consultation and the administrators and school personnel applied what they had learned in the lectures. Together, school and CRDG staff decided on the focus of the evaluation. If time permitted during the workshops, school and CRDG staff decided on the methods used to collect evaluation data, parties responsible for completing each task, and timelines to help ensure that the evaluation would progress in a timely manner. If time did not permit these last few tasks to be completed during the workshop, then school and CRDG staff contacted each other by phone, facsimile, e-mail, or met in person to complete the tasks. After the workshops, CRDG staff, with the assistance of administrators and school personnel, developed or selected many of the data-collection instruments.

Throughout the year, school and CRDG staff contacted each other by phone, facsimile, e-mail, or met in person, as needed, to discuss the progress of the evaluation and to clarify or revise tasks or the timeline. CRDG staff provided consultation about administrators and school personnel's evaluation responsibilities and answered questions about evaluation methods. CRDG staff also identified published data-collection

instruments related to the goals of the school projects. Schools had the prerogative of selecting the published instruments as part of their evaluation or use them as models for developing their own data-collection instruments.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The bodies of literature on learning theory and program evaluation were reviewed to develop a theoretical framework and methods for answering the research questions.

Learning Theory

The literature on Lev Vygotsky's principles on the social context of learning were reviewed to develop a theoretical framework for examining the evaluation-PD process in the context of social settings. Pressley and McCormick (1995) stated that, of the theorists in the area of "qualities of interpersonal relationships that contribute to the development of sophisticated cognition... [w]ithout a doubt, one of the most influential theorists in this arena has been Lev Vygotsky" (p. 226).

Vygotskian Theory: Basic Tenets

Learning happens in a social context. Vygotsky's first tenet is the genetic law of cultural development which implies that all higher mental functions appear first on the interpsychological plane, where a person interacts with others and begins to learn, and then on the intrapsychological plane, where the learner is able to perform the mental functions independently (Vygotsky, 1978). On the interpsychological plane, the learner is exposed to various aspects about the learning task, including the significance of the task within a cultural context and the cognitive aspects of understanding the task.

What is involved with this process of moving from the interpsychological plane to intrapsychological plane? Vygotsky's second major tenet is that the internalization process involves the learner's reconstruction of psychological activity that the learner was formerly only able to do through interaction with others on the interpsychological plane

(Vygotsky, 1978). The reconstruction of psychological activity is based on systems that serve to organize mental functioning for the purpose of enhancing understanding. Vygotsky (1978) called these systems "sign systems," with speech as the primary sign system both on the interpsychological plane and intrapsychological plane (p. 24) Aspects of external communicative speech turn "inward" to become the basis of "inner speech," the planning or mediating function which guides our own behavior (Wertsch & Bivens, 1992, p. 41).

A third major tenet is that forms of mediation (i.e., sign systems used to enhance understanding) are shaped by the sociocultural setting in which the activities take place (Wertsch & Bivens, 1992). For example, if learners are in a formal educational setting such as a school classroom, activities on the interpsychological plane may take the form of listening to the teacher giving explanations and descriptions or working collaboratively with peers in a small group toward completing a joint project. At home, activities on the interpsychological plane may be working one-on-one with a parent or sibling. In either scenario, the learning task will be infused with sociocultural aspects of those with whom the learner interacts.

When discussing the role of instruction and learning, Vygotsky (1978) placed the internalization process within a fourth tenet, the zone of proximal development (ZPD). The ZPD is the "distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). The ZPD, then, is the area between and including the

interpsychological and intrapsychological planes where teaching-learning social processes can happen. The ZPD as described by Vygotsky is a spiral (rather than a linear path) where the learner will continue to incorporate new knowledge with old knowledge. As learning progresses through the ZPD, the learner increasingly assumes responsibility for the processes necessary to competently complete the task without assistance (Vygotsky, 1978).

In the ZPD, teachers and learners engage in semiotic mediation—that is, they interact, commonly in the form of speech—to establish intersubjectivity—that is, shared understanding—about terminology and the values attached to the terms and learning tasks. As learners advance toward competent performance of the task, they also achieve deeper levels of understanding about the task.

Because Vygotsky died at the young age of 37, so few of his original manuscripts have been available outside of Russia, much of his theory has been underdeveloped. Neo-Vygotskians have continued his work, resulting in a prolific literature expanding his sign tenets. I will refer to these theorists whose work is most relevant to my study.

Wertsch (1985) expanded on Vygotsky's internalization process by introducing the notions of situation definitions. Rommetveit (1979) expanded on Vygotsky's concepts by added the construct of intersubjectivity. Rommetveit (1979) stated that intersubjectivity is based on some "shared social world," where there is common language and an understanding of what an object or concepts means within the context (p. 96). Motivation contributes to the internalization process because learners must be willing to understand and reconstruct the teacher's message to make sense of the learning

task (Rommetveit, 1979). Bruffee (1995) stated that as teachers and learners advance in their understanding of the others' culture, each experiences some reacculturation. That is, both the teacher and learner incorporate some of the other's culture into their own culture (e.g., language, symbols, values) to enhance communication about the task.

Working with the same paradigm as Vygotsky, Rogoff, Baker-Sennett, Lacasa, and Goldsmith (1995) saw development as a dynamic process of interchange between community, interpersonal, and individual (personal) planes of analysis where processes on one plane affect the other, mutually defining and changing the others' roles. From the perspective of Rogoff et al. (1995), the community plane of analysis is a level where individuals participate with others in culturally organized activities that are infused and inseparable from cultural values, practices, and goals. The community plane of analysis focuses on historical factors that affect the activities, the institutional factors that structure the activities, and the technologies that facilitate the activities.

The interpersonal plane of analysis looks at communication and coordination of efforts between people in face-to-face and side-by-side interaction (both literally and symbolically). Studies of the interpersonal plane can reveal the factors involved in facilitating individuals' participation in activities and restricting their participation in current or future-related activities.

The main focus on the personal plane of analysis picks up on the latter description of the interpersonal plane. That is, the personal plane focuses on how interaction between individuals affects their involvement in activities and preparedness for engagement in or restriction from involvement in related activities. The three planes of analysis are

11

intertwined aspects of the same phenomena of development and, therefore, studies of any one plane of analysis necessitate examination of the other two planes.

The development-through-participation perspective of Rogoff et al. (1995) entailed that studies of development should focus on the processes on each plane and discard the perspective of a distinction between process and achievement of a goal of the process; there really is no end product but a continuing developmental process. Rogoff et al. (1995) stated that their perspective does not accommodate "the idea of a boundary between internal and external phenomena" (p. 54). Individuals' understanding of and sense of responsibility for activities are based on their participation with others in the activity. Similar to Bruffee (1995), Rogoff et al., (1995) believed that each participant contributes to the activity and, thus, contributes to a cultural value of the activity. On the various planes of analyses, participants stretch their own beliefs and participation to incorporate new perspectives about the shared endeavor. As individuals participate in activities, their own beliefs and practices change simultaneously with their contributions to the activities and influences the beliefs and practices of others engaged in the activities.

Tharp and Gallimore (1988) had a perspective that is also congruent to that of Rogoff et al. (1995) about the social and individual processes that occur when an individual participates in a social activity. Tharp, Gallimore, and Rogoff et al. all built on Vygotsky's major tenets of internalization process, semiotic mediation, and a culturally shaped zone of proximal development. Tharp and Gallimore (1988) connected their perspective on the effect that an individual's participation in socially shared activities can have on the individual's intrapsychological processes to that of Vygotsky's notion of

internalization. Tharp and Gallimore (1988) stated that internalization is a process on which an individual's internal plane of consciousness is formed. Through an individual's participation in social activities, social and cultural traditions and beliefs are moved from the social plane to the psychological plane. This process parallels the process of an individual's development of self-regulation of the activities and moving away from social regulation of the activity. That is, higher mental functions that are part of the social and cultural heritage of the child will move from the social plane to the psychological plane, from the interpsychological to the intrapsychological, from the socially regulated to the self-regulated. Tharp and Gallimore (1988) added that these processes occur in both children and adults because these teaching-learning processes are universal.

Principles of Adult Learning

The connection between Vygotskian principles and adult learning is vital to this study because the participants in CRDG's PD about conducting evaluation tasks were in-service teachers. The literature on adult learning theories have many similarities to Vygotsky's learning principles. The literature on adult learning fleshes out Vygotsky's theory into practical applications. Three important principles are common to the adult learning theories and Vygotskian principles. The first principle is that learning occurs within the learners' ZPD. Teachers must consider that adults have various prior experiences and motivations for learning more about the content area. Second, it is always imperative to consider the social context of learning. The social context for adults may be their individual situation in life or their political awareness that serves as their lens for interpreting subject matter and the learning environment. Third, the instructor and

13

adult learner need to find a common language, have a mutual understanding of the learning tasks and structure, have a mutual understanding of the importance of the material, and have a mutual understanding of the purpose of learning.

The literature shows some debate about how adults learn, probably because adults learn in many different ways. As stated by Brookfield (1995), "Theorists of adult learning believe that there are forms of reasoning, thinking, and judging in adult life that are qualitatively different from those characteristic of adolescence and childhood" (p. 220). However, this is not to say that adult learning is completely separate and distinct from learning by children and adolescents. Many of the learning theories that have been applied to children and adolescents describe a continuum of approach to learning from childhood to adulthood and, therefore, are applicable to adults (Brookfield, 1995). There are, however, some common threads in the various beliefs about adult learning.

Galusha's (1998) theories about adult-learning theories stated that adults commonly participate in educational sessions to expand their opportunities by gaining new knowledge or learning new skills. Educators should consider the adult learner's needs and purposes when structuring a balance of knowledge-based subject matter (generally factual information) and theory-based subject matter (subject to discussion, exploration, critical analysis and problem solving) in the course content. That is, adult learners enter an educational context with a variety of prior experience, either knowledge-based or theory-based, about the subject matter. Educators must also consider the learner's prior knowledge when structuring subject matter and assess the learners' grasp of basic information about the subject matter, such as terminology and the most important

facts, before moving on to more complex theory-based subject matter. Educators, therefore, can make a powerful impact on adult learners by finding the relatedness of the subject matter to the learner's goal for his or her individual positioning or positioning within his or her organization. This is consistent with Vygotskian theory about the ZPD where teachers must consider the learner's prior experience and motivation to learn in order to design effective learning activities.

Along the same lines as Galusha (1998), Holton and Swanson (1999) stated that adult learning theory should give due consideration to the influence of "individual learner differences, situational differences, and goals and purposes of learning" (p. 20). Holton and Swanson stated that when adults learn one subject matter, they would probably use different learning strategies than when they learn other subject matter. Additionally, the situation of an adult learner dictates the type of learning situation that would be most effective, that is, different situations of adult learners require different learning situations. Education sessions, then, should be structured to fit the learner's purpose. For example, if the learner's purpose is to fit his/her learning into their role at their workplace, then the educational sessions should help the learner accomplish that purpose. Holton and Swanson's (1993) statements support Brookfield's (1995) earlier statements that, because adults learn for their own reasons, educators are advised to mold the educational experiences around the adult learners' needs, possibly by helping learners critically examine the meaningfulness of the subject matter within their organization's culture. Again, these principles about adult learning are similar to Vygotskian theory about characteristics of the learner that influence the effectiveness of the learning activities.

15

Culture can be defined as "the shared values, attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, and language use within a social group" (Guy, 1999, p. 7). Defining the culture of an organization can be as problematic as defining one's personal culture. Guy stated that defining a person's culture is problematic for reasons such as (a) the United States has a wide variety of socioeconomic and ethnic diversity; (b) there are always individual differences within groups and movements toward incorporating aspects of other cultures into their self-identify and defining that mix as one's culture; and (c) all cultures are not equally regarded. That is, some cultural groups are considered with higher esteem than other cultural groups. Educators, therefore, would be wise to consider issues of hierarchy among cultural groups as a basis for understanding their students' purpose and situational reasoning about the subject matter. These principles about adult learning are similar to Vygotskian theory about the influence of the learner's social environment on learning.

Although these issues of defining cultural background are commonly thought about in terms of ethnic group differences, the same ideas apply to organizational culture; for example, an organization may be held in higher esteem than other organizations because of specific organizational characteristics. Brookfield (1995) advised educators to recognize that adults bring awareness of organizational politics into a learning context. Ignoring adult learners' political awareness actually can be considered demeaning to the learner's status as a mature, intelligent adult.

Guy (1999) concurred with Brookfield that, typically, adults continuously learn about an organization's culture, how to obtain information about that culture, how to open communication lines within the organization, and who has power within the

organization. As adults are faced with new information, they consider an organization's

approval of the content and how the content will be evaluated in an organization.

Brookfield had stated that the meaningfulness of any PD curriculum to teachers will be

dependent on their frame of reference. For example, the learner's purpose may be to

improve the way his or her organization is regarded by society. In this example, the

culture of the learner's organization establishes criteria for the importance of the subject

matter. Teachers, then, are advised to develop an understanding of the meaning that an

adult learner would attach to the subject matter and the learning environment, including

characteristics of the teacher and content. Culturally relevant teaching requires that adult

educators examine their practices for "communicative processes, instructional practices,

classroom norms and expectations, learning evaluation criteria, and instructional content

that is potentially culturally incompatible with the learners' culture" (Guy, 1999, p. 14).

Vygotskian Principles Applied to Adult Learning

Although Vygotsky himself did not explicitly write about the applications of his

theory to educate adults, many educators have found that Vygotsky's principles were

useful in their work with adults. This section includes brief descriptions of three

university preservice education programs that are based on Vygotskian principles.

Collaborative-Apprenticeship Learning

Bayer (1996) described an example of the application of Vygotskian principles to

adult learning. In her example, Bayer (1996) described how she effectively developed and

implemented learning activities based on Vygotsky's principles for students in a year-

long teacher education class. Data were collected twice weekly over two semesters of the class through observations and videotapes which were later transcribed.

In her class, Bayer (1996) orchestrated joint activities in a college class that allowed students to engage in dialogic texts. Dialogic texts are defined as texts that allowed students to use language as thinking devices to make connections between what they already know and new concepts. An anlaysis of the video-taped course reveals two patterns in which the dialogic text took place. The first pattern called "shared knowledge scaffolding" involved students in writing activities that were designed to assess the students' prior knowledge on a topic. Then, students shared their writing in small groups with their peers. Through collaboration with peers, each group summarized similarities and differences between their prior knowledge. The groups shared their summaries with each other, and the instructor connected the similarities and differences, essentially developing a composite picture of the students' prior knowledge. These processes described by Bayer (1996) illustrated the construction of knowledge through collaboration.

The next activity was designed to connect prior knowledge to new knowledge where students were asked to note connections and discrepancies between their prior knowledge and new information. The students shared their insights on how the new information modified their prior beliefs about the topic. Although language was used throughout the learning process, new technical vocabulary was introduced after students discussed their insights about the new information. In this way, students could connect the vocabulary to concepts that were already cognitively processed. This "shared

18

knowledge scaffolding" pattern eventually disappeared and the resultant shared knowledge became the anchored knowledge that students used as mental hook as they engaged in increasingly more complex activities.

"Anchored knowledge scaffolding" is the second scaffolding structure identified in the analysis of the records of class activities and interactions between participants (Bayer, 1996, p. 176). In anchored knowledge scaffolding, students prepare for guided practice by using their shared knowledge base to make connections to guided practice and application of ideas in new situations.

Bayer (1996) stated that the scaffolding and connecting of new knowledge to prior knowledge is an illustration of Vygotsky's description of how mediation facilitates movement of knowledge from the interpsychological to intrapsychological, that is, internalization of socially-constructed knowledge.

The Kamehameha Elementary Education Program (KEEP)

Dalton (1989) described how Vygotskian principles were applied in an experimental preservice teacher education program based on the KEEP program. The preservice teacher education program was offered through the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, College of Education, in Honolulu, Hawai'i. The preservice teachers were half-way through their teacher education program. Experienced teachers had received PD through the KEEP program and served as mentors for the preservice teachers.

According to Vygotsky, learning is facilitated by social interactions, a principle that is the basis of the KEEP preservice education program (Dalton, 1989). In the experimental preservice education program, the researcher observed interactions between

19

the teacher-mentors and preservice teachers and between preservice teachers and their students. Dalton (1989) claimed that the analysis of the observations of these interactions revealed ZPDs and social construction of knowledge, two important elements of Vygotskian principles.

The preservice program was designed to facilitate the preservice teachers' development from that of novices to professional educators. The preservice teachers had opportunities to socially construct knowledge about professional performance through their interactions with their mentors and their students. As the preservice teachers encountered new information, they integrated the new knowledge with their prior knowledge, transforming their thinking about teaching. The Vygotskian principle that learning is socially formed was developed into three principles of teaching that guided the preservice teaching program.

The first principle, assisted performance, emphasizes that teachers should arrange learning activities that include opportunities for students to socially interact with peers or adults. The learning activities should be based in part on the students' prior knowledge and opportunities to connect that prior knowledge to new knowledge. Two Vygotskian notions interplay in these learning activities: (a) the interactions between teachers and students should facilitate intersubjectivity between the teacher and the student and (b) by basing the learning activity on students' prior knowledge, teachers will guide students through their ZPDs.

The second principle, teachers adjust instruction, suggests that teachers should design learning activities that are compatible with the students' preferred styles of

"thinking, speaking, organizing, and motivation" (Dalton, 1989, p. 6). According to this principle, teachers need to consider students' preferences of social interaction and participation when designing the learning activity. If teachers effectively adjust instruction, the result will be learning activities that optimize the students' collaborative interaction and potential for intersubjectivity.

The third principle, teachers assist performance, "stresses teacher responsibility for the actual performance of students" (Dalton, 1989, p. 7). This principle means that teachers should be able to understand students' thinking and understanding and respond by adjusting the learning activity to facilitate students' connection to new information. Responsive teaching facilitates development of intersubjectivity between the teacher and students. This principle incorporates the previous two principles; that is, the teacher should be able to arrange learning activities and adjust instruction for "compatibility with students' preferred learning styles" (Dalton, 1989, p. 11).

Dalton (1989) concluded that the social interactions of the preservice education teachers with their mentors and students represent successful application of Vygotskian principles. Dalton included excerpts of the preservice teachers' journal that show their development as a professional educator as the students worked through their ZPDs reached intersubjectivity with others and internalized pedagogical principles emphasized in the preservice program.

The University of Southern California (USC) Training Course for Graduate Assistants

In this example of the application of Vygotskian principles to adult learning, Tirrell (1985) described a teacher education course at USC to train graduate assistants to

teach. Tirrell (1985) used a Vygotskian perspective to describe this training course for the purpose of showing "how courses for new instructors can be conceptualized to view learning and teaching as continuing and reciprocal processes" (p. 3).

A fundamental Vygotskian principle is that learning is socially constructed. Tirrell (1985) stated that the learning environment for the teacher education course included many interconnecting variables that translate to several opportunities for students to interact and develop knowledge. The instructors were responsible for ensuring that each student had a place within the learning environment. That is, each student had opportunities to interact with others and felt safe to take risks by engaging in activities (e.g., sharing their writing) and forming dyadic relationships. This means that the instructors needed to learn as much as possible about their students so that the instructors could appropriately design the learning environment based on students' prior knowledge, learning preferences, and connections to new knowledge.

The primary dyadic (interpsychological) relationship in the USC teacher education course was between the instructors and each student (Tirrell, 1985). However, the instructors designed the learning environment to facilitate formation of a multitude of other dyadic relationships between students and their peers and groups of students and the instructor. The instructor modeled how she or he learned from the interactions with others and facilitated students' learning from each other as well as from the instructor. "In all these relationships, the teacher needs to be the mediator for student growth. . . In other words, he intervenes at the ZPD" (Tirrell, 1985, pp. 6–7).

Program Evaluation Theory

Cousins and Earl (1992, 1995), Lee and Cousins (1995), and Nevo (1994, 1995) have discussed their reflections on providing PD to administrators and school personnel about conducting adequate evaluations. The following review includes their insights on how the quality of evaluations are affected by the school's organizational culture, the relationship with evaluation experts, and characteristics of the administrators and school personnel involved in the evaluations.

Participatory Educational Evaluation

Cousins and Earl (1992) defined participatory evaluation as "applied social research that involves a partnership between trained evaluation personnel *and* practice-based decision makers, organization members with program responsibility, or people with a vital interest in the program" (pp. 399–400). The school evaluations in this study are considered similar to participatory evaluations because the administrators and school personnel who were interviewed in this study had significant program responsibilities, including active participation in the PD about conducting evaluations and responsibility for carrying out evaluation tasks. The research on participatory evaluation, then, is useful to this study because it provides insights about schools as organizations and the characteristics of evaluation experts that enhance the quality of school-based evaluations.

According to Cousins and Earl (1995), a major benefit of participatory evaluation is that it draws on both the expertise of an evaluation consultant and the practitioners' knowledge of the evaluation context and content. This combination promotes the likelihood that the evaluation design will be focused appropriately, carried out with

23

acceptable technical quality, and relatively highly valued and understood (in comparison to external evaluations) by the administrators and school personnel that carry out the evaluation tasks.

In participatory evaluation, the evaluation team members "learn on the job" under close supervision of an evaluation expert (Cousins & Earl, 1992). The evaluation expert's input diminishes as the school evaluation team learns the necessary skills to adequately conduct the evaluation. The evaluation expert's role may change from educator, coordinator, and quality-control supervisor to consultant for highly-specialized tasks. Participatory evaluation is based on the principles of organizational learning (Cousins & Earl, 1992). A major principle of organizational learning is that knowledge is socially constructed through interactions between administrators and school personnel and evaluation consultants that lead to shared understanding. This principle is consistent with a basic tenet of Vygotskian theory. Organizational learning grows as new constructs are integrated into existing cognitive structures. The "salience of new information depends upon the value placed on its source in addition to consensual interpretations" (Cousins & Earl, 1992, p. 401). The consensual interpretations are based on mutual understanding, therefore improving actions within the organization. An organization's potential for learning is greatly enhanced if the staff who participate in the evaluation have organizational memory (that is, knowledge about the organization's cultural rules, structures, values, goals, and so forth) (Cousins & Earl, 1995).

In research on participatory evaluation, Cousins and Earl (1995), among others, have reported that increasing the level of administrators and school personnel's

involvement in program evaluations increases the likelihood that they will conduct

adequate evaluations. Staff collaboration greatly enhances organizational learning by

increasing shared value for the programs, clarity about program goals, uniformity in

program implementation, and knowledge about students. Five characteristics of schools

that support the participatory-evaluation model's viability are (a) the administrators and

school personnel must value evaluations; (b) the school must devote adequate resources

to the evaluation, including personnel time and funding; (c) the school must be

committed to improving through organizational learning; (d) the administrators and

school personnel involved in the evaluation must be highly motivated; and (e) an

evaluation expert should provide PD sessions to administrators and school personnel that

are involved in the evaluation.

In their study of participatory evaluation, Lee and Cousins (1995) interviewed

staff at four schools who were involved in an evaluation. The findings substantiated

Cousins and Earl's (1995) statements about the potential benefits of participatory

evaluation, including the characteristics of the administrators and school personnel and

evaluation consultant that influenced the effectiveness of the participatory evaluation

model. The administrators and school personnel who participated in Lee and Cousins'

study were, generally, more enthusiastic in learning about the effectiveness of changes at

their schools. The administrators and school personnel involved in the evaluation thought

that the participatory model could influence other staff at their schools to value evaluation

and, generally, to work toward school improvement. An additional finding was that

administrators and school personnel's value of the evaluation was negatively affected

25

when the administrators and school personnel who participated in the evaluation were not allotted adequate time and resources for the evaluation tasks (Lee & Cousins, 1995).

Cousins and Earl (1995) identified six requirements for evaluation experts to be effective in providing PD to administrators and school personnel. Experts must (a) have appropriate levels of expertise in program evaluation and research skills, (b) be accessible to administrators and school personnel who may need the evaluation expert to attend meetings or to address specific questions, (c) have adequate resources available for use in the evaluation, (d) practice effective teaching methods for adults, (e) be motivated, and (f) be flexible in their definition of adequate levels of performance because the administrators and school personnel will implement the evaluation plan at their level of skill and experience (probably a substantially lower level than that of the evaluation expert).

In Lee and Cousins' (1995) findings about participatory evaluation, they found that the evaluation consultant, like the administrators and school personnel, required considerable time for the evaluation, more time than usually allotted for other evaluation models. The consultant's role was expanded to acting as a "sounding board" and "counselor" to administrators and school personnel about difficulties in the project (p. 82). Lee and Cousins recommended that there should be well-defined roles for the evaluation consultant and school staff who are participating in the evaluation.

School-Based Evaluation

Nevo (1994) describes an evaluation model where evaluation experts collaborate with administrators and school personnel to conduct adequate school-based evaluations.

Nevo's model is similar to the participatory evaluation model described by Cousins and Earl (1992, 1995) in many aspects. Nevo describes school-based evaluation as a mix of internal evaluation (conducted by administrators and school personnel), which is best suited for formative purposes, and external evaluation (conducted by evaluation experts), which is best suited for summative purposes. According to Nevo (1994), the school-based evaluation model is a stronger model than either the internal or external evaluation models because it dispels much of the subjectiveness and bias in internal evaluations and the defensive behavior that administrators and school personnel develop when faced with the perceived threat of external evaluations.

Nevo (1995) described the four basic components of an evaluation listed below in the order in which they should occur. The first three components were developed into the structure of CRDG's PD sessions. The last component about sampling, data analyses, and reporting was not developed into a PD sessions because, as Nevo (1995) stated, CRDG, as the evaluation experts, assumed the main responsibility for these tasks.

Component 1: "Understanding the Evaluation Problem" (Nevo, 1995, p. 121)

A clear description of the project should be written to enhance understanding of the evaluation problem. The description should be useful for providing information from which the evaluation team can develop a tentative list of evaluation questions that will be addressed by the evaluation. A school-based evaluation team (administrators and school personnel) should be responsible for writing the project description. The project description should include statements about the project's nature, supporting rationale for the project, and curricular or instructional approaches. The project description should also

define "potential audiences and stakeholders of the evaluation," what their concerns are, and the function that the evaluation will serve.

Component 2: "Planning the Evaluation" (Nevo, 1995, p. 124)

The school-based evaluation team should develop a clear plan for the evaluation based on the project description. The evaluation plan should include a translation of the evaluation questions into operational terms, selection of data-collection methods, description of sampling procedures, selection of data-analysis procedures, and a timeline for the evaluation. These tasks involve expertise in research and evaluation methods and the evaluation team should consult with evaluation experts in developing its plan. Nevo (1995) recommends that the plan for these tasks be recorded in a table format with the headings of "evaluation questions, instruments and data collection procedures, samples, data analysis procedures, and timetable" (p. 127).

Component 3: "Data Collection" (Nevo, 1995, p. 128)

According to Nevo, the school-based evaluation team should have primary responsibility for data-collection tasks, carefully follow the timeline for data collection activities that is included in the evaluation plan, and consult with evaluation experts to be sure that data-collection procedures are appropriate.

Component 4: Sampling, Data Analyses, and Reporting Findings

Nevo (1995) stated that evaluation experts should take the main responsibility for sampling procedures, data analyses, and reporting evaluation findings because these tasks require expertise in research and statistical methods.

According to Nevo (1995), "awareness, training, and organizational resources" are key variables in studying the extent to which a school values evaluations and is open to conducting evaluations (p. 171). Nevo recommends that evaluation experts first attempt to secure school administrators' support of the evaluation tasks. To do this, evaluation experts should enhance the administrators' awareness of evaluation principles, methods, and usefulness. If the administrators' support is secured, then the administrators and school personnel that will participate in the evaluation process should receive PD about evaluations.

Although there may be several teachers on the evaluation team, the evaluation experts should clarify the type and level of resources that the school must devote to the evaluation tasks. These resources include personnel, funding, and arrangements for data collection (Nevo, 1995). The extent to which school resources are available will affect the breadth and scope of the evaluation.

The Role of Evaluation Experts in School-based Evaluation

Nevo (1995) writes that, initially, evaluation experts should provide an overview of evaluation principles and PD in evaluation procedures to school administrators. If evaluation experts successfully secure the support of administrators, the evaluation can progress more smoothly. Evaluation experts can then provide evaluation PD to the school-based evaluation team members.

After the initial PD, evaluation experts take the role of consultants and provide technical assistance to the evaluation team. Nevo (1995) warns that evaluation experts are

only helpful if their verbal and written communications are understandable to the administrators and school personnel and evaluation stakeholders.

The Place of the Study in the Literature on Participatory Evaluation

A review of the literature on Vygotskian principles is included in this dissertation as the lens through which the research questions will be addressed. This study will contribute to the literature on Vygotsky because the study uses Vygotskian concepts as a method of analyzing data and it would be interesting to see if other researchers find it useful to follow this method.

Because Vygotsky's work was mainly in terms of children's learning, a few examples where Vygotskian principles were applied to adult learning and a review of the literature on adult learning were also included in this section. The review of the two latter bodies of literature shows that it is appropriate to apply Vygotsky's principles to adult learners and, therefore, appropriate as the framework for data collection and analysis for this study.

The evaluation PD provided by CRDG staff has characteristics of the evaluation PD discussed by Cousins and Earl (1992, 1995) and Nevo (1994, 1995). This research on school-conducted evaluation is useful for addressing the research questions in this study because the scenarios described by Nevo are similar to those of the CRDG-provided evaluation PD sessions and school-conducted evaluations. The principles and insights discussed by Nevo helped to form the theoretical framework for the data-collection methods and interpretation of findings for this study.

This study follows the literature on participatory evaluation and school-based evaluation in examining the influence of factors such as characteristics of the PD, characteristics of the learner, and characteristics of the school environment that influence the extent to which administrators and school personnel learn evaluation skills. Therefore, this study will contribute to research about participatory evaluations and school-conducted evaluations reported to date.

CHAPTER 3. METHODS OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to collect and analyze administrators' and school personnel's retrospective perspectives on the extent to which they learned evaluation skills during one school year. Fourteen administrators and school personnel from nine Oʻahu schools who had participated extensively in the PD sessions were selected as interviewees for this study.

Other administrators and school personnel at three Oʻahu schools who were implementing SNS or IIG projects were excluded from the interview group because they did not fully participate in the sessions or were not primarily responsible for the evaluations. At one of these three schools, the project coordinators were not present for the scheduled PD time for either of the two sessions and had substantial difficulty in scheduling time to meet with CRDG staff. At the second school, the project coordinator was required to serve on extended jury duty and could not fully participate in the PD. The project coordinators from these two schools would have been unable to provide information to address the first and second research questions of this study. At the third school, the project coordinator was not primarily involved in designing the evaluation, developing or identifying data-collection instruments, or collecting data, because program consultants from Johns Hopkins University used an existing data-collection instrument to collect data about the school's project. The project coordinator from this school would have been unable to provide information to address the three research questions of this study that ask about influences on the administrators and school personnel's abilities to conduct these evaluation tasks.

Table 1 includes a description of the interviewees by their gender, position at their school, grade levels at their school, the number of schools they represented (some projects included more than one school), the number of projects they represented (some schools were implementing more than one project), and background.

A research method that allows the researcher to probe the respondent for more in-depth information about respondents' responses is the interview method. Literature about the interview method was reviewed to ensure that this data-collection method was properly developed for the purpose of the study. Patton (1987) stated that the advantage of interviewing "allows the evaluator to enter another person's world, to understand that person's perspective. . . .We also interview to learn about things we cannot directly observe" (p. 109). Borg, Gall, and Gall (1993) stated that "the principal advantage of interviews is their adaptability. . . ; the well-trained interviewer can alter the interview situation at any time in order to obtain the fullest possible responses from the individual" (p. 113). Borg et al. (1993) added that, through interviews, researchers can obtain more in-depth information than possible with some other data-collection methods.

Patton (1987) describes three types of interviews, each of which are appropriate for different purposes: (a) "the informal conversational interview, (b) the general interview-guide approach, and (c) the standardized open-ended interview" (Patton, 1987, p. 109). Informal interviews look like ordinary conversations, and, usually, the questions are not predetermined. The strength of the informal interview is that the interviewer can

Table 1. Description of Interviewees, Grouping, Schools, and Projects by Interview

Gender	Position at school	School level	N interviewees	N schools represented	N projects represented	Background
female	administrator	middle	1	6	1	administrator
male	administrator	elementary	1	1	1	administrator
female	administrator	elementary	1	1	1	administrator
female	teacher (former government administrator)	high	1	1	1	administrator
female	administrator		1			administrator
female female male	Reading Coordinator/teacher Curriculum Coordinator/teacher STW Coordinator/teacher	high	3	1	3	school personnel
female female	Project Coordinator/teacher Project Coordinator/teacher	elementary	2	1	1	school personnel
female male	Counselor Teacher	elementary	2	1	1	school personnel
female	Budget Coordinator	high & intermediate	1	1	1	school personnel
female male	Librarian Technology Coordinator/teacher	elementary	2	1	1	school personnel
Totals						
female:11 male:4	administrator:4 teacher:1 mixed positions:6	elementary:5 middle:1 high & intermediate:1 high:2	15	14	11	administrator:5 school personnel:5

34

customize the conversations to the interviewee. The weakness is that it "requires a great amount of time to get systematic information" (Patton, 1987, p. 110). Additionally, the interviewer would need to be well skilled as a conversationalist. Another weakness of this type of interview is that the data are usually difficult to summarize because each interview is different.

In the interview-guide approach, a brief manual is prepared with a description of procedures and questions for the interview. The interview guide also includes information about the research context that is important for the interviewer to know when presenting the questions in an interview. Sometimes interviewers are allowed to change the order of questions in the interview guide and add questions if they feel that further probing is needed to obtain a satisfactory amount of information. The advantage of this approach to interviews is that each interviewee is asked to address a common set of issues, with the desired result of obtaining data that are systematic and easier to analyze than the information conversational interview. The weaknesses of this approach are similar to that of the informal interview—that is, because the questions vary, the information may not uniformly address the research issues.

The standardized open-ended interview is the third type of interview described by Patton (1987). This approach is similar to the interview guide approach because there are prepared questions; however, in the standardized open-ended interview, the interviewer must carefully follow the sequence of questions and may not deviate from the predetermined wording. Additionally, interviewers are constrained to use only the predetermined probing questions. A main advantage of standardized open-ended

interviews is that it helps to minimize any bias that can result when the questions are worded differently among interviewees. For example, the standard wording can help to focus interviewees on one aspect of an evaluation task regardless of their diverse backgrounds or foci. The weakness of this approach is that the interviewer is not able to interject additional questions to encourage interviewees to elaborate on their responses.

There are other disadvantages associated with the use of interviews—for example, interviewing to collect retrospective perspectives. Collecting retrospective perspectives is appropriate for addressing the questions of this study because the administrators and school personnel learned about program evaluation over the entire school year and because their involvement in the evaluation tasks were an important aspect of the PD. The disadvantage of collecting retrospective perspectives for the study is that the interactions between evaluation experts (CRDG staff) and administrators and school personnel were not directly observed. Another disadvantage is that the data were collected through direct interaction between the interviewer and interviewee. This scenario easily can be infused with subjectivity based on the interviewer-interviewee relationship. For example, a respondent with a certain perception of the interviewer may be more apt to provide answers to please the interviewer. Possibly, the same interviewee may give very different information to a different interviewer who the interviewee finds objectionable in some way (Borg et al., 1993). Another disadvantage is that collecting data through interviews is more costly and time consuming than other methods. Researchers need to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the interview method against the data needed in the research when designing the research.

To enhance the validity of the interview data for this study, an interviewer who was not involved with the evaluation training sessions was trained to conduct the interviews. Interviews, as a data-collection method, have the disadvantage that interviewees may provide responses to please the interviewer. The purpose of hiring an independent interviewer was to avoid the tendency for interviewees to provide socially-desirable responses to the evaluation experts who participated in the PD. Clearly, if the interviewer was involved with the evaluation training, the interviewees would be generally inclined to make positive statements out of politeness or regard for the status of the evaluation experts who conducted the training. The interviewees would be more likely to provide both positive and negative responses to a more neutral interviewer.

This study was designed to use Vygotskian learning principles to examine the data about a hybrid model of participatory evaluation and school-based evaluation; therefore, Vygotskian principles were the basis of the interview questions. The Vygotskian learning principles also were used to interpret the data and address the three research questions about aspects of the PD, characteristics of the interviewees, and aspects of the interviewees' school environment that influenced the interviewees' learning program evaluation skills. This study does not purport to study Vygotskian learning processes. Instead, Vygotskian learning processes are used in this study to categorize the interview data and interpret the patterns in the data.

The Interview Guide

As described in the previous section, interviews may be either formal and structured or informal, like a conversation. It was decided that standardized open-ended

interviews would be appropriate for this study because the administrators and school personnel involved in the evaluation PD were very diverse; some were administrators, some were teaching staff, and some were non-teaching staff. I anticipated that, without a standardized open-ended interview, the interviewees would focus on quite different perspectives of the evaluation tasks and it would not be possible to define patterns within the data. This study required information from respondents about uniform issues; therefore, an interview guide was developed for the standardized open-ended interview format. There were 15 interviewees, thus this interview method was feasible and could yield a rich set of data.

The standardized open-ended interview format was designed to help put the interviewees at ease as a way of encouraging full responses when sensitive questions where asked, for example, the questions about aspects of the school culture. An interview guide was developed (shown as Appendix A); it included questions that all interviewees were asked to ensure that all the interviews addressed issues about the evaluation PD and the extent to which they learned about evaluation. A few Likert-type items were included for the purpose of collecting interviewees' overall assessment about the extent to which they believed they were proficient in various evaluation tasks.

The interview guide included five main sections of interview questions. The first main section was an introductory section. The second main section included some background questions. The following three sections ask about the project description component, the designing an evaluation plan and selecting methods component, and the component about collecting evaluation data.

The Introductory Section

The introductory section included three subsections. The first subsection was designed to help the interviewer better understand the study by providing information about the background of the study and guidelines for conducting the interviews. This section addressed the research questions, background about the evaluation training sessions and participants, a synopsis of the literature about Vygotskian and program evaluation theories, and the place of the study in the literature on participatory evaluation.

The second introductory subsection described the interview method, specific instructions for preparing for each interview session, and procedures for taking notes or audiotaping the interviews. The third introductory subsection gave specific instructions on beginning the interview, requesting the interviewee's permission to audiotape the interviews, and introduction of the interviewer to the interviewee. The third introductory subsection also gave specific instructions about stating the purpose of the interview, stating that it is acceptable for the interviewee to be critical about the evaluation training and consultation, and reassuring the interviewee about the confidentiality of his or her statements. The interview guide then provided the interviewer with acceptable probing questions to use in the interview whenever it seemed that the interviewee might have further thoughts about a topic than what was already stated.

The Second Section: Background Questions

The second main section listed 15 questions that the interviewer was to ask interviewees about their background and general information. This section included (a) one question about the interviewee's background in conducting evaluations, (b) three

questions about how the interviewee felt about being selected to participate in the evaluation training sessions, (c) one question about why the interviewee was selected to participate in the evaluation, (d) seven questions about how others at the school felt about the interviewee's participation in the training sessions, and (e) five questions about changes in the interviewee's attitudes toward evaluation over the course of the year. Next, the interview guide included procedures designed to refresh the interviewee's memory about the evaluation training sessions including the logistics of the sessions, content of the sessions, and the written materials that were provided and discussed. The section concluded with a brief overview about the structure of the rest of the interview that the interviewer was to read to the interviewee.

The Third Section: Writing a Project Description

The third main section listed 33 questions about how the interviewee was taught to write a project description. In this section, the interview items asked about the interviewee's experience in the evaluation training session, including (a) three items about the interviewee's pre-training self-rating of ability to write a project description, (b) one item about how CRDG taught them to write a project description and what influenced their learning, (c) seven items about the appropriateness or adequacy of the workshop and printed guidelines, (d) six items about communications with CRDG about writing a project description, (e) four items about the value and feasibility of the evaluation tasks, (e) ten items about support for the evaluation in the interviewee's school and interviewee's role in the school, and (f) two items about the interviewee's post-training self-rating of ability.

The Fourth Section: Developing an Evaluation Plan and Selecting Evaluation Methods

The fourth main section listed 34 questions. These questions asked about the same topics as the third section about writing a project description, except the item about the coverage of concepts was split into two items, one about developing an evaluation plan and the other about selecting evaluation methods.

The Fifth Section: Collecting Evaluation Data

The fifth main section listed 31 questions. Again, the questions asked about the same topics as in the third section about writing a project description. However, two items about the appropriateness or adequacy of the workshop and printed guidelines were omitted because CRDG did not provide printed materials about collecting evaluation data or make oral presentations about collecting evaluation data. At the point at which schools were ready to collect evaluation data, the context and process of collecting data varied among schools; therefore, most of the discussions about collecting data were in the break-out groups between CRDG evaluation staff and faculty and administrators and school personnel.

The interview guide ended with some general questions asking about other comments the interviewees might have about the evaluation training and consultation, influences on their level of participation in the training, or influences on their ability to conduct the evaluation tasks. Table 2 is the blueprint for the background questions, showing the parallels of the interview questions to Vygotskian learning principles, and the research questions for this study. Table 3 is the blueprint of the interview questions about the three PD components of writing a project description, designing an evaluation

Table 2. Blueprint of the Interview Guide: Background and General Information Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions

Background and general information section interview questions	Vygotskian principle	Research question
1. What experiences have you had in evaluations previous to this evaluation?	•Prior experience •ZPD	1. Characteristics of the learner
2. At the beginning of this year's evaluation, how did you feel about being selected to participate in it? 3. How do you feel *now* about having been selected to participate? 4. If there is a change in how you feel, what brought about that change?	•Motivation •Sociocultural •Internalization	2. Characteristics of the learner
For Question 5-12, if the interviewee asks why you are interested in information about others at the school, say: One of the purposes of this study is to examine the influences of others at the school on your participation in the evaluation training and ability to adequately conduct the evaluation tasks.		
5. Why do you believe you were selected to participate in the evaluation?	•Learner's attention to components	2. Characteristics of the learner
6. At the beginning of this school year, how many others at the school were aware of your participation in the evaluation? 7. What positions did they hold? 8. Before the evaluation began, what do you think your school administrators' and other staff's attitudes were about your having to do the evaluation? (Interviewer prompt terms: amount of support provided, perceived importance, meaningfulness of the evaluation to others)	•Learner's environment •Motivation •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
9. At this point in the school year, how many others at the school are *now* aware of your participation in the evaluation? 10. What positions do they hold? 11. What do you think their attitudes are now about having the evaluation done at the school? 12. If there is change in their attitudes, what brought about that change?	•Learner's environment •Motivation •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
13. What were your attitudes toward evaluation in general before this year? 14. At this point, how do you feel about evaluations in general? 15. If there was a change, what brought about it about?	•Prior experience •Motivation •Sociocultural •Intersubjectivity •Internalization	2. Characteristics of the learner

42

(Table 2. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Background and General
Information Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions, continued)

Background and general information section interview questions	Vygotskian principle	Research question
On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (e.g., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, rate your ability to conduct evaluation tasks for each component before you learned about it from CRDG. Please tell me why you chose this rating.	•Prior experience •Semiotic mediation •ZPD	
33. On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (i.e., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, what rating do you give your ability to conduct evaluation tasks *for each component now* (that is, after learning about how to conduct the evaluation task and actually conducting the evaluation task for your project)? 34. Please explain your rating.	•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	

Table 3. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Relationships Between Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions

Interview guide section and questions			Vygotskian principle	Research question
Project description	Evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods	Collecting evaluation data		
1. First, I'll ask about the first evaluation phase (writing a project description). 2. Think back to before you learned from CRDG about writing a project description. On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (e.g., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, rate your ability to write a project description before you learned about it from CRDG.	1. In this section, I'll ask about the second evaluation phase (developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods). 2. Think back to before you learned from CRDG about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods. On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (e.g., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, rate your ability to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods before you learned about it from CRDG.	1. In this section, I'll ask about the third evaluation phase (collecting evaluation data). 2. Think back to before you learned from CRDG about collecting evaluation data. On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (e.g., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, rate your ability to appropriately collect evaluation data before you learned about it from CRDG.	•Prior experience •ZPD	2. Characteristics of the learner
3. Please tell me why you chose this rating.	3. Please tell me why you chose this rating.	3. Please tell me why you chose this rating.	•Prior experience •ZPD	2. Characteristics of the learner
4. Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to write a project description and what influenced your learning.	4. Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods and what influenced your learning.	4. Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to appropriately collect evaluation data and what influenced your learning.	•Learner's attention to components •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD

44

(Table 3. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Relationships Between
Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions, continued)

Interview guide section and questions			Vygotskian principle	Research question
Project description	Evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods	Collecting evaluation data		
5. Was the timing of the workshop appropriate? (Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)	5. Was the timing of the workshop appropriate? (Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)	5. Were timing of the consultation sessions appropriate? (Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)	•ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
6. How appropriate was the length of the workshop?	6. How appropriate was the length of the workshop?	6. How appropriate was the length of the consultation sessions?	•ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
7. How appropriate was the focus of the workshop about writing a project description? (Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)	7. How appropriate was the focus of the workshop about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods? (Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)	7. How appropriate was the focus of the consultation sessions about collecting evaluation data? (Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)	•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
8. How good was the coverage of concepts about writing project descriptions or the procedures for writing them? (Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)	8. How good was the coverage of concepts about developing evaluation plans or the procedures for developing them? 9. How good was the coverage of concepts about selecting evaluation methods or the procedures for selecting them? (Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)	8. How good was the coverage of concepts about collecting evaluation data or the procedures for appropriately collecting the data? (Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)	•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD

45

(Table 3. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Relationships Between
Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions, continued)

Interview guide section and questions			Vygotskian principle	Research question
Project description	Evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods	Collecting evaluation data		
9. How understandable were the oral presentations in the workshops or elsewhere?	10. How understandable were the oral presentations in the workshops or elsewhere?		•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
10. How understandable were the written materials in the workshop or elsewhere?	11. How understandable were the written materials in the workshop or elsewhere?		•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
11. How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?	12. How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?	9. How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?	•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
12. Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?	13. Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?	10. Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?	•ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
13. How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)	14. How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)	11. How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)	•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD

(Table 3. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Relationships Between Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions, continued)

Interview guide section and questions			Vygotskian principle	Research question
Project description	Evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods	Collecting evaluation data		
14. When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)	15. When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)	12. When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)	•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
15. How was CRDG's pace? (Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)	16. How was CRDG's pace? (Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)	13. How was CRDG's pace? (Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)	•ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
16. Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase? (Interviewer prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)	17. Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase? (Interviewer prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)	14. Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase? (Interviewer prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)	•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD
17. Overall, to what extent did the workshop, consultation, and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to write a project description?	18. Overall, to what extent did the workshop, consultation, and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods?	15. Overall, to what extent did the consultation and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to appropriately collect evaluation data?	•Semiotic mediation •ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD

47

(Table 3. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Relationships Between
Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions, continued)

Interview guide section and questions			Vygotskian principle	Research question
Project description	Evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods	Collecting evaluation data		
18. How well did CRDG explain the importance of writing a project description?	19. How well did CRDG explain the importance of developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods?	16. How well did CRDG explain the importance of appropriately collecting evaluation data? (Interviewer prompts: procedures to enhance validity and reliability of the data)	•Semiotic mediation •Sociocultural •ZPD	2. Characteristics of the learner
19. How important do you think it is? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness or helpfulness in your understanding of evaluation)	20. How important do you think it is? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness or helpfulness in your understanding of evaluation)	17. How important do you think it is? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness or helpfulness in your understanding of evaluation)	•Motivation •Sociocultural •ZPD	2. Characteristics of the learner
20. Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks? (Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection)	21. Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks? (Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection)	18. Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks? (Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrange-ments for data collection)	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural •ZPD	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
21. How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?	22. How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?	19. How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?	•ZPD	1. Aspects of the PD

48

(Table 3. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Relationships Between
Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions, continued)

Interview guide section and questions			Vygotskian principle	Research question
Project description	Evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods	Collecting evaluation data		
22. How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about writing a project description?	23. How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods?	20. How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about collecting evaluation data?	•Learner's environment •sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
23. If you consulted with others at your school, what types of information did they provide?	24. If you consulted with others at your school, what types of information did they provide?	21. If you consulted with others at your school, what types of information did they provide?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
24. If you consulted with others at your school, how do you think they felt about being consulted about writing a project description?	25. If you consulted with others at your school, how do you think they felt about being consulted about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods?	22. If you consulted with others at your school, how do you think they felt about being consulted about collecting evaluation data?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
25. If you consulted with others at your school, to what extent did the information you got help you to write a project description?	26. If you consulted with others at your school, to what extent did the information you got help you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods?	23. If you consulted with others at your school, to what extent did the information you got help you to appropriately collect evaluation data?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
26. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *role or status* in your school?	27. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *role or status* in your school?	24. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *role or status* in your school?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment

(Table 3. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Relationships Between
Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions, continued)

Interview guide section and questions			Vygotskian principle	Research question
Project description	Evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods	Collecting evaluation data		
27. If it has changed, how so?	28. If it has changed, how so?	25. If it has changed, how so?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
28. Why do you think it has changed?	29. Why do you think it has changed?	26. Why do you think it has changed?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
29. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *level of influence* on school decisions and activities?	30. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *level of influence* on school decisions and activities?	27. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *level of influence* on school decisions and activities?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
30. If it has changed, how so?	31. If it has changed, how so?	28. If it has changed, how so?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment
31. Why do you think it has changed?	32. Why do you think it has changed?	29. Why do you think it has changed?	•Learner's environment •Sociocultural	3. Aspects of the learner's school environment

(Table 3. Blueprint of the Interview Questions: Relationships Between
Questions, Learning Theory, and Research Questions, continued)

Interview guide section and questions			Vygotskian principle	Research question
Project description	Evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods	Collecting evaluation data		
32. On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (i.e., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, what rating do you give your ability to write a project description *now* (that is, after learning about how to write a project description and actually writing a project description for your project)?	33. On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (i.e., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, what rating do you give your ability to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods *now* (that is, after learning about how to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods and actually developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods for your project)?	30. On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (i.e., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, what rating do you give your ability to appropriately collect evaluation data *now* (that is, after learning about how to collect evaluation data and actually collecting evaluation data for your project)?	•Intersubjectivity •ZPD	2. Characteristics of the learner
33. Please explain your rating.	34. Please explain your rating.	31. Please explain your rating.	•Intersubjectivity •ZPD	2. Characteristics of the learner

51

and selecting methods, and collecting evaluation data. Table 3 shows the parallels

between the questions about each component, connections of the interview questions with

the Vygotskian learning principles, and the connections of the interview questions with

the research questions for this study.

The interviewer met with the administrators and school personnel from each

school for approximately one to two hours to collect data addressing the research

questions for this study. The resulting interview data are the participating administrators'

and school personnel's responses to questions about the appropriateness or adequacy of

(a) the PD workshop, (b) the printed PD guidelines, (c) the evaluation tasks, (d) the value

and feasibility of the evaluation tasks, and (e) the support for the evaluation in the school

and for the interviewee's role in the school.

The data-collection procedures called for the interviewer to record the

interviewees' responses as hand-written notes on note-taking forms. The interviews were

also audio recorded if the interviewee agreed to it. After the interview, the interviewer

transcribed the hand-written notes and added information from taped interviews. The

audio tapes were destroyed after the interviews were taped.

Analyzing the Interview Data

Content analysis is a method for categorizing interview notes and other qualitative

data to categories through a coding system (Babbie, 1989; Krippendorff, 1980). The

content analysis method was used to analyze the interview data that were collected for

this study.

The literature was reviewed to examine the process involved in content analysis. Wholey et al. (1994) referred to qualitative data as a mass of information where some of the data may be relevant to the study and some of the data may not be relevant. Content analysis is a method of organizing the data through a system of assigning codes to chunks of data (Wholey et al., 1994). Essentially, the coding system should sift out the irrelevant data, resulting in categories of data that can be examined for meaningful patterns or inconsistencies.

The process of content analysis starts with the research questions for the study, from which key concepts are identified that can be translated into codes (Borg et al., 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, as cited in Wholey et al., 1994, p. 79). In this method, the data are initially reviewed, notes are made about the categories of responses that are provided to each question (Wholey, Hatry, & Newcomer, 1994), and the responses are classified by category. Usually, the codes are abbreviations or symbols that represent the key concepts in the research. It is important that codes are distinct from each other, or it may be difficult to interpret patterns within and between the categories connected to a research question (Wholey et al., 1994). The list of codes should be revised if the initial coding system excludes some pertinent data (Borg et al., 1993; Miles & Huberman, 1984). The method of assigning codes should include a mechanism to assure that the codes are reliably assigned (Walberg & Haertel, 1990).

Applying the procedures described in the literature on content analysis, the research questions and interview data in this study were reviewed to make decisions about the key concepts that would become codes. Clearly the Vygotskian concepts are the

key concepts, because they constitute the lens through which the data are to be viewed to determine factors that influenced the effectiveness of the PD sessions. For example, by assigning codes representing the Vygotskian concepts to the data, the researcher can identify the aspects of the learning environment, semiotic mediation, or the zone of proximal development that enhance or hinder the learning process. Therefore, initially, I reviewed the data and developed a tentative list of Vygotskian concepts that were represented in the data. In this study, the unit of analysis is the interview. Therefore, when there were more than one participant in an interview, their combined comments were considered as one response.

Two reviewers independently assigned codes representing Vygotskian concepts to the interview data. Both reviewers were students in the Educational Psychology doctoral program at the UH-Mānoa and had completed coursework in learning principles. I was one of the reviewers and am a full-time educational program evaluator at CRDG. I also was one of the CRDG evaluation experts who provided PD to the administrators and school personnel. The other reviewer conducted research based on data collected at the UH-Mānoa Student Health Center.

The codes that the reviewers assigned to the data defined the type or quality of the interaction between the evaluation experts and the administrators and school personnel who participated in the PD sessions about conducting summative evaluations. A plus mark (+) was added to the Vygotskian code if the interviewee(s)' response indicated that the PD, learner, or learner's school environment, had the characteristics that would enhance learning about evaluations or conducting evaluation tasks. A minus mark (-) was

added to the Vygotskian code if the interviewee(s)' response indicated that characteristics of the PD, learner, or learner's school environment were not those that enhance learning about evaluations or conducting evaluation tasks. If the interviewee(s)' response indicated positive characteristics about the PD, their own characteristics, and characteristics of their school environment then the Vygotskian code was repeated with a plus mark (+) and minus mark (-) (e.g., ZPD+, ZPD-). A neutral code (neither plus nor minus) was used when ambivalent responses were given about one part of the evaluation—for example, when it was positive in one sense and negative in another. A neutral code was also assigned if there were statements from more than one interviewee in an interview about the same part of the session, but one interviewee had a positive perspective and the other interviewee had a negative perspective.

After each reviewer had coded one section of data, they met to discuss the differences in their coding. It became clear immediately that some of the initial definition of codes needed to be refined. For example, initially, the code of ZPD was only to be assigned if other codes associated with the ZPD (semiotic mediation, intersubjectivity, etc.) could not be assigned. However, the two reviewers agreed that the ZPD code should be assigned along with other codes, else, it have omitted possibilities of looking at the positive and negative ZPD aspects of the data. Additionally, the codes of motivation and sociocultural context needed refinement because, initially, they were being used interchangeably (either code may have been assigned to refer to the same concept). The initial definitions did not clearly make a distinction between the two codes. The codes were refined to distinguish between motivation and sociocultural context. The reviewers

agreed that more than one code could be assigned to the same chunk of data. The reviewers were also careful not to assign codes based on the reviewers' knowledge about the interviewees or their schools and to assign codes based on meanings or actions that were explicitly stated in the data. The codes for intersubjectivity and internalization were seldom used because it was not clear from the data that the interviewees actually reached these ZPD stages. The reviewers continued to meet to discuss any differences in coding to check if they were working from common understandings of the codes and data. This process narrowed the definitions of the codes. The final definitions of codes are shown as Table 4. The agreement level between the two reviewers after reconciling the differences in coding was 98%.

The data were reviewed to make decisions about a method for displaying, discussing, and elucidating the results of the analyses. The data showed similarities between the responses by administrators as distinguished from responses by school personnel. These patterns are discussed further in the sections about findings and discussion of the findings. It was decided to categorize the findings according to the interviewees' backgrounds of being administrators or school personnel (shown in Table 1). There was another pattern distinguishing the administrators from the school personnel; the administrators were interviewed alone while the school personnel were interviewed together. It is not known if this pattern in the interviews affected the interviewees' responses.

Table 4. Codes Used to Represent Vygotskian Concepts

Code	Description
Codes mainly pertaining to the individual	
Prior experience (PE)	Knowledge, beliefs, and values that learners bring to the learning situation that may influence their learning
Learner's attention to components (LA)	Interviewee's perspective or focus in the evaluation component (project description, developing an evaluation plan and selecting or developing methods, and data collection).
Motivation (MO)	Interviewee's belief about the need for the evaluation task.
Codes mainly pertaining to the individual's context for the evaluation	
Sociocultural context (SC)	Value of others at the interviewee's school and receptiveness of the interviewee or others at the school to the evaluation task. See also literature review.
Learner's environment (LE)	A descriptive code for the school context for the evaluation. If several people were involved with or knowledgeable about the evaluation, then a LE+ was assigned. If only the administrators and school personnel were involved in the evaluation or one or two other people were involved in or knowledgeable about the evaluation, then a LE- was assigned. If adequate school resources (including people) were available for the evaluation, then a LE+ was assigned. Conversely, if inadequate school resources were available for the evaluation, then a LE- was assigned. When others were consulted, such as school administrators, faculty, or staff, then a LE+ code was assigned. If only a few people who were not administrators or if no one was consulted, then a LE (neutral code) was assigned because consultation may not have been necessary. A neutral code was used when ambivalent responses were given about one part of the evaluation, for example, when it was positive in one sense and negative in another. A neutral code was also assigned if there were statements from more than one staff member in an interview about the same part of the session, but one staff member had a positive perspective and one staff member had a negative perspective.
Codes mainly pertaining to the interaction between CRDG and the interviewee in the training	
intersubjectivity (IS)	Shared understanding between teachers and learners about terminology and the values attached to the terms and learning tasks; the goal of semiotic mediation.
internalization (IN)	The learner's reconstruction of psychological activity that the learner was formerly able to do only through interaction with others on the interpsychological plane (Vygotsky, 1978). As learners advance toward competent performance of the task, they achieve deeper levels of understanding about the task and assume increasing responsibility for the processes necessary to competently complete the task without assistance (Vygotsky, 1978).
Semiotic mediation (SM)	The quality or type of interaction between evaluation experts and interviewee.

(Table 4. Codes Used to Represent Vygotskian Concepts, continued)

Code	Description
Zone of proximal development (ZPD)	The area between and including the interpsychological and intrapsychological planes where teaching-learning social processes can happen. The ZPD as described by Vygotsky is a spiral (rather than a linear path) where the learner will continue to sweep around old knowledge while incorporating new knowledge.

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

As discussed in the chapter about methods of this study, the data showed similarities between the responses by administrators as distinguished from responses by school personnel. The comparisons between the group of administrators and group of school personnel became the framework for displaying the findings for this study and drawing conclusions about the findings. The unit of analysis is the interview, thus allowing a direct comparison of the number of comments between administrators and school personnel. There were five interviews with administrators (one administrator per interview) and five interviews with school personnel (two or three school personnel). Interestingly, the administrators chose to be interviewed individually. It is not known if this had an effect on the interview data collected for this study.

Findings to Address Question 1, "What Aspects of the Professional

Development That Was Provided to a Sample of Public-School

Administrators and Personnel in How to Conduct Summative

Evaluations Influenced Their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills?"

The 48 interview questions and the interviewees' comments that address Question 1 about aspects of the PD sessions are shown in Table B1. After each comment, the number of interviews in which the comment was made is given. Following the number of interviews is the Vygotskian code, with the categories of positive (+), negative (-), or moderate, neutral, mixed or unclear (no sign).

General Description of How CRDG Taught the Interviewees

to Conduct the Evaluation Tasks and What Influenced Their Learning

The Project Description Component

Four of the five administrators had positive comments about how CRDG taught

them to conduct evaluation tasks, and one negative comment that the lecture-style

workshop was initially unclear. This was only slightly more than the amount of positive

comments from school personnel. For example, an administrator stated that CRDG staff

were "very professional"and provided easy-to-follow written examples of the evaluation

tasks, and another said that CRDG taught them to "think in terms of quantitative

measures" while focusing the project description from an evaluation point of view. The

school personnel also had more positive than negative comments about how CRDG

taught them to write a project description. One of the school personnel could not provide

a response to this interview question because he/she did not actually write the project

description—another staff member wrote a description in the previous year and it was

adequate for the evaluation.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

Four of the five administrators provided positive comments about how CRDG

taught them to develop an evaluation design and select methods, and one administrator

stated that CRDG's explanation was unclear. This was essentially the same as the school

personnel's comments. One administrator stated that, "Having [CRDG staff] sort out

what we were doing or where we might be able to attribute changes or differences was

really helpful." Another administrator stated that the information provided by the CRDG

Evaluation Project Director was not clear, but he/she agreed to follow the Project Director's lead: "[the CRDG Evaluation Project Director] guided me in what would be a good way to do it and I said 'yes, yes, yes' because as I said, I don't know that much about educational evaluation."

> It was really good because we questioned stuff. . . . It made us think about why the item was in there. As a result, I'm looking more at what do we want to get out and then creating questions and saying is this kind of question going to address this. And I know for the rubric section, they gave us a lot of hints, good suggestions. Again, it was that one-on-one. They looked at what we had and responded to it. And they didn't act like know-it-alls. The handouts really helped a lot. We'd want to use different tools for measuring different things, discussions helped, when they first introduced the [test name] that helped. We were wrestling with how to measure attitude changes.

One of the school personnel stated that the initial lecture-style overview was over his/her head. However, when another school personnel member who was working on the same project started working on the evaluation questions for the evaluation design, the meaning behind the task and the process became clearer, "it gave me perspective."

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

Four of the five administrators provided positive comments about how they were taught to collect data, and one administrator said that he or she did not recall the PD. This was just slightly less positive than the school personnel's comments. One administrator stated

One thing I learned is there's information and data all over the place. You just need to know where it is and how to collect it. Many think data collection means gathering test scores. There's so much more to it than test scores, you also need to know what you're collecting it for.

Another administrator didn't recall how CRDG taught him/her to collect evaluation data. This administrator's comment was that the selected data-collection method was a student questionnaire and he/she struggled with getting all the students to complete the questionnaire.

The school personnel in all five interviews provided positive statements about how they were taught to collect data. One school personnel said that CRDG "taught [us] that evaluation is like other science. It's based on solid principles and can be objective and you can really measure solid things. . . . It reinforced for me the need for solid data."

Summary. The administrators and school personnel were quite similar in their descriptions of the PD. The administrators had slightly more positive comments about the PD for writing a project description and the school personnel had slightly more positive comments about the PD for collecting evaluation data. The two groups were equivalent for the PD about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods.

Appropriateness of the Timing of the Workshop

The Project Description Component

Four of the five administrators stated that the timing was appropriate, however, one administrator mentioned that the timing of the PD workshop was criticized because the DOE IIG program leaders had just required the school-level project staff to submit a

similar written description of their project. The school personnel has slightly fewer numbers of positive comments than the administrators. Because of the DOE IIG leaders' request for a project description about the same time as the CRDG workshop, the participants at the workshop felt that CRDG's request for a written project description was an unnecessary burden on them and that there should have been better communication and coordination between the DOE and CRDG. Some participants made a distinction between the CRDG and DOE requests and recognized that CRDG's request was part of a larger evaluation effort. Some comments were, "the process was spaced out in an orderly fashion. . . I could see the logical progression," and "the timing was good because they were in the final year of their project."

The findings for the school personnel were more tentative than the administrators, but mainly positive. The school personnel in three of the five interviews stated that the timing was fine. One of the school personnel would have liked to have started earlier.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were mixed findings for the administrators, who made fewer positive comments than the school personnel. Two administrators thought that the timing of CRDG's PD was fine, two administrators thought it should have been sooner (although one of these administrators stated that the PD was still useful for other projects), and one administrator thought it should have been later. School personnel in four of the five interviews provided positive comments about the timing of the PD.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

Four of the five administrators thought that the timing of the PD sessions about evaluations was good, which was slightly higher than the number of positive comments from the school personnel. One administrator thought that it would have been nice to have started earlier, but it was still "O.K." School personnel in three interviews also had positive comments about the timing of the PD. School personnel in one interview thought that the PD was a little late.

Summary

The administrators provided slightly more positive comments about the timing of the PD for writing a project description and collecting data. There were distinctly lower numbers of positive comments by the administrators than the school personnel about the PD for developing an evaluation plan and selecting methods. The data do not suggest any reason for the differences between the groups regarding timing of the PD.

Appropriateness of the Length of the Workshop

The Project Description Component

There were positive comments about the length of the workshop by three of the five administrators. Two administrators did not comment about the length of the workshop. The school personnel had slightly more positive comments about the length of the workshop than the group of administrators.

64

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

The administrators and school personnel had about the same number of positive comments about the appropriateness of the length of the PD. Four administrators and school personnel in four interviews stated that the length of workshops were fine.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

Generally, the administrators and school personnel thought that the length of the PD sessions about collecting data were appropriate, with slightly more positive comments from the school personnel. Four of the five administrators stated that the length of the sessions were fine. One administrator added that he/she would have liked more time for the small group meeting. The school personnel in all five interviews stated that the length of the PD sessions was good.

Summary

Both the administrators and school personnel showed high numbers of positive comments about the project description and data-collection components. For the component about writing a project description, some school personnel stated that they liked the length of the PD because it allowed enough time for small group meetings with CRDG staff. In these two components, slightly more school personnel than the administrators stated that the length of the workshop was appropriate. The administrators and school personnel were about equal in the numbers about the appropriateness of the length of the workshop about evaluation design and selection of methods. For the components about designing an evaluation plan and selecting methods and collecting evaluation data, administrators mentioned that they liked the length of the workshop

because they had time for small group discussion with CRDG. They added that the small group discussions were well focused and their questions were answered.

<center>*Appropriateness of the Focus of the Workshop About the Component*</center>

The Project Description Component

There were mixed findings from the administrators and school personnel about the focus of the workshop, which was at essentially equal levels between the two groups. Three administrators stated that the focus was appropriate. However, there were tentative comments from one administrator and negative comments from one administrator. The negative comments were that the workshop was "extremely technical" and he/she understood it because he/she had heard it before, but "I couldn't understand the project write up."

School personnel in three of the five interviews stated that the focus of the workshop was appropriate. In one interview, one of the school personnel stated that the workshop was very "frustrating" and "awful, too broad . . . There were too many people, and it didn't meet our needs."

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

The administrators and school personnel both reported mixed feelings about the foci of the PD, with the school personnel providing slightly more positive comments. Two of the five administrators stated that the focus was good. One administrator did not attend the workshop, but the project coordinator from his/her school who attended the workshop said it was better than the first workshop. One administrator stated that the

<center>66</center>

lecture-style portion of workshop was too generic and broad, but the handouts that CRDG provided at the workshop were helpful.

The school personnel in three interviews stated that the foci of the PD sessions were good. In one interview, the school personnel added that the written materials were very helpful. In one interview, one interviewee stated that the workshop was confusing and not well focused, and the other interviewee stated that the focus was better at the end when there was time for CRDG to meet with them in a school group. School personnel in one interview stated that the PD sessions were too broad and it would have been better if the participants were organized into small groups depending on the stage of their project.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

The findings for this component about the focus of the PD sessions were the most positive in comparison to the other components. All administrators and school personnel, stated that the foci of the PD sessions were appropriate.

Summary

In the project description component, the administrators and school personnel provided about equivalent numbers of positive comments about the foci of the workshops. There were favorable comments in three of the five interviews for each group. Some administrators and school personnel commented that the small group or individual discussions after the generic workshop were most helpful. In the component about evaluation design and selection of methods, the school personnel had slightly more positive comments than the administrators about the focus of the workshop. The

comments about collecting evaluation data were more uniformly positive than the comments about the other two components.

Quality of the Coverage of Concepts About the Component

or the Procedures for Conducting the Evaluation Tasks

The Project Description Component

There were mixed findings for both the administrators and school personnel, with the school personnel providing slightly more positive comments. Two administrators stated that the PD session was good. One administrator "didn't have any feelings one way or another." Another administrator felt that the workshop was much too broad; however, he/she felt that the written materials were good and reinforced the presentation. Another administrator stated that the presentation was very technical and he/she couldn't understand the project write up. School personnel in three of the five interviews stated that the coverage of concepts was good.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were mixed findings for the administrators and school personnel with the school personnel having slightly more positive comments. Three administrators stated that the coverage of concepts was good. One administrator stated that the coverage of concepts was "too broad" but did not offer any elaboration. School personnel in four interviews thought the coverage of concepts was good. School personnel in one interview added that they were able to get more information in the small group discussions with CRDG.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

All the administrators and school personnel stated that the coverage of concepts was good.

Summary

In the component about writing a project description and designing evaluation plans and selecting methods, there were slightly more positive comments by school personnel than administrators about the coverage of concepts for conducting the evaluation tasks. The most positive comments were about the data-collection component, where all administrators and school personnel gave positive comments about the coverage of concepts.

Understandability of the Oral Presentations in the Workshops or Elsewhere

The Project Description Component

Although there were mixed findings for the administrators and school personnel, there were slightly more positive comments by the administrators. One administrator thought the oral presentations were too technical and it was difficult to understand. School personnel in two interviews thought the presentations were "good" and "really clear." School personnel in two interviews had mixed comments. In one of these two interviews, the school personnel stated that some concepts were difficult to understand at first but that they were clarified in the small group meetings when he/she was able to ask questions.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were mainly positive comments from both groups, with slightly more positive comments from the administrators. Four administrators thought that the presentations were "very helpful" and fine." One administrator stated that the materials were a little difficult to understand, but his/her prior experience helped him make sense of it. School personnel in three interviews stated that the oral presentations were fine, adding that the small group work was good.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

The administrators and school personnel were not asked about the oral presentations in workshops because all the PD about collecting and occurred in personal consultations.

Summary

In the components about writing a project description and developing an evaluation design and selecting methods, the administrators had slightly more positive comments about the understandability of the oral presentations than the school personnel. In the component about designing evaluations and selecting methods, administrators stated that the oral presentations were very clear. One of the school personnel mentioned that the written materials were very helpful together with the oral presentations. This question was not asked in the section about collecting data because all the PD sessions about data collection were in small group or individual discussions.

Understandability of the Written Materials in the Workshop or Elsewhere

The Project Description Component

There were positive comments in both groups, with neutral responses from the school personnel. Four administrators reported that they liked having the written materials and found them useful, adding that CRDG staff were always available to answer questions. School personnel in three interviews liked having the written materials as an additional resource.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were positive comments from both groups, with distinctly more positive comments from the school personnel. Two administrators provided positive comments that the written materials were "plentiful and fine . . . the discussions were a whole lot more helpful," "the examples were very helpful," and "it was fine. . . . I was accustomed to the language already because I had worked with CRDG before."

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

CRDG did not provide written materials about collecting evaluation data; therefore, the question was not asked for this component.

Summary

In the project description component, the administrators had slightly more positive comments about the written materials than in the school personnel. In the component about developing an evaluation design and selection of methods, the school personnel had distinctly more positive comments than the administrators. For both components, only

positive comments were provided by each group. The interviewees who did not provide comments either had not read the materials or did not respond to the question.

Helpfulness of the Personal Consultation (if any) after the

Workshop, For Example, by Facsimile, E-mail, Phone, or In Person

The Project Description Component

There were mainly positive comments from both groups, and at the same levels. Four administrators had positive comments about the personal consultations; for example, they commented that the consultations were "excellent" and "very good, " and they said that "CRDG was always available for questions." School personnel in four interviews had positive comments about the personal consultations; for example; they said that they were "excellent," or "good," and said "it was good because it was specific to our school and what we were doing."

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

All administrators and school personnel stated that the personal consultations were helpful. Some comments were, "all good, " "they were practical in all their consultations and information," and "extremely."

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

All administrators and school personnel stated that the personal consultation sessions with CRDG were helpful.

Summary

In all three components, administrators and school personnel provided about equal levels of positive comments about the helpfulness of the personal consultation. It should

be noted that there were no negative comments given by administrators and school personnel.

Adequacy of Opportunities to Ask Questions During this Phase of the Evaluation

The Project Description Component

There were equal levels of positive comments from the administrators and school personnel. Some comments were, "[CRDG staff] were always available for questions," "anytime I needed help I could just call or email," and "[CRDG staff] didn't waste time, got right to the matters, answered my questions, covered it efficiently, were always there, very helpful."

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were mainly positive comments from both groups and at equal levels. One administrator stated that if they ran out of time to ask questions at any time, they were always able to followup with CRDG. One comment from the group of school personnel was that "CRDG was quick to get back to them," "[CRDG staff] were practical in all their consultations and information and always got right back to us. . . . They actually kept us on our toes. . . . This phase was great."

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

There were positive comments from both groups with distinctly more positive comments from the school personnel.

Summary

In the project description component and the component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods, there were equal levels of positive comments

from the administrators and school personnel about the adequacy of opportunities to ask

questions. In the data-collection component, the school personnel gave distinctly more

positive comments than the administrators. Some positive comments were about

communications in small group sessions, individual sessions, e-mail messages,

availability of CRDG to answer questions, written materials, and establishing a common

vocabulary.

<center>*Quality of CRDG's Answers to Questions or Concerns*</center>

The Project Description Component

The findings were mixed for the administrators while there were mainly positive

comments from the school personnel. Three administrators stated that CRDG's answers

to their questions were good and very helpful. One administrator stated that the project

description phase was very confusing and that CRDG was more helpful during the

subsequent phases of the evaluation. One of the school personnel stated that "I liked

dealing with them because it gave me a sense of direction. And then they were really nice

because they said they would take the data we had and analyze it for us."

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

All administrators and school personnel stated that CRDG's answers were good.

One administrator elaborated by stating that "the good part about CRDG when they do

evaluations is they try to personalize it to the school and they try to be as least intrusive."

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

There were positive comments from both the administrators and school personnel,

but the school personnel had a slightly higher level of positive comments. Four of the five

<center>74</center>

administrators stated that CRDG's answers to questions were helpful. School personnel in all five interviews stated that CRDG's answers to their questions were "good," "very clear," "helpful," "excellent," and "very specific."

Summary

In the project description and the data-collection components, positive comments were stated by slightly more school personnel than administrators about the quality of CRDG's answers to questions or concerns. In the component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods, all administrators and school personnel provided positive comments about the quality of CRDG's answers.

Helpfulness of CRDG's Monitoring of the

Interviewees' Progress and Reminders About Next Steps

The Project Description Component

The were mainly positive comments from the administrators but mixed findings for the school personnel. Some comments by administrators were, "very good, [CRDG staff]'s been really good on keeping on task at that . . . . kept in touch with us all the time" "very good. I didn't feel rushed at all and I knew it had to come at the end, so I knew we had time. There were times I admit, we forgot and [CRDG staff] would say 'reminder.' . . . was good about that;" and "they really kept us on our toes and it was very courteously and graciously done." School personnel in three interviews stated that CRDG's monitoring and reminders were good. There were mixed comments in one interview with school personnel.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

While there were positive comments from all the school personnel, there were mainly positive comments by the administrators with one administrator giving a negative comment. Four administrators stated that CRDG's monitoring and reminders were helpful. One comment was, "[CRDG staff] were very helpful in answering my questions and suggesting what we could do. They had examples and they were very good at getting back to me," and "[CRDG staff] have been in contact with [school staff] and I know [school staff] are on top of things. That's helpful for us because we forget." All the school personnel had positive comments about the helpfulness of CRDG's monitoring and reminders.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

All administrators and school personnel stated that CRDG's reminders and monitoring were very helpful. One administrator added that the e-mail communication was particularly helpful. School personnel in one interview added that CRDG kept them on task.

Summary

In the project description component, the administrators provided slightly more positive comments than the school personnel about the helpfulness of CRDG's monitoring and reminders. In the component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods, the school personnel provided slightly more positive comments than the administrators. In the data-collection component, all administrators and school personnel provided positive comments about CRDG's helpfulness.

Overall Adequacy of the Workshop, Consultation, and Printed

Guidelines in Providing Sufficient Information to Conduct the Evaluation Tasks

The Project Description Component

The administrators mainly provided positive comments, while there were mixed findings for the school personnel. Four administrators stated that CRDG provided sufficient information to conduct the evaluation tasks. Some comments were, "the individual consultation was especially helpful," and "it was especially helpful that CRDG staff took the time to work with them, look at the project documentation, and then follow up to provide further clarification. . . . They helped us see what was important. . . . they spent enough time with us and they were accessible in case we left a meeting and we had a question. . . . very cordial and always expansive from their side."

There were mixed findings for the school personnel. School personnel in one interview stated that the work with CRDG was adequate. He/she elaborated that,"I don't know if we could have done the project description as well without their help because even when I looked back at it, I've used it countless times to describe the program as concisely as possible. I can just pull it out and say this is what it is."

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were mainly positive comments from the administrators and school personnel with slightly more positive comments from the school personnel. All the school personnel stated that CRDG provided them with sufficient information to conduct the evaluation tasks.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

All the administrators and school personnel stated that CRDG provided them with adequate information to conduct the evaluation tasks. School personnel in one interview added that sometimes they were not clear about the tasks at first, but the consultation with CRDG helped them to understand the process.

Summary

In the project description component, most of the administrators provided positive comments about the overall adequacy of the PD. The school personnel provided mixed comments about the overall adequacy of the PD sessions in the project description component. In the component about development an evaluation plan and selecting methods, the school personnel provided slightly more positive comments than the administrators. In the data-collection component, all administrators and school personnel provided positive comments about the overall adequacy of the PD sessions.

<div align="center">

Appropriateness of CRDG's Pace

</div>

The Project Description Component

There were mainly positive comments from the administrators, with mixed findings for the school personnel.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were positive comments from the administrators and school personnel with slightly more positive comments from the school personnel. Four administrators stated that CRDG's pace was "very good," "O.K.," and "very good." School personnel in all five interviews stated that CRDG.'s pace was "all right" or "good."

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

All administrators and school personnel stated that CRDG's pace was appropriate. Some comments from interviewees in the group of administrators were, "O.K.," "perfect," "fine,"or "good." One comment from the school personnel was, "I remember once I had called [CRDG staff] and what was nice was that it felt OK even if she wasn't certain what I was talking about. 'That's OK, why don't you just send it in and we'll take a look at it.' That was a wonderful response."

Summary

In the project description component, there were slightly more positive comments from the administrators than the school personnel about CRDG's pace. In the component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods, the school personnel provided slightly more positive comments than the administrators about CRDG's pace. In the data-collection components, all administrators and school personnel provided positive comments.

Overall Helpfulness of Consultation with CRDG in Clarifying the Evaluation Tasks

The Project Description Component

There were three administrators and three school personnel who provided positive comments about the overall helpfulness of consultation with CRDG. Three administrators stated that the consultation was "good" or "excellent" in helping to clarify the evaluation tasks. School personnel in three of the five interviews stated that the consultation "kept us on schedule," was "good," or was "very helpful." In one interview, one of the school

personnel could not remember the consultation while the other school personnel thought the evaluation tasks were "very confusing."

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were mainly positive comments from both groups, with slightly more positive comments from the school personnel. Four administrators stated that the consultations were "good," "very helpful in that they honed in on what we were doing," "probably more helpful in this phase than in the first phase," and "very helpful."

The school personnel in all five interviews stated that the consultation with CRDG helped to clarify the evaluation tasks. Some comments were, "good . . . they always answered us and were quick to get back.. . . they were practical in all their consultations;" "it was very helpful very helpful because if you had questions about the surveys, [CRDG staff] would also look at them and then come up with her own ideas and suggest;" and they had "difficulty coming up with their evaluation questions, but consultation with CRDG helped them clarify the task."

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

All the comments from the administrators were positive and there were mixed findings for the school personnel. All five administrators stated that the consultation helped to clarify their tasks. Some comments were, "Good," "perfect," "very helpful," "the whole thing was good. . . . In particular the email was terrific," and "excellent." School personnel in four interviews stated that the consultations were helpful in clarifying the evaluation tasks. Some comments were, "very helpful," "sometimes I wasn't real clear what they were saying but when we talked enough, it clarified," and "definitely the

personal service was most effective." A school staff member in the last interview stated that he/she "didn't necessarily want to hear it," and "I felt they were telling us one way, but the evaluation may be different; like they [CRDG] had a lot of confusion about the evaluation tasks."

Summary

In the project description component, the administrators and school personnel provided about equal numbers of positive comments about CRDG's overall helpfulness. In the component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods, the school personnel provided slightly more positive comments than the administrators. In the data-collection component, the administrators provided slightly more positive comments than the school personnel. Two negative comments from school personnel about the project description and evaluation design components were "very confusing." All other comments were positive.

CRDG's Explanation of the Importance of the Task

The Project Description Component

There were mainly positive comments by the administrators with mixed findings for the school personnel. Four administrators stated that CRDG did a good job of explaining the importance of the task. One administrator added that

> [CRDG staff] took the time with us to actually look at our documentation
>
> after they told us what to do and we tried to do it, then they looked at it to
>
> better clarify. They helped us see what was important. . . . they spent

enough time with us and they were accessible in case we left a meeting and we had a question. Very cordial and always expansive from their side.

There were mixed findings for the school personnel. School personnel in one interview stated that they already knew that the evaluation was very important. School personnel in two interviews somewhat recalled CRDG talking about the importance of the evaluation. School personnel in one interview stated that the component was confusing.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were mainly positive comments from both groups, with slightly more positive comments by the school personnel. Four administrators and school personnel in five interviews stated that CRDG explained the importance of the evaluation and they also believed it was important.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

There were positive comments from four administrators and school personnel in five interviews; slightly more positive comments from the school personnel. One administrator stated that the CRDG staff must have assumed that he/she knew the importance and didn't really discuss it because "I knew it was important." The school personnel in all five interviews recalled CRDG discussing the importance of the evaluation tasks and they knew it was important.

Summary

In the project description component, most of the administrators and school personnel had positive comments about CRDG's explanation of the importance of the

tasks. In the components about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods and collecting evaluation data, the school personnel provided slightly more positive comments than the administrators. For this item, the findings are clouded with lack of the administrators' and school personnel's clear memory about CRDG discussing the importance of the task or if they already knew the importance of the task.

Appropriateness and Fairness of the Division of Responsibilities

for the Tasks Among Administrators or School Personnel and CRDG Staff

The Project Description Component

There were positive comments by two administrators and neutral comments by other administrators. Four school personnel had more positive than negative comments.

The Component About Developing an Evaluation Design and Selecting Methods

There were equal numbers of administrators and school personnel who gave positive comments about the division of responsibilities. School personnel in one interview felt that it was a little unfair because CRDG did more work than they expected, perhaps more than they should have.

The Component About Collecting Evaluation Data

There were more positive comments by the administrators than school personnel. Some of the comments by administrators and school personnel suggested that there was confusion about the definition of fairness for the division of responsibilities. The administrators that gave neutral comments (neither positive or negative) stated that they especially appreciated that CRDG did the analyses of data. School personnel in one

interview stated that the division of responsibilities were fair. The school personnel in the other four interviews gave neutral comments.

Summary

In the project description component, the school personnel provided distinctly more positive comments than the administrators about the division of responsibilities between administrators or school personnel and CRDG staff. In the component about developing evaluation designs and selecting methods, all administrators and school personnel provided positive comments. In the data-collection component, a little more than half of the administrators positive comments about the division of responsibilities. There were mixed findings for the school personnel.

Findings to Address Question 2: "What Characteristics of

School Personnel who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions

About Evaluations Account for Learning Program Evaluation Skills?"

As discussed in the literature about learning principles, it is important to consider characteristics of the learner, or intrapsychological factors, when conducting a study of the effectiveness of a learning experience. In this study, the interviewees began the PD sessions with an accumulation of knowledge, attitudes, values, and skills. In the literature about learning theory, these learner characteristics are described in terms of prior experiences, motivation, and socio-cultural values (Vygotsky, 1978; Bruffee, 1995; Rogoff et al., 1995; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

The eight interview questions and the interviewees' comments that address Question 2 about characteristics of the interviewees are shown in Table B2. Like Table

84

B1, the number of interviews in which the comment was made is given. Following the

number of interviews is the Vygotskian code, with the categories of positive (+), negative

(-), moderate or neutral, mixed or unclear, and negative (no sign). The unit of analyses is

the interview. All five administrators were interviews alone. Two or three school

personnel were interviewed together in each of five interviews.

Background information

Interviewees' Experiences in Evaluations Previous to This Evaluations

The administrators had more and higher-quality prior experiences in conducting

evaluations than the school personnel. Although two administrators had moderate levels

of prior experience, they stated that they were highly motivated to be involved in the

evaluations. School personnel in three interviewees had moderate levels of prior

experiences with conducting evaluations. School personnel in two interviewees had low

levels or no prior experiences.

Interviewees' Feelings at the Beginning of the Year About Being Selected to Participate

in the Evaluation

The administrators had slightly higher levels of enthusiasm for participating in the

evaluation than in the school personnel. Five administrators and four of the school

personnel provided positive comments about being selected to participate in the PD.

Interviewees' Feelings at the End of the Year About Having Been Selected to Participate

in the Evaluation

Four administrators and three of the school personnel gave positive comments.

One administrator gave a mixed comment and one of the school personnel gave a neutral

comment. The administrators commented that the evaluation was important as a measure of the effectiveness of their efforts, the evaluation capacity at the school was enhanced because of the evaluation, and he/she became "a lot more comfortable with the idea of quantifying this information."

One of the school personnel stated that they "were trying to apply it in other ways." One school personnel stated that he/she was "pleased the way the teachers have responded to the need." School personnel in one interview wanted to wait to form an opinion about participating in the evaluation until they had the evaluation results. One of the school personnel felt that the amount of data collected were overwhelming and unnecessary.

Summary. Before and after CRDG's PD, the administrators had slightly more positive feelings than the school personnel about having been selected to participate in the evaluation. Interestingly, however, both groups of administrators and school personnel had less positive comments at the end of the year. One administrator commented that the evaluation was useful but began late in the project and he/she could not collect all the data for a good evaluation. One school stated that it was overwhelming or stressful but they learned a lot.

Reasons that Administrators or School Personnel Changed How They Felt About Participating in the PD About Conducting Evaluation

One administrator commented that he/she was "a lot more comfortable with the idea of quantifying this information." One administrators stated that he/she thought that the 'evaluation was useful but he/she was unsure that there were enough respondents

because data was collected late in the project." Two administrators stated that they did not change how they felt about participating in the evaluation. The administrators had distinctly more positive comments than the school personnel.

One of the school personnel stated that he/she was "unhappy about the amount of data that were collected." The school personnel in another interview reported some struggle with "getting buy in" from others at the school, but they were glad that they were able to get strong support from the principal and support from the teachers. School personnel in one interview felt that they learned a lot of useful information but they were "nervous about the design that we did—we kind of designed what we were going to do halfway into our program here so we settled on doing an eval based on some tests we had. . . ."

Summary. There were mixed responses to this question by both administrators and school personnel, but the administrators had a slightly higher level of positive feelings about participating in the evaluation than the school personnel. Two administrators and some of the school personnel were unfamiliar and a little uncomfortable with the evaluation design or type of data.

Interviewees' Beliefs About Why They were Selected to Participate in the Evaluation

Three of the five administrators gave positive comments about being selected to participate in the evaluation—slightly fewer than the number of interviews in which school personnel gave positive comments. Other administrators stated that they wanted to learn about conducting evaluations to building accountability into the project or to validate the project. School personnel in four interviews gave positive comments about

participating in the interview. Some of the comments were that they wanted to learn about

conducting evaluations because they knew that evaluations are necessary.

Summary. The school personnel had slightly more positive perspectives about

being selected to participate in the evaluation than the administrators. personnel. Overall,

there were positive comments about being selected to participate in the evaluation.

Interviewees' Attitudes Toward Evaluation in General Before They Had the Training in

Conducting Evaluations

Three administrators stated that evaluations are necessary, important, and

extremely critical because the information tells them if they are doing the right thing or

not. One other administrator had a moderate level of understanding about evaluations and

felt that evaluations were the weakest sections in the grants that he/she wrote. One

administrator did not respond to the question. The administrators' comments more

positive than those of the school personnel. School personnel in three interviews believed

that evaluations were important to their projects because they would be able to see the

results of their efforts. Two of the school personnel, however, did not share this

perspective and stated that evaluations are necessary but "cumbersome" or "stressful."

Interviewees' Feelings About Evaluations in General at the End of the Year of Training

Three administrators stated that they could see the importance of conducting

evaluations. Two administrators did not respond to the question. Four of the school

personnel provided positive comments, stating that "evaluations were very important,"

they realized 'how important assessment is," "evaluations are essential," and "the support

from CRDG made the evaluation process easier because CRDG was "responsive and hands-on."

Summary. The administrators had more positive statements about conducting evaluations than the school personnel at the beginning of the year, but this pattern was reversed at the end of the year. The data did not suggest why some interviewees did not provide answers to the interview questions, but if all interviewees had provided answers, it may have made a difference in these findings. It is not possible to explain why the patterns were reversed at the end of the year with the existing data. Most of the comments were that the administrators and school personnel saw the importance of evaluations and that the PD helped them understand the evaluation process.

Findings to Address Question 3, "What Aspects of School

Environment Account for Learning Program Evaluation Skills?"

A total of 40 interview questions were posed to interviewees to elicit information about the interviewees' *school environment* that may have affected the interviewees' ability to conduct the evaluation tasks. The most used code are for the learning environment (LE). Examples of a positive learning environment (LE+) are where others at the school are aware of the interviewee(s)' participation in the evaluation or when several others at the school were consulted and provided input into the evaluation. A neutral code (LE) was assigned where moderate levels of resources were available for the evaluation or there was no need to consult with others at the school about the evaluation. A negative code (LE-) suggests that only a few or no one else at the school knew about the interviewee(s) involvement in the evaluation, or inadequate resources were available

89

for the evaluation. However, if the interviewee stated it was not necessary to consult many people, then the neutral code was assigned. In this case, a positive code was not assigned because it was not clear if, indeed, the evaluation tasks could be adequately performed without consulting other school personnel.

Further clarification of the learning environment code was accomplished with use of codes for socio-cultural context and motivation. As stated in the methods section of this dissertation, the socio-cultural code was used to describe the *value* of others at the school for the evaluation task and *receptiveness* of the interviewee or others at the school for the evaluation tasks. The code for motivation was used to describe the interviewee's belief about the *need* for the evaluation task. The two concepts are not usually defined in such narrow terms, but the narrowed definitions were useful for this study.

As in the previous two sections, the findings are presented as comparisons of the groups of administrators and school personnel. Each group included five interviews. The unit of analyses is the interview.

The interview comments that address Question 3 about aspects of the school environment are shown in Table B3. After each comment, the number of interviews in which the comment was made is given. Following the number of interviews is the Vygotskian code, with the categories of positive (+), negative (-), moderate or neutral, mixed or unclear, and negative (no sign).

Background Information

Awareness of the Interviewees' Participation in the Evaluation

Awareness at the beginning of the school year. Two administrators stated that

everyone at their schools were aware of their participation in the evaluation. The other

three administrators stated that only principals and coordinators were aware of the

interviewees' involvement in the evaluation. The school personnel had slightly more

comments than the administrators that all or almost all others at their schools were aware

of the interviewees' participation in the evaluation. However, there was an interesting

difference in quality of awareness at the schools. The school personnel reported more

schools with many people who were aware of the interviewees' participation in the

evaluation, the staff may have heard about it but were not very interested or the staff may

have heard about it but did not know very much about the evaluation.

Awareness at the end of the school year. At the end of the school year, three

administrators reported that all or almost all staff knew about the interviewees'

participation in the evaluation. Two administrators reported slight increases in the school

staffs' awareness, where there had been lower levels of awareness before the evaluation

training. School personnel in four interviews reported all or almost all staff at their

schools knew about their participation in the evaluation at the end of the school year.

School personnel in one interview reported that all the project teachers knew about it but

maybe not all teachers.

Summary. More staff at the school personnel's schools than at the administrators'

schools knew about the school personnel's participation in the evaluation at the beginning

and end of the year. The quality of the staff's awareness at the beginning of the year was less than that of the administrators. Although not all the staff at the administrators' schools knew about the administrators' participation in the evaluation at the beginning of the school year, more of the staff knew about it at the end of the year. The interview data does not show if there were changes in the quality of awareness in the two groups.

School Administrators' and Other Staffs' Attitudes About the Interviewees' Participation in the Evaluation

Attitudes at the beginning of the year. Four administrators reported positive attitudes at their schools about their participation in the evaluation and one administrator reported that other administrators "just wanted to know what they needed to do." The administrators had distinctly more positive attitudes than the school personnel about the attitudes at their schools about their participation in the evaluation. School personnel in three interviews reported that others at the school who knew about the evaluation were willing to cooperate with the evaluation but did not think the evaluation was very important or did not comprehend it. In another interview, the school personnel reported that others at the school just accepted that the interviewee had to do the evaluation. In the last interview, school personnel reported that their schools' administrators were supportive, but they weren't sure about the attitudes of other staff.

Attitudes at the end of the year. Two administrators reported that their school staff were comfortable with doing evaluations. Two administrators reported that the school staff and themselves were unclear about their attitudes. One administrator did not respond to the question. In four interviews with the school personnel, they reported improvement

of attitudes about the school personnel's participation in the evaluation. One of the school personnel reported that the school staff just accepted that the interviewee had to do the evaluation.

Summary. The findings are interesting and difficult to explain. While the administrators reported more positive attitudes at their school about the evaluation at the beginning of the year, the school personnel report more positive attitudes at the end of the year.

Findings by Evaluation Component

Adequacy of Resources for the Evaluation

The project description component. Three administrators reported that there were adequate resources at their schools for the evaluation tasks. In comparison, slightly fewer school personnel (two interviews) reported having adequate resources. Both groups of administrators and school personnel had one interviewee who reported inadequate resources.

The component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods. Two administrators reported adequate resources at their school for developing an evaluation design and selecting methods. Slightly more school personnel (three interviews) reported having adequate resources for this evaluation task.

The component about collecting evaluation data. Two administrators reported having adequate resources at their schools for collecting evaluation data. In comparison, there were slightly more school personnel (three interviews) reported having adequate

resources. Both groups included an interview where it was reported that inadequate levels of resources were available for the evaluation.

Summary. For the component about writing a project description, the administrators had slightly more positive comments about the PD. The school personnel had slightly more positive comments about the PD for developing an evaluation design and selecting methods and collecting evaluation data.

Consultation with Others at the School About the Evaluation

The project description component. The administrators had distinctly higher levels of consultation over the school personnel. One administrator reported that everyone at the school was informed about the evaluation and many provided feedback. One administrator reported that several school personnel (including administrators and coordinators) were informed and provided feedback. One administrator reported informing everyone at the school about the evaluation, receiving feedback from some staff, and having extensive consultation with the project consultant. One administrator did not consult anyone. The last administrator did not respond to the question.

The school personnel in two interviews reported that, at most, the principal was consulted and information was provided to a few other staff. School personnel in two other interviews reported that they did not consult with anyone. School personnel in one interview did not respond to this question.

The component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods. The administrators had higher levels of consultation with other staff at their schools than the school personnel. One administrator reported that everyone at the school was involved

94

in the evaluation. One administrator reported that project consultants were involved and all school staff had opportunities for input. One administrator reported that some staff gave input into the evaluation. One administrator reported that it was not necessary to consult anyone. The last administrator was not very involved in developing an evaluation design and selecting methods. The school personnel in one interview reported that the principal and some teachers were consulted to plan the evaluation. School personnel in one interview reported that the project teachers were consulted. School personnel in one interview reported that the principal and one other staff member were consulted. School personnel in one interview reported that only the principal was consulted. School personnel in one interview reported that only the principal was just informed.

The component about collecting evaluation data. The administrators had somewhat higher levels of involvement by others at the schools than the school personnel. The administrators' comments show that there were various scenarios at their schools: (a) there was school-wide involvement at one school, (b) a few others at the school were consulted and, (c) it was not necessary to consult with anyone else. The comments by school personnel also show various scenarios at their schools: (a) teachers at their school provided input, (b) the principal and some teachers provided input, (c) some teachers were consulted, or (d) the principal was the only one consulted.

Summary. In all three components, the administrators had higher levels of consultation with others at the school. These findings are expected because administrators would have more authority to involve others in the evaluation.

Changes in the Interviewees' Role or Status in the Schools

The project description component. There were slightly more favorable findings for the administrators than the school personnel. Three administrators reported that there were no changes in their role or status at the school due to their involvement in the evaluation. School personnel in four interviews reported no changes.

The component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods. The administrators and school personnel provided essentially equivalent responses about any changes in their role or status at their schools over the school year. One administrator believed that he/she was looked on as more of a facilitator and that others at the school assumed the main responsibility for the evaluation. One administrator reported no changes in his/her role or status, but his/her role or status may change depending on the evaluation findings. Three administrators reported no changes. The school personnel in one interview reported that staff at their school may have had a more positive view because the interviewees' participation in the evaluation meant that the other staff did not have to do the evaluation tasks. School staff in another interview reported no change in their role or status but that that may change depending on the evaluation findings. No changes were reported by school personnel in three interviews.

The component about collecting evaluation data. All five administrators reported no changes in their role or status. The school personnel did not all clearly address the question. In two interviews with school personnel, the school personnel stated that their role or status with others at the school might have changed depend on the evaluation findings. In another interview, the school personnel stated that others thought that the

interviewee already had a lot of power because of his/her control over their budgets. No changes were reported in the last three interviews with school personnel.

Summary. The two groups had essentially equal levels of reports that there was no change in their role or status at their school as a result of their participation in the evaluation. There were some interesting comments that the administrator's or school personnel's role of status at their school may change depending on the evaluation data. This finding suggests that others at the school are interested in the findings of the evaluation.

Changes in the Interviewees' Level of Influence on School Decisions and Activities

The project description component. The administrators had more positive changes in their level of influence at their schools than the school personnel because of their involvement in the evaluation. One administrator reported that his/her influence increased in the whole school complex. One administrator believed that the evaluation influenced the staff to clarify their value of accountability. Three administrators reported no changes. School personnel in four interviews reported no changes.

The component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods. The findings showed that the changes in the interviewees' level of influence were about equal between the two groups. One administrator reported an increase of influence in the school complex. One administrator stated that he/she was able to further convince the school personnel of the importance of conducting interviews. Two administrators reported no changes in their level of influence. School personnel in one interview reported an increased level of influence evidenced by the principal's providing more staff

97

to work on the evaluation. School personnel in another interview believed that the importance of the evaluation had increased their level of influence because other schools were interested in the findings to make decisions about adopting the project. School personnel in three interviews reported no changes.

The component about collecting evaluation data. Three administrators reported that there were no changes in their levels of influence. The only changes reported by the school personnel were negative changes. In one interview, school personnel reported that "they just think I'm a nag." In another interview, the school personnel reported that he/she had used up "IOU's" in order to get the evaluation tasks completed. No changes were reported in three other interviews with school personnel.

Summary. The administrators had slightly more positive comments than the school personnel in the component about writing a project description. The two groups were essentially equal in their levels of positive comments about the PD for developing an evaluation design and selecting methods. There were distinctly more positive comments from the administrators about the PD for collecting evaluation data because the school personnel only reported negative data.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Aspects of the PD that Influenced the School Faculty and

Other School Personnel's Learning of Program Evaluation Skills

The findings of this study suggest that, generally, all aspects of the PD sessions

had some positive influence on faculty and school personnel's learning of program

evaluation skills in the three components of writing a project description, developing an

evaluation plan and selecting methods, and collecting evaluation data. In this section, the

findings with the strongest patterns are discussed first, followed by discussions of the

findings based on some mixed patterns.

Large Group, Small Group, or Individual PD Sessions

Over all the three components, the findings suggest that the PD sessions positively

influenced the participants' learning about conducting program evaluation tasks. The

small group and individual consultation seemed to be most conducive for effective

communications for both administrators and school personnel. The findings also suggest

that the large group format had a positive influence only on participants who had prior

experience with conducting evaluations. In this study, the administrators had more prior

experience than the school personnel.

The finding that the small group format seemed more conducive for effective

communications is consistent with Vygotksian theory. That is, Vygotskian (1978) theory

would predict that the small group or individual formats would have a positive influence

on the participants' learning because the formats provided an environment where the

participants could freely exchange information and learn about each others' interests,

values, and needs for information. Additionally, information could be more effectively exchanged in these small group and individual sessions (as compared to the large group sessions) because the format supported assessing the learners' zones of proximal development, especially for a group of people with the diverse backgrounds of those who participated in CRDG's PD sessions. In small group or individual sessions, more easily than in large groups, CRDG could assess whether they were using understandable terminology and exchanging information at the appropriate pace to enhance the semiotic mediation. Here, the semiotic mediation occurred in the discussions among participants or among participants and CRDG staff.

In the large group format, the school personnel with little or no prior knowledge about evaluations probably had difficulties with understanding the information because they did not have much or any prior knowledge on which to build their understanding of the new knowledge. The school personnel, then, probably were dependent on opportunities to ask questions and participate in discussions with evaluation experts or administrators with prior knowledge. These findings are consistent with Dalton's (1989) and Bayer's (1996), activities with adults, which were based on Vygotskian theory about making connections between prior knowledge and current knowledge, and having opportunities to interact with peers and more capable others. Bayer (1996) designed activities to explicitly connect prior knowledge to new knowledge by asking students to write about their prior knowledge on a topic, share these connections with others, and identify discrepancies and similarities between their prior knowledge and new knowledge about the topic. Bayer (1996) wrote that the social interactions to identify and clarify the

100

link between prior knowledge and new knowledge enhanced intersubjectivity and internalization.

The finding in this study that small group and individualized PD were the most effective format is also supported by Dalton's view on Vygotskian theory. Dalton (1989) conceptualized Vygotskian theory in terms of three principles: (a) teachers should design learning activities to include opportunities for social interaction between peers or adults, while tapping on prior knowledge and connecting prior knowledge to new knowledge; (b) teachers should adjust instruction to be compatible with students' preferred styles of interacting and learning; and (c) teachers should assist student performance through their understanding of students' thinking and, accordingly, adjust the learning activity to facilitate students' connection to new information. Dalton posited that learning activities based on these three principles would facilitate intersubjectivity between teachers and students and internalization.

The Importance of the Evaluation Tasks

The findings for the component about writing a project description were probably confounded by the request from the DOE for a project description just prior to CRDG's PD about writing a project description. In the components about designing an evaluation plan and selecting methods and collecting evaluation data, however, almost all interviewees stated either that CRDG adequately explained the importance of the evaluation tasks or that they already knew the task was important. This is an important finding because the literature on Vygotskian learning theory, adult learning theory, and participatory evaluation principles suggest that understanding the importance of the

learning task facilitates learning. According to Vygotskian theory, this finding suggests a common understanding (intersubjectivity) of the socio-cultural aspect of the task. As the CRDG evaluators exposed the administrators and school personnel to various aspects of an evaluation task, including the importance of the task, learners became acculturated, or developed their own sense of value for the task (internalization).

Similarly, the literature on adult learning theory states that adults are more likely to understand content, including seeing the importance of the content, if they can place it within a context. Adult learners who are aware of the context of a learning task—including the importance of the task—find meaning in the purpose and process of the task (Galusha, 1998; Guy, 1999; and Brookfield, 1995). Tharp and Gallimore (1988) described learning as "goal-directed action" (p. 73). Tharp and Gallimore (1988) believed that "the more powerful members must provide supplementary motivation for students until they incorporate the values and meanings (and thus the motives) of the controlling members" (p. 78). In my study, the more powerful members were the evaluation experts and, perhaps, the administrators who had powerful positions in schools and were learning about conducting evaluation tasks along side the school personnel. Essentially, CRDG's PD placed the content (evaluation tasks) in a context familiar to the participants (the school environment for the projects) to assist the participants toward understanding the importance and procedures of the evaluation tasks. According to adult learning principles, then, CRDG's contextualization of the evaluation tasks facilitated the PD participants' learning.

The literature on participatory evaluation also describes the connection between understanding the importance of the tasks and adequately conducting evaluations. In Lee and Cousins' (1995) study of the viability of the participatory evaluation model, they found that school personnel are willing to give more time and effort to the evaluation when they valued it. Lee and Cousins wrote, "strong motivation of the project participants and their high level of commitment and ownership of their projects made the process a rewarding one. . . . resistance, apathy and 'other priorities' are not in evidence" (p. 83).

Other Aspects of the PD That Had Positive Influence on

Participants' Learning About Conducting Adequate Evaluations

In general, comments from administrators and school personnel showed that some of the logistical aspects of the PD sessions were helpful in learning evaluation skills. These logistical aspects included the pace of the PD sessions and the length of the sessions. Although there were mainly positive comments, it is not clear why the administrators or school personnel may have provided more positive comments about one type of evaluation task and that pattern was reversed for another type of evaluation task.

Vygotskian learning principles suggest that logistical aspects of learning sessions enhance learning if they are appropriate to learners' abilities to learn about a topic. This is consistent with Vygotsky's concept of the ZPD. Vygotsky (1978) defined the ZPD as the distance between where learners are before the learning activity and their potential development after learning (mediating) activities. That is, the learning activities needed to start at the lower end of the learner's ZPD, entailing a match between the logistics of the PD sessions and the learners' ability to understand the PD presentations (including the

factor of their prior knowledge), amount of time to devote to the PD, and need for the evaluation tasks at the time of the PD. From the participatory evaluation perspective, Cousins and Earl (1995) stated that participatory evaluations are most viable when schools provide the time and resources needed for the evaluation tasks. In this view, the learning activities about conducting the evaluation tasks need to be appropriate for the amount of time and resources that the administrators or school personnel devoted to the evaluation.

Some cognitive aspects of the PD sessions that were helpful in learning evaluation skills were the focus of the PD sessions, coverage of concepts, understandability of written materials, monitoring of progress and reminders about next steps, and clarification of the tasks. Again, in Vygotksian learning principles, these aspects of the PD sessions would be considered aspects of the ZPD. They are mediating activities, intended to guide the learner through the ZPD toward independent, competent performance of the evaluation tasks. The findings that there were appropriate levels of these aspects in CRDG's PD sessions suggest that there were favorable conditions for learning about conducting evaluation tasks because the learners' ZPD was appropriately addressed.

Mixed Findings

The Division of Responsibilities Among CRDG Staff and Administrators and Other School Personnel Who Participated in the PD Sessions

In the component about writing a project description, slightly more school personnel provided positive comments about the division of responsibilities than

104

administrators. In the component about developing evaluation designs and selecting

methods, there were equal numbers of administrators and school personnel who provided

positive comments. In the component about collecting evaluation data, the administrators

provided more positive comments than the school personnel. The data does not provide a

clear explanation of the circumstances behind one comment that CRDG did more work

than they should for developing the evaluation design and selecting methods component.

There were many positive comments about the division of responsibilities. However, it is

not clear why the proportions of positive comments changes between the types of

evaluation task.

The Timing of the PD

In the component about writing a project description, four administrators and

three of the school personnel commented that the timing of the PD was appropriate. In the

component about developing an evaluation design and selecting methods, two

administrators and four of the school personnel stated that the timing was appropriate. In

the component about collecting evaluation data, four administrators and three school

personnel stated that the timing was appropriate. The comments suggesting that the

timing was inappropriate were, specifically, that the evaluation PD was too late. These

findings are unfortunate because, according to Vygotskian principles, adult learning

principles, and participatory evaluation principles, the timing of the PD is an important

factor in the administrators and school personnel's learning about conducting evaluations.

However, the timing was beyond the control of CRDG.

Characteristics of Personnel Participating in the PD

That Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills

The findings suggest that the administrators learned more than the other school personnel about conducting program evaluations. In this study, the administrators had more positive attitudes about evaluation in general and more positive attitudes about the evaluation PD by CRDG. As discussed in a previous section, prior knowledge is an important factor that facilitates learning and the administrators also had more prior experience in conducting evaluations. The administrators' higher levels of positive attitudes about evaluation and CRDG's PD sessions as well as their higher levels of prior knowledge may have accounted for the increased effectiveness of the PD sessions with administrators than with the school personnel.

Participants' Attitudes about Evaluations and Participating in CRDG's PD Sessions

At the beginning and end of the year, the group of administrators had more positive attitudes than other school personnel about (a) evaluations in general, (b) being selected to participate in the evaluation, and (c) reasons that they were selected to participate in the evaluation. These factors also may have facilitated the administrators' higher levels of learning the evaluation tasks over the school personnel. The relationship between participants' attitudes toward program evaluation and learning of evaluation skills is consistent with the literature on Vygotskian learning principles, adult learning principles, and participatory evaluation. Vygotskian theory states that learning activities are most effective when the learners are motivated to learn. As discussed in the earlier section about the importance of the evaluation task, some of the literature about adult

learning suggests that learning activities with adults are effective if the adult participants

see the learning content as purposeful (Holton, & Swanson, 1999; Galusha, 1998; Guy,

1999; and Brookfield, 1995). Cousins and Earl (1992) stated that PD about evaluations

are most effective when the participants value evaluations and are motivated to learn how

to conduct evaluation tasks. The interviewees' attitudes about participating in the

evaluation and evaluations in general were consistent with their degree of motivation to

learn evaluation tasks.

Prior Experience in Conducting Evaluations

The finding that the administrtors' had higher levels of prior experience with

conducting evaluations and higher levels of learning evaluation skills is consistent with

Vygotksian learning principles and the participatory evaluation model. As discussed in

the earlier section about the format of the PD sessions, the findings that prior knowledge

plays an important role as the foundation on which to build new knowledge are consistent

with the research by Bayer (1996) and Dalton (1989). In Vygotskian learning theory, the

learners incorporate new knowledge with prior knowledge in the ZPD. Learning is

supported by prior knowledge. In the participatory evaluation model, organizational

memory supports organizational learning. In this study, organizational memory is

represented by prior knowledge.

Characteristics of the School Environment of PD

That Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills

In this study, the administrators learned more about conducting program

evaluation tasks than other school personnel. Although these are not strong findings, there

are patterns that suggest that the aspects of the school environment that accounted for the administrators learning about conducting evaluations than the school personnel were that (a) more staff members at the administrators' schools were involved in the evaluation, including more staff members were aware that the administrators interviewees were involved in the evaluation and (b) the administrators consulted more with other staff at their schools about conducting the evaluation.

Two aspects of involvement by others at the school were described by the interviewees in this study. One aspect was the number of people at the school that knew about the evaluation or knew about the interviewee's involvement in the evaluation. The lowest level of this type of involvement is informing one or a few others about the evaluation. The highest level is informing everyone else at the school about the evaluation. The other aspect of involvement by others at the school was the quality of the involvement. A low level of quality was the awareness by others at the school of the interviewees' participation in the evaluation. A higher level of quality was consulting others at the school and incorporating their input into conducting the evaluation tasks.

According to the particpatory evaluation literature, the number of people in the organization who are involved with the evaluation and the quality of their involvement has direct relationships to the quality of the evaluation activities. Cousins and Earl (1992) stated that an organization's potential for learning is greatly enhanced if the staff who participate in the evaluation have organizational memory. Cousins and Earl (1995) stated, "A significant feature associated with organizational learning is the organization's capacity to order and store information for future retrieval and, indeed, its capacity to

retrieve desired information as the need arises" (p. 6). They suggest that if key staff at the school are consulted, then it is more likely that there will be a pool of organizational memory to enhance planning and conducting the evaluation tasks. Additionally, the levels at which others at the school were involved in the evaluation may have had the side effect of increasing faculty and staff's value for the evaluation and building evaluation capacity. Cousins and Earl (1995) also stated that staff collaboration enhances organizational learning by increasing shared value for the programs and clarity about program goals. The school environment's value for the evaluation are shown in the regard that other school staff had for the interviewees' involvement in the evaluation. In this study, the indicators for how the interviewees were regarded were adequacy of school resources for the evaluation, improvement in the interviewees' role or status at the school, and improvement in the interviewee's level of influence at the school.

Component-Specific Findings About Aspects of the School

Environment that Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills

There were component-specific findings about the effects of evaluation resources, changes in the interviewees' roles or status at the school, and changes in the interviewees' level of influence at the school because of the interviewees' involvement in the evaluation. The component-specific findings suggest that the effects of these aspects of the school environment on learning evaluation skills depended on the type of evaluation task.

The findings suggest that the administrators learned more than the school personnel about writing a project description. In the component about writing a project

109

description, the description was more likely to be adequately written if many people at the school were consulted, as was the case for three of the five administrators. Meanwhile, four of the five groups of other school personnel consulted very few people or no one else at the school. These findings are tentative because there was only a slight proportion of administrators who informed or consulted with many other people at the school. Although tentative, these findings have support in the participatory evaluation literature. The participatory evaluation literature (Cousins, 1992) states that in order for the participatory evaluation model to be viable, the organization must be committed to organizational learning. That is, the level of awareness about the evaluation by others at the school directly affects how well the evaluation task is conducted. In light of the literature, the findings suggest that the evaluation tasks were better conducted at the schools where administrators were involved in CRDG's PD sessions.

The interviewees were asked if their participation in the evaluation changed their role or status in their school and if their participation in writing the project description changed their level of influence on school decisions and activities. These were considered indicators of the values for the evaluation by others at the school. Mainly, the administrators and school personnel reported no changes in their role or status in their schools as a result of their participation in the evaluation. However, some administrators and school personnel stated that their role or status at the school may change, depending on the evaluation findings. This suggests that others at the school may be interested in the evaluation. There were very interesting findings about the changes in the administrtors' or school personnel's level of influence at the school during the school year due to their

participation in the evaluation. For the component about collecting evaluation data, there were, mainly, no changes for the administrators, but negative findings for all the school personnel. I surmise that these findings may suggest that when the evaluation tasks fall to the school personnel, others at the school feel that the requests for evaluation data are an imposition, while they may consider it as of the duties of others at the school rather than an imposition when the administrators ask for evaluation data.

Data were also collected about the adequacy of resources available for the evaluation as an indicator of the value for the evaluation in the school. Interestingly, it was not clear that having adequate resources available for the evaluation was necessary for writing the project description. This is inconsistent with the participatory evaluation literature. Cousins and Earl (1992) stated that the evaluation must provide the resources necessary for the evaluation if the evaluation is to be conducted adequately.

In the component about developing an evaluation plan and selecting methods, the findings suggest that a main aspect of the school environment that contributed to the adequacy of conducting the evaluation tasks was consultation with others at the school about the evaluation. As discussed previous, the literature on participatory evaluation literature suggests that the consultation with key personnel at the school contributes to the adequacy of the evaluation.

Limitations of the Study

There were five limitations of this study. First, the results reflect correlations, not causes. The unit of analysis was the interview. The findings in this study are based on 10 interviews. Some interviews included groups of two or three interviewees, for a total of 15 interviewees. I grouped the 10 interviews into administrators and other school personnel based on patterns of findings. Each group included five interviews. The small number of units of analyses meant that, although correlational patterns were revealed, it cannot be said with certainty that an aspect of the PD sessions, characteristic of the participants, or aspect of the school environment caused the learning of program evaluation skills. Instead, the findings this study can suggest that the PD, participant characteristics, or school environment may have influenced learning program evaluation skills. This is especially the case when the findings of this study are consistent with Vygotskian learning theory, adult learning theory, or participatory evaluation theory.

Second, the findings about the adequacy of resources, changes in role or status at the school, or level of influence at the school varied among evaluation components, making it difficult to arrive at conclusions about the effects of these evaluation aspects. The lack of clear findings may be due to the low number of units of analyses. It may also be due to ambivalence in the schools' environments about the value of the evaluation and the stature of the interviewees who participated in the evaluation.

Third, the findings in this study were not only limited by the low number of units of analyses, but also because only one method was used to collect data, that is, retrospective interviews. Stronger conclusions for a study are usually possible if the study

includes multiple methods of addressing the research questions and the findings support a common conclusion. In this study, only the retrospective interview method was used to collect data.

Fourth, the interviews were designed to ask interviewees to recall what happened in workshops and personal consultation over one school year. The caution here is that the interviewees may not have had clear or accurate memories of the entire year of in-service education. Additionally, the self-report nature of the data mean that there may be a bias toward social desirability; that is, the interviewees may have altered their perceptions to what they thought the interviewer wanted to hear.

Finally, the last limitation of this study is that all the projects being implemented were unique and managed by the school faculty and personnel who were interviewed in this study. The school administrators and other personnel's level of responsibility for the project may have affected their learning of evaluation skills and knowledge. These findings should not be generalized beyond site-managed programs.

<div align="center">Implications for Future Research</div>

Additional research that replicates this study needs to be conducted. The purpose of replicating the study would be to see if the study yields the same findings or refutes them. The in-service education sessions should be as similar as possible to those provided by CRDG. Then, the interview guide used in this study would be used to collect the school faculty and personnel's self-report, retrospective perspectives about the workshops and personal consultation. The Vygotskian concepts would be used to code the interview data.

<div align="center">113</div>

Another study might be to replicate the structure and methods of the study with the changes suggested by the findings in this study to see if they do, indeed, improve the participants' learning of program evaluation skills and knowledge. For example, the findings here suggest that changes in the in-service education sessions and types of participants who were involved may have improved the effectiveness of the participants' learning of program evaluation skills and knowledge. Some of the changes suggested in this study are increasing the participation of administrators, increasing the participation of school faculty or staff with considerable organizational memory, clearly defining the split of responsibilities between the evaluation experts and the school participants, and increasing consultation with others at the school about the evaluation.

In this study, the Vygotskian concepts were useful as a lens to examine the teaching-learning processes. This method could be a valuable way of examining other teaching-learning processes. In this study, the Vygotskian principles of learning were an easy fit to the participatory evaluation model used in the PD sessions. If the method were used to examine other types of teaching-learning processes, the findings might suggest whether using the Vygotksian principles as part of a method is viable beyond this study.

RECEIVED
AS
FOLLOWS

Appendix A

The Interview Guide

THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

Section I. Introduction

I.   This interview guide provides the interviewer with information about the background for the interviews, an overview of the interviews, and procedures for the interviews.

II.   The research question that will be addressed by the information collected in the interviews is

1.   Using a Vygotskian perspective, what aspects of school culture and characteristics of public-school elementary and secondary administrators and teachers involved in the summative evaluations of site-managed projects conducted during the evaluation training accounted for learning program evaluation skills?

   1.   It should be noted that the influences of school culture and of the school staff on their ability to conduct program evaluation tasks are tightly intertwined.

      a.   Cultural aspects of the school and school staff that affected the staff's learning about program evaluations will be examined in terms of the individual staff, interpersonal relationships, and community or organizational culture.

      b.   Specifically, this study will examine the appropriateness of the evaluation training for the school culture and school staff's culture in terms of

         (1)   appropriateness or adequacy of the evaluation training and printed guidelines,

         (2)   communications with CRDG about three evaluation phases,

         (3)   perceived value of the evaluation tasks, and

         (4)   feasibility of the evaluation tasks.

2.   A sub-question is

   a.   At what levels do school staff receiving in-service training learn program evaluation skills during the course of one school year?

III.   *Background*

1.   In School Year 1997–98, Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) provided evaluation training and assistance to Hawai'i public schools that were funded by the Incentive and Innovation Grants (IIG) program or Special Needs Schools (SNS) program.

   1.   The purpose of the training and assistance was to help schools learn program evaluation knowledge and skills and apply their learning in summative evaluations of their SNS or IIG projects.

   2.   Thirteen IIG-funded schools and seven SNS-funded schools participated in the evaluation training.

2. The sample of schools for this study will be the eight Oʻahu schools where staff participated extensively in the provided training.

IV. *The Evaluation-training sessions*
1. To prepare for the evaluation training sessions, CRDG prepared evaluation-training materials to distribute to schools at the workshops.
    1. The materials focused on providing guidelines for conducting evaluations that would be "psychometrically and methodologically adequate" (Wang, Brandon, Higa, & Saka, 1996, p. 8).
2. CRDG's evaluation training was offered in such a manner that participating school administrators and faculty would be given opportunities to learn program evaluation skills in didactic and interactive formats at group workshops or at individual schools.
3. The training addressed
    1. writing project descriptions to use when evaluating the projects,
    2. developing evaluation plans based on the project description and selecting appropriate data-collection methods, and
    3. collecting evaluation data.
4. The workshops began with lecture-style presentations of basic information, followed by break-out sessions in which CRDG staff provided intensive consultation and the school staff applied what they had learned in the lectures.
    1. Together, school staff and CRDG decided about the focus of the evaluation, the methods used to collect evaluation data, and parties responsible for completing each task.
    2. Throughout the year, the schools and CRDG contacted each other by phone, fax, or e-mail or met in person, as needed, to discuss the progress of the evaluation and to clarify or revise tasks or the timeline.
    3. CRDG provided consultation about school staff's evaluation responsibilities and answered questions about evaluation methods. CRDG also collected information which helped them as they developed or selected instruments and analyzed data.

V. *Literature review*: The bodies of literature on learning theory and on program evaluation were reviewed to develop a theoretical framework and methods for answering the research questions.
1. *Learning theory*
    1. The literature on elements of the social context of learning, with a focus on Vygotsky, was reviewed to develop a theoretical framework for examining the evaluation-training process in the context of social settings.
    2. *Vygotskian theory: basic tenets*
        a. The over-riding tenet of Vygotskian theory is that learning starts with interpersonal exchange.

b. As learning progresses, the learner increasingly assumes responsibility of the processes necessary to competently complete the task without assistance (Vygotsky, 1978).

c. Vygotsky (1978) discussed teaching-learning social processes as events that happen within a *zone of proximal development* (ZPD).

    (1) The ZPD is the "distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86).

    (2) The learner's actual developmental level is what the learner has already achieved and can do alone and the potential level is what the learner can achieve with assistance to advance beyond the actual developmental level (Vygotsky, 1978).

d. In the ZPD, teachers and learners engage in *semiotic mediation*—that is, interact, commonly in the form of speech—to establish *intersubjectivity*—that is, shared meaning—about terminology and the values attached to the terms and learning tasks.

e. As the learner advances toward competent performance of the task, the learner also gains a deeper understanding of the task.

f. This advancement of the learner's thinking and functioning on the task is called *internalization* (Vygotsky, 1978).

3. Wertsch (1985) posits that two factors contribute to the effectiveness of a teaching-learning situation to move the learner from working with assistance to independent, competent performance of the task.

a. Teachers are most effective when they allow learners to increasingly regulate their own actions during their attempts to gain competence in a task.

b. As learners take on more responsibility for the task, they advance toward independent, competent performance of the task.

4. Subsumed in the study of social contexts is a focus on socio-cultural values and traditions.

a. To be effective, teachers must consider characteristics of the learner (e.g., prior knowledge, cultural background, existing skills) when planning curriculum and learning activities.

b. Learners must be willing to understand and reconstruct the teacher's message to make sense of the learning task (Rommetveit, 1979, p. 96).

c. Bruffee (1995) states that as teachers and learners advance in their understanding of the other's culture, each party will experience some reacculturation.

        (1)   That is, both the teacher and learner will incorporate some of the other's culture into their own culture (e.g., language, symbols, values) to enhance communications about the task.

2. ***Program evaluation theory***: The following review includes their insights about how the quality of the evaluation is affected by the school's organizational culture, the relationship with evaluation experts, and characteristics of the school staff involved in the evaluations.

  1. ***Participatory educational evaluation***

    a.   Cousins and Earl (1995), among others, have reported that increasing the level of school staffs' involvement in program evaluations increases the likelihood that they will conduct adequate evaluations.

    b.   Staff collaboration greatly enhances organizational learning by increasing shared value for the programs, clarity about program goals, uniformity in program implementation, and knowledge about students.

    c.   Five characteristics of schools that support the participatory-evaluation model's viability are

        (1)   the school staff must value evaluations;

        (2)   the school must devote adequate resources to the evaluation, including personnel time and funding;

        (3)   schools must be committed to improving through organizational learning;

        (4)   the school staff involved in the evaluation must be highly motivated; and

        (5)   an evaluation expert should train school staff that are involved in the evaluation.

    d.   The evaluation team members learn job" under close supervision of an evaluation expert.

        (1)   The evaluation expert's input diminishes as the school evaluation team learns the necessary skills to adequately conduct the evaluation.

        (2)   Eventually, the evaluation expert's role may change from trainer, coordinator, and quality-control supervisor to consultant for highly-specialized tasks.

    e.   Cousins and Earl (1995) identified six requirements for evaluation experts to be effective in providing training to school staff.

        (1)   they have appropriate levels of expertise in program evaluations and research skills,

        (2)   they are accessible to school staff who may need the evaluation expert to attend meetings or to address specific questions,

(3) they have adequate resources available for use in the evaluation,

(4) they must practice effective teaching methods for adults,

(5) they must be motivated, and

(6) they must be flexible in their definition of adequate levels of performance because the school staff will implement the evaluation plan at their level of skill and experience (probably a substantially lower level than that of the evaluation expert).

2. *School-based evaluation*

    a. *Organizational contexts for evaluations.* According to Nevo (1995), "awareness, training, and organizational resources" are key variables in studying the extent that a school values evaluations and is open to conducting evaluations (p. 171).

        (1) Nevo (1995) recommends that evaluation experts first attempt to secure school administrators' support of the evaluation tasks.

            (a) To do this, evaluation experts should enhance the administrators' awareness of evaluation principles, methods, and usefulness through a presentation of evaluation principles, methods, and usefulness.

            (b) If the administrator's support is secured, then the school staff that will participate in the evaluation process should receive training about evaluations.

        (2) Although there may be several teachers on the evaluation team, the evaluation experts should clarify the type and level of resources that the school can devote to the evaluation tasks.

            (a) These resources may be personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection (Nevo, 1995).

            (b) The extent to which school resources are available will affect the evaluation breadth and scope.

        (3) *The role of evaluation experts in school-based evaluation.*

            (a) Nevo (1995) writes that, initially, evaluation experts should provide an overview of evaluation principles and training in evaluation procedures to school administrators.

            (b) If evaluation experts successfully secure the support of administrators, the evaluation can progress more smoothly.

            (c) Evaluation experts can then provide evaluation training to the school-based evaluation team members.

  (4) After the initial training, evaluation experts would take the role as consultants and would also provide technical assistance to the evaluation team.

    (a) Nevo (1995) warns that evaluation experts are only helpful if their verbal and written communications are understandable to the school staff and evaluation stakeholders.

VI. *The place of the proposed study in the literature on participatory evaluation:*

  1. The evaluation training provided by CRDG has characteristics of the evaluation training discussed by Cousins and Earl (1992, 1995) and Nevo (1994, 1995).

    1. However, the literature on participatory evaluation and school-based evaluation do not carefully examine the extent to which school personnel learn evaluation skills.

    2. Therefore, the proposed study will contribute to research about participatory evaluations and school-conducted evaluations reported to date.

Section II. An Overview of the Interviews

I. *Before the interview*
1. Contact the designated school staff shown on the school roster sheet.
   1. The designated school staff have been informed that you will be contacting them.
   2. Introduce yourself and state that you have been asked to collect information about Curriculum Research & Development Group's (CRDG) evaluation services in School Year 1997–98, that is, the evaluation training sessions and consultation.
      a. You are not a regular staff member.
      b. The information also will help CRDG improve their future services to Hawai'i public schools.
   3. The interviews will collect information about the school staffs' perspectives on the extent to which the evaluation training and consultation provided by CRDG helped them learn evaluation skills and knowledge.
   4. Confidentiality Issues
      a. For schools with more than one interviewee per interview, tell interviewees that you will not record peoples' names with their responses.
   5. Ask the interviewee to find a room that is private so that there will not be distractions such as people walking through the interview area.
2. Review the packet of information provided by CRDG about the school's project and the school staff's involvement in CRDG's evaluation training and consultation.
3. If you have any questions about the information included in the school's packet, contact CRDG to clarify the information before the interview.
4. Be sure that you have all the necessary interview materials, including:
   1. a copy of the interview guide
   2. note pad with a sufficient number of pages.
   3. two pens or pencils
   4. audio tape recorder with microphones and appropriate size and length of audio tapes
5. Practice using the audio tape recorder until you are thoroughly familiar with its features.
6. Study the map to the schools and make sure you know how to get there and where to park.
7. Check in at the school office at least five minutes before the interview and ask about visitor sign-in procedures.

II. *Note-taking procedures*
1. Write your notes on a note pad.

2. When you begin move to a subsequent interview question, write the interview question number on the note pad as a reference for your notes.
3. Take as many notes as you need to record the information.
4. If you cannot write down all the information during the interview, write notes immediately after the interview to avoid gaps in information due to time interference with your memory of the conversation.

Section III. Conducting the Interview

I. **Instructions to the interviewer**
    1.   The procedures in this section were developed to ensure that each interview covers all aspects of the study.
    2.   Say the content of the boxes to the interviewee.
        1.   Paraphrasing is permissible as long as the meaning of the statements is preserved.
        2.   The exceptions are when the boxes are crossed out with red ink.
            a.   That means that the question is irrelevant to the interviewee because he or she did not participate in the training or task that is referenced.
    3.   If you find ways to improve on the interview questions, record these in writing and arrange a meeting with CRDG to discuss the improvements before your next scheduled interview.

II. *Before the interview*
    1.   Record the school name, interviewee's name, and date, time, and location of the interview on the first page of the note pad.
    2.   Take notes about the setting.
        1.   Where in the school did the interview happen?
        2.   Was there anything about the interview setting that affected the interview, (e.g., people walking around, noise outside the windows)?

III. *Beginning the interview and establishing rapport with the interviewees*
    1.   Introduce yourself and the purpose of the interview again.

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me and help with this study.

My name is Alix Howard-Jones. I am not a regular staff member at CRDG. I've been asked to collect information about CRDG's evaluation services, that is, the evaluation training sessions and consultation during the school year.

The purpose of the interviews is to get your feedback about the evaluation of your school's project that is funded by the [say appropriate prompt: Incentive and Innovation Grants program/Special Needs Schools program]. CRDG will use the results of this study to help improve their service to the schools.

Its o.k. to be critical about the evaluation training and consultation. The purpose of collecting information from you and other participants about CRDG's services is to find ways to improve the evaluation training and consultation.

I'm going to ask you about several topics including some general information questions and some questions about the school's evaluation and your participation in that evaluation.

2.   Confidentiality Issues

> **Your responses are confidential. Names of individuals will not be included in the report.**

3.   Audio taping of the interview

> *As a backup for my note taking, I would like to audio tape the interview. The tapes will only be used to allow me to focus on the conversation without writing too many notes. No one other than myself will listen to the tapes. Will you be comfortable with the tape recorder?*

D.   If the interviewee says that he or she will *not* comfortable with the audio tape recorder, then put the tape recorder away and say,

> *At times, I may need to stop the interview and take a few more notes. Please bear with me at these times.*

IV.   *Interviewer's conduct during the interview*
1.   The interview should be conducted like a friendly conversational manner.
2.   *Acceptable Probing Questions*
     1.   Whenever you believe that the interviewee has provided a response that needs further clarification to address the question to the fullest extent, encourage the interviewee to provide further information through probing questions.
         a.   However, if you believe that the interviewee does not want to provide information beyond what was already provided, move on to the next question.
     2.   Sometimes, verbal prompting is not necessary.
         a.   You may also merely provide more time for the interviewee to add information to the response.
     3.   At other times, general prompts may be used, for example,
         a.   "Please elaborate on your answer."
         b.   "Can you give me an example of what that means?"
     4.   Sometimes the response calls for more specific probing questions, for example,
         a.   If the interviewee uses esoteric terms, ask for definitions or elaboration.
         b.   If you suspect that the interviewee is providing a judgmental statement instead of a factually-based perspective, ask the interviewee to describe the basis for the statements.
     5.   When interviewees provide responses that are evasive or tangential from the intent of the question, maneuver the conversation back to the original question.

         a.   Be especially diplomatic if you think the interviewee feels uncomfortable about the question.
             (1)   That is, do not point out that the original response was evasive or tangential but try to gently guide the conversation back to the

        original question, for example, "let me summarize your response to the question to make sure that the question has been addressed."

    (2)   For more forthright interviewees, it may be appropriate to explicitly point out that the question was not addressed.

        (a)   In this case you may wish to repeat the question.

    (3)   *Ensure that interviewees give examples to support their opinions*

        (a)   It is very important that the interviewee provide evidence to support their statements.

        (b)   Therefore, ask the interviewee to provide examples to support his or her statements or opinions and attitudes.

6.   *Appropriate responses to various issues or resistance*

    a.   If interviewees seem very self-conscious, reluctant, or resistant in the interviews, it may not be possible to elicit the desired depth of information.

    b.   However, be friendly and as sensitive as possible to their cultural background, time restrictions, etc.

Background and General Information Questions

> 1. What experiences have you had in evaluations previous to this evaluation?

> 2. At the beginning of this year's evaluation, how did you feel about being selected to participate in it?
>
> 3. How do you feel now about having been selected to participate?
>
> 4. If there is a change in how you feel, what brought about that change?

For Question 5-12, if the interviewee asks why you are interested in information about others at the school, say

> One of the purposes of this study is to examine the influences of others at the school on your participation in the evaluation training and ability to adequately conduct the evaluation tasks.

> 5. Why do you believe you were selected to participate in the evaluation?

126

6. At the beginning of this school year, how many others at the school were aware of your participation in the evaluation?

7. What positions did they hold?

8. Before the evaluation began, what do you think your school administrators' and other staff's attitudes were about your having to do the evaluation?
(Interviewer prompt terms: amount of support provided, perceived importance, meaningfulness of the evaluation to others)

9. At this point in the school year, how many others at the school are now aware of your participation in the evaluation?

10. What positions do they hold?

11. What do you think their attitudes are now about having the evaluation done at the school?

12. If there is change in their attitudes, what brought about that change?

---

13. What were your attitudes toward evaluation in general before this year?

14. At this point, how do you feel about evaluations in general?

15. If there was a change, what brought about it about?

**Review of Activities for the School's Evaluation
and Interviewee's Participation in the Evaluation**

Take out the school's packet and say

> *Now I'd like to first refresh your memory about your participation in learning about and doing the evaluation.*
>
> *There were three phases to the evaluation training and tasks:*
> *(a) writing a project description*
> *(b) developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods*
> *(c) collecting evaluation data*

Open the project folder for the school and briefly review the interviewee's participation in the evaluation training, the evaluation tasks, the evaluation products for each of the evaluation phases, and the written and verbal interaction (consultation) with CRDG about each phase. An example of what to say when reviewing the project folder, is:

> *CRDG sent a memo to school principals and [say the appropriate prompt: IIG/SNS] project coordinators to inform them of CRDG's evaluation sessions and to invite school principals and project coordinators to the first training session.*
>
> *You attended the workshop about writing a project description that was held [fill in date, time, place from project folder].*
>
> *On [date] you faxed your project description to CRDG.*
>
> *etc.*

Show CRDG's written guidelines about conducting evaluations (light blue cover), and say,

> *You may recall that CRDG provided you with this set of written guidelines. These guidelines are about how to write a project description, develop an evaluation plan, select evaluation methods, and collect evaluation data.*
>
> *These written guidelines were discussed at the workshops and during consultation.*

(Review of Activities for the School's Evaluation and
Interviewee's Participation in the Evaluation, continued)

Questions about each phase of the evaluation, say,

Now, for each phase of the evaluation process, I'll ask you questions about your participation in the evaluation training, about communication and consultation with CRDG, and about the progress of your evaluation.

For some questions, I'll first ask you to rate your understanding or attitudes about the evaluation and then ask you to explain your rating.

For other questions, I'll just ask for a narrative response or comment.

The First Evaluation Phase: Writing a Project Description

Interviewer: Show the materials from the project folder about writing a project description again to refresh the interviewee's memory about the training and consultation or tasks.

Pre-training self-rating of ability

> 1. **First, I'll ask about the first evaluation phase (writing a project description).**
>
> 2. **Think back to before you learned from CRDG about writing a project description.**
>
>   **On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (e.g., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, rate your ability to write a project description before you learned about it from CRDG.**
>
> 3. **Please tell me why you chose this rating.**

General question about learning to write a project description

> 4. **Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to write a project description and what influenced your learning.**

Follow Question 4 with any questions from 5 to 31 that he or she does not cover in responding to Question 4 above. Prompt the interviewee if any information is not clear or if any topics are not addressed.

Appropriateness or adequacy of the workshop and printed guidelines

> 5. **Was the timing of the workshop appropriate?**
> **(Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)**

> 6. **How appropriate was the length of the workshop?**

> 7. **How appropriate was the focus of the workshop about writing a project description?**
> **(Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)**

8. **How good was the coverage of concepts about writing project descriptions or the procedures for writing them?**
(Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)

9. **How understandable were the oral presentations in the workshops or elsewhere?**

10. **How understandable were the written materials in the workshop or elsewhere?**

11. **How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?**

Communications with CRDG about writing a project description.

12. **Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?**

13. **How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns?**
(Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)

14. **When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they?**
(Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)

15. **How was CRDG's pace?**
(Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)

16. **Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase?**
(Interviewer prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)

17. **Overall, to what extent did the workshop, consultation, and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to write a project description?**

(The First Evaluation Phase: Writing a Project Description, continued)

Value and feasibility of the evaluation tasks.

18.	**How well did CRDG explain the importance of writing a project description?**
19.	**How important do you think it is?**
(Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness or helpfulness in your understanding of evaluation)	

20.	**Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks?**
(Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection)	

21.	**How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?**

Support for the evaluation in the school and interviewee's role in the school

22.	**How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about writing a project description?**
23.	**If you consulted with others at your school, what types of information did they provide?**
24.	**If you consulted with others at your school, how do you think they felt about being consulted about writing a project description?**
25.	**If you consulted with others at your school, to what extent did the information you got help you to write a project description?**

26.	**Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your role or status in your school?**
27.	**If it has changed, how so?**
28.	**Why do you think it has changed?**

29.	Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your level of influence on school decisions and activities?
30.	If it has changed, how so?
31.	Why do you think it has changed?

Post-training self-rating of ability

32.	*On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (i.e., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, what rating do you give your ability to write a project description now (that is, after learning about how to write a project description and actually writing a project description for your project)?*
33.	*Please explain your rating.*

The Second Evaluation Phase: Developing an
Evaluation Plan and Selecting Evaluation Methods

Interviewer: Show the materials from the project folder about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods again to refresh the interviewee's memory about the training and consultation or tasks.

Pre-training self-rating of ability

1. *In this section, I'll ask about the second evaluation phase (developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods).*

2. *Think back to before you learned from CRDG about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods.*

   On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (e.g., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, rate your ability to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods before you learned about it from CRDG.

3. *Please* **tell me why you chose this rating.**

General question about learning to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods

4. *Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods and what influenced your learning.*

Follow Question 4 with any questions from 5 to 32 that he or she does not cover in responding to Question 4 above. Prompt the interviewee if any information is not clear or if any topics are not addressed.

Appropriateness or adequacy of the workshop and printed guidelines

5. *Was the timing of the workshop appropriate?*
   (Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)

6. *How appropriate was the length of the workshop?*

7. **How appropriate was the focus of the workshop about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods?**
    (Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)

8. **How good was the coverage of concepts about developing evaluation plans or the procedures for developing them?**

9. **How good was the coverage of concepts about selecting evaluation methods or the procedures for selecting them?**
    (Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)

10. **How understandable were the oral presentations in the workshops or elsewhere?**

11. **How understandable were the written materials in the workshop or elsewhere?**

12. **How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?**

Communications with CRDG about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods

13. **Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?**

14. **How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns?**
    (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)

15. **When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they?**
    (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)

16. **How was CRDG's pace?**
    (Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)

> **17.** *Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase?*
> *(Interviewer prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)*

> **18.** *Overall, to what extent did the workshop, consultation, and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods?*

Value and feasibility of the evaluation tasks.

> **19.** *How well did CRDG explain the importance of developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods?*
>
> **20.** *How important do you think it is?*
> *(Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness or helpfulness in your understanding of evaluation)*

> **21.** *Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks?*
> *(Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection)*

> **22.** *How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?*

Support for the evaluation in the school and interviewee's role in the school

23. *How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods?*

24. *If you consulted with others at your school, what types of information did they provide?*

25. *If you consulted with others at your school, how do you think they felt about being consulted about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods?*

26. *If you consulted with others at your school, to what extent did the information you got help you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods?*

27. *Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your role or status in your school?*

28. *If it has changed, how so?*

29. *Why do you think it has changed?*

30. *Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your level of influence on school decisions and activities?*

31. *If it has changed, how so?*

32. *Why do you think it has changed?*

Post-training self-rating of ability

33.	*On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (i.e., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, what rating do you give your ability to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods now (that is, after learning about how to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods and actually developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods for your project)?*
34.	*Please explain your rating.*

The Third Evaluation Phase: Collecting Evaluation Data

Interviewer: Show the materials from the project folder about collecting evaluation data again to refresh the interviewee's memory about the training and consultation or tasks. Say,

> *Information about appropriately collecting evaluation data was discussed with some schools during consultation at the second set of workshops. For other schools, information about collecting evaluation data were discussed on the phone, by e-mail, by fax, or in-person consultation meetings between CRDG and school staff.*
>
> *Depending on the evaluation plan and selection of evaluation methods, the topics discussed with CRDG about collecting evaluation data may have addressed procedures for:*
> * *developing a survey questionnaire to collect data that would address specific evaluation questions*
> * *distributing survey questionnaires*
> * *pilot-testing survey questionnaires*
> * *selecting and administering commercially-published instruments*
> * *developing performance assessments*
> * *administering performance assessments (giving prompts to students and rater conduct)*
> * *developing interview guides*
> * *addressing threats to validity and reliability*
> * *spreadsheet formats to use when preparing data for transfer to CRDG*
> * *contracting a professional data-entry service to prepare data for transfer to CRDG*

Pre-training self-rating of ability

> 1. *In this section, I'll ask about the third evaluation phase (collecting evaluation data).*
>
> 2. *Think back to before you learned from CRDG about collecting evaluation data.*
>
>   *On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (e.g., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, rate your ability to appropriately collect evaluation data before you learned about it from CRDG.*
>
> 3. *Please* tell me why you chose this rating.

General question about learning to collect evaluation data

> **4. Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to appropriately collect evaluation data and what influenced your learning.**

Follow Question 4 with any questions from 5 to 29 that he or she does not cover in responding to Question 4 above. Prompt the interviewee if any information is not clear or if any topics are not addressed.

Appropriateness or adequacy of the consultation sessions and printed guidelines

> **5. Were timing of the consultation sessions appropriate?**
> *(Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)*

> **6. How appropriate was the length of the consultation sessions?**

> **7. How appropriate was the focus of the consultation sessions about collecting evaluation data?**
> *(Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)*

> **8. How good was the coverage of concepts about collecting evaluation data or the procedures for appropriately collecting the data?**
> *(Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)*

> **9. How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?**

Communications with CRDG about collecting evaluation data.

> **10. Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?**

> **11. How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns?**
> *(Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)*

> **12. When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they?**
> *(Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)*

(The Third Evaluation Phase: Collecting Evaluation Data, continued)

---

13.   *How was CRDG's pace?*
(Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)

---

14.   *Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase?*
(Interviewer prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)

---

15.   *Overall, to what extent did the consultation and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to appropriately collect evaluation data?*

Value and feasibility of the evaluation tasks.

---

16.   *How well did CRDG explain the importance of appropriately collecting evaluation data?*
(Interviewer prompts: procedures to enhance validity and reliability of the data)

17.   *How important do you think it is?*
(Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness or helpfulness in your understanding of evaluation)

---

18.   *Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks?*
(Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection)

---

19.   *How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?*

Support for the evaluation in the school and interviewee's role in the school

20.	How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about collecting evaluation data?
21.	If you consulted with others at your school, what types of information did they provide?
22.	If you consulted with others at your school, how do you think they felt about being consulted about collecting evaluation data?
23.	If you consulted with others at your school, to what extent did the information you got help you to appropriately collect evaluation data?

24.	Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your role or status in your school?
25.	If it has changed, how so?
26.	Why do you think it has changed?

27.	Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your level of influence on school decisions and activities?
28.	If it has changed, how so?
29.	Why do you think it has changed?

Post-training self-rating of ability

30.	On a 10-point rating scale where 10 is at the level of an evaluation expert (i.e., CRDG staff) and 1 is totally novice, what rating do you give your ability to appropriately collect evaluation data now (that is, after learning about how to collect evaluation data and actually collecting evaluation data for your project)?
31.	Please explain your rating.

Ending the Interview

Ask the interviewee

> *Do you have any other comments that you would like to add about*
> *(a) CRDG's evaluation training and consultation,*
> *(b) influences on your level of participation in the training, or*
> *(c) influences on your ability to conduct the evaluation tasks?*

After the Interview

Protocol
- When the interview is complete, thank the school staff for their assistance and time.
- Sign out at the office.
- Type your interview notes according to the interview question numbers.
- Listen to the audio tape to make sure your typed notes are complete.

Appendix B

**Findings About the Effects of the Professional Development Sessions,
Characteristics of the Administrators or School Personnel, and
Characteristics of the School Personnel that Affects the Administrators'
or School Personnel's Learning of Program Evaluation Skills**

Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: What Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills?

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
	Writing a project description	
4. Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to write a project description and what influenced your learning.	Positive: •work in small groups (1) (ZPD+) •clarifying the project from an evaluation point of view (3) (IS+, ZPD+) •follow-up contacts (1) (ZPD+) •written materials with examples were easy to follow (1) (SM+) Negative: •presentation was very generic (1) (SM-)	Positive: •taught us to become very concise (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •could follow written materials (1) (SM+) •small group work in plain language (1) (SM+) •gave immediate feedback after sent to CRDG (1) (ZPD+) •CRDG reviewed the old project description and it was OK (1) (PE+, ZPD+) No response. (1)
5. Was the timing of the workshop appropriate? (Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)	Positive: •appropriate (4) but others at the workshop didn't like it because it was too close to HDOE's request for a project description (ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •timing was fine (3) (ZPD+) Negative: •would have liked to start earlier (1) (ZPD-) No response. (1)
6. How appropriate was the length of the workshop?	Positive: •length of the workshop was appropriate (3) (ZPD+) No response. (2)	Positive: •length of the workshop was appropriate (4): length of the workshop was appropriate because it allowed time for small group meetings with CRDG (2) (ZPD+) No response. (1)

NOTE: IN=internalization, IS=intersubjectivity, LA=learner's attention to components, LE=learner's environment, MO=motivation, PE=prior experience, SC=socio-cultural aspects, SM=semiotic mediation, ZPD=zone of proximal development. See Table 1 for an explanation of the codes. + indicates a positive comments, - indicates a negative comment, and no sign indicates a comment that is moderate, neutral, mixed, or unclear.

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
7. How appropriate was the focus of the workshop about writing a project description? (Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)	Positive: •focus was appropriate (3) One interview: Most helpful that CRDG met with them individually after the generic workshop. (SM+, ZPD+) Mixed: •workshop was "extremely technical" and he/she understood it because he/she had heard it before, but "I couldn't understand the project write up." (1) (PE+, SM-, ZPD-) No response. (1)	Positive: •focus was appropriate (3). Some comments were, "it was in language I understood. . . . I don't know if it's because I had one year of experience," "Meeting with them afterwards really helped because then they could clarify the concerns and issues that we had," and "small group meetings were a good followup because they could ask specific questions to get clarification about conducting the evaluation task." (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •the workshop was very "frustrating" and "awful, too broad. . . . There were too many people and it didn't meet our needs." (1) (SM-, ZPD-) No response. (1)
8. How good was the coverage of concepts about writing a project description? (Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)	Positive: •the professional development session was good (2) (ZPD+) Negative: •the presentation was very technical and he/she couldn't understand the project write up (1) (SM-, ZPD-) Mixed: •"didn't have any feelings one way or another" but the other interviewee felt that the workshop was much too broad. However, he/she felt that the written materials were good and reinforced the presentation. They also used materials from a project that they worked on previously (1) (SM, ZPD) No response. (1)	Positive: •coverage of concepts was good (3). Some comments were that "they appreciated the examples in the written materials and the specifics of writing a project description" and "the small group meetings with CRDG were a good followup because they could ask specific questions to get clarification about conducting the evaluation task." (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •coverage of concepts "needed modification since we weren't going to do some of the activities." (1) (ZPD-) No response. (1)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
9. How understandable were the oral presentations in the workshops or elsewhere?	Positive: •Oral presentations were good (3). Some comments were, "CRDG staff members were always available for questions, and "the presentation was "excellent." (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •Oral presentations were too technical and it was difficult to understand. (1) (SM-, ZPD-) No response. (1)	Positive: •presentations were "good" and "really clear" (2) (SM+, ZPD+) Mixed: •some concepts were difficult to understand at first but that they were clarified in the small group meetings when he/she was able to ask questions (1) (SM, ZPD) •didn't really remember the presentation, and the other interviewee thought that it was unclear why they needed to write another project description besides the one that they wrote for HDOE. (1) (SM, ZPD) No response. (1)
10. How understandable were the written materials in the workshop or elsewhere?	Positive: •liked the written materials and found them useful, adding that CRDG staff were always available to answer questions (4) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •liked the written materials as an additional resource (3) (SM+) Neutral: •did not review the materials (1) No response. (1)
11. How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?	Positive: •Liked the personal consultations, for example, "excellent," "very good, " and "CRDG was always available for questions" (4) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •liked the personal consultation. Some comments were, "excellent," "good," and "it was good because it was specific to our school and what we were doing." (4) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)

148

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
12. Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?	Positive: •Adequate opportunities to ask questions about writing a project description. Some comments were: "[CRDG staff] were always available for questions," "anytime I needed help I could just call or email," and "[CRDG staff] didn't waste time, got right to the matters, answered my questions, covered it efficiently, was always there, very helpful." (3) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (2)	Positive: •Adequate opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation. One interviewee added, "but there was a communication problem in not knowing enough to ask the right questions." Another interviewee added that the answers were very clear but did not address the gist of the question about adequacy of opportunities to ask questions. (4) (SM, ZPD+) No response. (1)
13. How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)	Positive: •CRDG's answers were good and very helpful (3) (SM+) Mixed: •The project description phase was very confusing; CRDG was more helpful during the subsequent phases of the evaluation (1) (SM-) No response. (1)	Positive: •CRDG's answers to questions or concerns were adequate. One interviewee added: "They listened a lot." (4) (SM+) •"I liked dealing with them because it gave me a sense of direction. And then they were really nice because they said they would take the data we had and analyze it for us. We just received it back, and I didn't understand what it said. [CRDG staff] then sent us an explanation of effect/cause statistic or whatever. But it's going to go in on our evaluation as an attachment." (1) (SM, ZPD+)

149

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
14. When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)	Positive: •CRDG's monitoring was helpful. Some statements were, "very good, [CRDG staff]'s been really good on keeping on task at that. . . . kept in touch with us all the time," "very good. I didn't feel rushed at all and I knew it had to come at the end, so I knew we had time. There were times I admit, we forgot and [CRDG staff] would say 'reminder' . . . . was good about that," "they really kept us on our toes and it was very courteously and graciously done. It's nice to be reminded because with my world I need those reminders, but I never felt they thought the project was junk because we didn't turn something in," and "excellent. . . . As I say, when you're a teacher you got a million things going on and you tend to forget things. [CRDG staff] was really good and especially by using email. It was a real good way to communicate." (4) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •CRDG's monitoring and reminders were good (3) (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •couldn't remember what happened and the other interviewee said it was a very confusing phase of the evaluation. (1) (SM-) No response. (1)
15. How was CRDG's pace? (Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)	Positive: •CRDG's pace was "good" or "excellent." (3) (ZPD+) No response. (2)	Positive •CRDG's pace was good (3) (ZPD+) Negative: •could not remember what happened and the other interviewee stated that that was a very confusing phase in the evaluation. (1) (SM-) No response. (1)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
16. Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase? (Interviewer's prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)	Positive: •consultation was "good" or "excellent" in helping to clarify the evaluation tasks. (3) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (2)	Positive: •consultation "kept us on schedule," was "good," or was "very helpful." (3) (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •could not remember the consultation while the other interviewee thought the evaluation tasks were "very confusing." (1) (SM-) No response. (1)
17. Overall, to what extent did the workshop, consultation, and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to write a project description?	Positive: •CRDG provided sufficient information to conduct the evaluation tasks. Some comments were: "the individual consultation was especially helpful," "it was especially helpful that CRDG staff took the time to work with them, look at the project documentation, and then follow up to provide further clarification. . . .They helped us see what was important. . . . they spent enough time with us and they were accessible in case we left a meeting and we had a question. . . . very cordial and always expansive from their side." (4) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •the work with CRDG was adequate. Elaboration: "I don't know if we could have done the project description as well without their help because even when I looked back at it, I've used it countless times to describe the program as concisely as possible. I can just pull it out and say this is what it is." (1) (SM+, ZPD+) •"The bulk of our write up was basically all right." (1) (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •"this was a very confusing phase in the evaluation." (1) (SM-) No response. (2)

151

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
18. How well did CRDG explain the importance of writing a project description?	Positive: •CRDG did a good job of explaining the importance of the task. One of these interviewees added that "[CRDG staff] took the time with us to actually look at our documentation after they told us what to do and we tried to do it, then they looked at it to better clarify. They helped us see what was important. . . . they spent enough time with us and they were accessible in case we left a meeting and we had a question. Very cordial and always expansive from their side." (4) (SC+, SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •they already knew that the evaluation was very important. (1) (SC+, SM+, ZPD+) Mixed: •somewhat recalled CRDG. talking about the importance of the evaluation. (2) (SM) Negative: •didn't address the question but stated that they were very confused about the evaluation tasks. (1) (SM-) No response. (1)
21. How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?	Positive: •the division of responsibilities was appropriate. (2) (ZPD+) Moderate: •CRDG did "a lot more than I thought or expected." (1) (ZPD) •"they only thing I had to do was the project description and a timeline of the curriculum. But I had that at hand. I think [CRDG staff]'s done the lion's share of the work on this." (1) (ZPD) No response. (1)	Positive: •it was fair. Some comments: expected CRDG to help, but "there were times along the way I never knew I needed help, and so maybe [CRDG staff] would call and say, maybe this or that and it would help," "it was as fair as could be expected," and CRDG gave "a lot as far giving me feedback. (4) (ZPD+) No response. (1)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
	Develop an evaluation design and selecting methods	
4. Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods and what influenced your learning.	Positive: •CRDG and the interviewees decided to focus the evaluation on implementation to study specific data about different groups in the project. They identified data sources and planned data collection, including how to minimize the requests for time and effort made of school teachers and staff, which can turn into a "negative situation." (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •CRDG helped them to clearly focus on specifics about the project so that they could develop an appropriate evaluation plan and select methods. (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •they and CRDG had long "philosophical" discussions about the value and appropriateness of quantitative data for the evaluation. CRDG had to go through many reiterations of the rationale for quantitative data before he/she came to understand CRDG's proposed evaluation design. (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •CRDG "guided me in what would be a good way to do it and I said yes, yes, yes. Because as I said, I don't know that much about educational evaluation." (1) (SM+, ZPD) •The interviewee initially wanted a school-wide evaluation. However, CRDG proposed focusing on activities that were funded by the program and examining relationships between the activities, "Having him [CRDG staff] sort out what we were doing or where we might be able to attribute changes or differences was really helpful." (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+)	Positive: •CRDG and us worked to form a well-focused, concise evaluation questions for the evaluation plans. (1) (SM+, ZPD+ •The individual consultation was most helpful. CRDG corrected a lot of outdated ideas. (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •CRDG reviewed the project description. We needed to limit the evaluation to methods that would not take a lot of staff time because the school was under-going accreditation, so CRDG and the interviewee decided it would be most useful to focus the evaluation on the most important project objective. (1) (SM+, ZPD+) •We already had an evaluation design and selected methods prior to CRDG's PD sessions. CRDG asked questions to make sure that the evaluation design was well-focused and the methods were appropriate. "It was really good because we questioned stuff. And I know for the rubric section, they gave us a lot of hints, good suggestions. Again, it was that one on one. The handouts really helped a lot. When they first introduced the {test name] that helped. We were wrestling with how to measure attitude changes." (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) Mixed: •The lecture-style overview was over my head. However, when another school staff started working on the questions for the evaluation design, the meaning behind the task and the process became clearer, "it gave me perspective." (1) (SM)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
5. Was the timing of the workshop appropriate? (Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)	Positive: •the timing of the professional development sessions about evaluations was fine. (2) (ZPD+) Negative: •preferred that the evaluation education sessions to be scheduled a little later. (1) (ZPD-) Mixed: •the evaluation was a little late. However, one interviewee added that the evaluation was still useful for them because they were able to work with CRDG to examine some important aspects of their project. Another interviewee added that they were already in the second year of the project and would have preferred that the evaluation education session started earlier in the year so "we have plenty of time." (2) (SC+, ZPD)	Positive: •the evaluation sessions were well timed. (4) (ZPD+) Negative: •the evaluation sessions were a little late because they would have preferred to complete the pre-testing of the instruments earlier. (1) (ZPD-)
6. How appropriate was the length of the workshop?	Positive: •the length of the professional development sessions were fine. The interviewees elaborated by stating that the length was good because they had time to meet with CRDG staff in small groups and the small group meeting with CRDG was well focused, his/her questions were answered, and next steps were planned. (4) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •the length of the sessions were good. (4) (ZPD+) No response. (1)

154

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
7. How appropriate was the focus of the workshop about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods? (Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)	Positive: •the focus was good. (2) (SM+, ZPD+) •didn't go to the workshop, but the project coordinator from his/her school who went to the workshop said it was better than the first workshop. (1) (ZPD+) Mixed: •the lecture-style portion of workshop was too generic and broad, but the handouts that CRDG provided at the workshop were helpful. (1) (SM, ZPD) No response. (1)	Positive: •the focus was good. One interviewees added that the written materials were very helpful. (3) (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •the professional development sessions were too broad and it would have been better if the participants were organized into small groups depending on the stage of their project. (1) (SM-, ZPD-) Mixed: •the workshop was confusing and not well focused, the focus was better at the end when there was time for CRDG to meet with them in a school group. (1) (SM, ZPD)
8&9. How good was the coverage of concepts about developing evaluation plans or the procedures for developing them? How good was the coverage of concepts about selecting evaluation methods or the procedures for selecting them? (Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)	Positive: •the coverage of concepts was good. One interviewee added that CRDG staff was "very helpful in answering my questions and suggesting what we could do. They had examples and they were very good at getting back to me." (3) (SM+, ZPD+) •didn't attend the sessions, instead, the coordinator from the school who attended the sessions stated that the session was great and he/she was able to develop the evaluation design. (1) (ZPD+) Negative: •the coverage of concepts was "too broad" but did not offer any elaboration. (1) (ZPD-)	Positive: •the coverage of concepts was good (4) (ZPD+) •they were able to get their questions obtained more information in the small group discussions with the CRDG Evaluation Principal Investigators. (1) (ZPD+)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
10. How understandable were the oral presentations in the workshops or elsewhere?	Positive: •the presentations were "very helpful" and fine." Some of the comments were that "the oral presentation were very clear, and he/she could relate it to an evaluation he/she was involved in previously" and "the oral presentation in the small group meetings with CRDG was the most helpful part of the professional development sessions." (4) (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •the materials were a little difficult to understand, but his/her prior experience helped him make sense of it. (1) (PE+, SM-, ZPD-)	Positive: •the oral presentations were fine, adding that the small group work was good. (3) (SM+, ZPD+) •the written materials together with the oral presentations were very helpful; "they both complemented each other. . . . It really helped to have both." (1) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)
11. How understandable were the written materials in the workshop or elsewhere?	Positive: •the written materials were "plentiful and fine . . . the discussions were a whole lot more helpful, " "the examples were very helpful," and "it was fine. . . .I was accustomed to the language already because I had worked with CRDG before." (2) (PE+, SM+, ZPD+) Mixed: •the written materials were good, although other coordinators may not have thought so. (1) (SM) No response. (2)	Positive: •the written materials were good and very helpful. Some comments were that the written materials were a good complement to the oral presentations and that the written materials helped them understand the vocabulary for evaluations. (5) (SM+, ZPD+)
12. How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?	Positive: •the personal consultations were helpful. Some comments were, "all good, " "they were practical in all their consultations and information," and "extremely." (5) (SM+, ZPD+)	Positive: •the personal consultations were helpful. Some comments were, "all good, " "they were practical in all their consultations and information," and "extremely." (5) (SM+, ZPD+)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
13. Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?	Positive: •there were sufficient opportunities to ask questions. (3) (ZPD+) Neutral: •did not address the question about the adequacy of opportunity to ask questions, but their responses are noteworthy. One interviewee stated that if they ran out of time to ask questions at any time, they were always able to followup with CRDG. (2) (ZPD)	Positive: •they had adequate opportunities to ask questions during this phase. Some comments were that, "CRDG was quick to get back to them," "[CRDG staff] were practical in all their consultations and information and always got right back to us. . . . They actually kept us on our toes. . . . This phase was great." (4) (SM+, ZPD+) Neutral: •didn't address the question but stated that they were able to establish common vocabulary for the evaluation and have good discussions in individual conversations with CRDG. (1) (SM+, ZPD+)
14. How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)	Positive: •CRDG's answers were good. One interviewee elaborated by stating that "the good part about CRDG when they do evaluations is they try to personalize it to the school and they try to be as least intrusive. So they try not to bother you but yet you know you can always call and ask questions. Very accommodating." (5) (SM+, ZPD+)	Positive: •CRDG's answers were good. One interviewee elaborated by stating that "the good part about CRDG when they do evaluations is they try to personalize it to the school and they try to be as least intrusive. So they try not to bother you but yet you know you can always call and ask questions. Very accommodating." (5) (SM+, ZPD+)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
15. When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)	Positive: •CRDG's monitoring and reminders were helpful. Some comments were, "very helpful," "very, because these are not just timelines but products that were due," "It was very helpful, . . . The focus was good and the coverage. [CRDG staff] was very helpful in answering my questions and suggesting what we could do. They had examples and they were very good at getting back to me," and "[CRDG staff] has been in contact with [school staff] and I know [school staff] is on top of things. That's helpful for us because we forget. We get caught up in the day to day things and forget the deadline is coming up and getting closer and closer." (4) (SM+, ZPD+) Mixed: •there was a problem in getting one of the CRDG staff members to understand the project, but it was eventually clarified. (1) (IS, SM, ZPD)	Positive: •positive comments about the helpfulness of CRDG's monitoring and reminders. Some comments were, "very helpful," "very good, wonderful," "the reminders and discussions about next steps were wonderful," "They always answered us and were quick to get back. . . . They were practical in all their consultations and information. . . . they actually kept us on our toes, . . . this phase was great," "good, better than earlier in the school year," and "It was OK." (5) (SM+, ZPD+)
16. How was CRDG's pace? (Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)	Positive: •CRDG's pace was "very good," "O.K.," and "very good." (4) (ZPD+) •not very involved in developing the evaluation design and selecting methods, but surmised that the pace was good. (1) (ZPD+)	Positive: •CRDG's pace was "all right" or "good." (5) (ZPD+)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD)
that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct
Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
17. Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase? (Interviewer prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)	Positive: •the consultations were "good," "very helpful in that they honed in on what we were doing," "probably more helpful in this phase than in the first phase," and "very helpful." (4) (SM+, ZPD+) Neutral: •merely recalled submitting a draft questionnaire to CRDG. CRDG revised it and return the questionnaire to the interviewee. (1) (LA)	Positive: •the consultation with CRDG helped to clarify the evaluation tasks. Some comments were: "good . . . they always answered us and were quick to get back. . . . they were practical in all their consultations," "it was very helpful very helpful because if you had questions about the surveys, [CRDG staff] would also look at them and then come up with her own ideas and suggest," and they had "difficulty coming up with their evaluation questions, but consultation with CRDG helped them clarify the task." (5) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+)
18. Overall, to what extent did the workshop, consultation, and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods?	Positive: •they were given adequate information to conduct the evaluation tasks. (4) (SM+, ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •CRDG provided them with sufficient information to conduct the evaluation tasks. (5) (SM+, ZPD+)
19. How well did CRDG explain the importance of developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods?	Positive: •CRDG explained the importance of the evaluation and they also believed it was important. (4) (SM+, SC+, ZPD+) Neutral: •"it's clouded because I learned from [CRDG staff] way back about how important it was." (1) (PE+, SC+, ZPD+)	Positive: •recalled CRDG explaining or indicating the importance of an evaluation and they also thought it was important. (5) (SC+, SM+)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
22. How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?	Positive: •division of responsibilities was fair. (4) (ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •division of responsibilities was fair. (4) (ZPD+) Negative •it was a little unfair because CRDG did more work than they expected, perhaps more than they should have. (1) (ZPD-)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
	Collecting evaluation data	
4. Tell me in general about how CRDG taught you to appropriately collect evaluation data and what influenced your learning.	Positive: •discussed with CRDG about the statistical appropriateness or validity of the data resulting from various methods and procedures for collecting data. It became clear that the "same directions and information would have to be given to each teacher" to ensure the consistency of the data. (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •CRDG was very helpful in discussions, providing written materials, and followup. (1) (SC+, ZPD+) •recalled that the data-collection procedures were based on the evaluation design. He/she could see how the target group for the data collection was selected based on their project objectives. (1) (IS+, SM+) •CRDG worked with them to make sure their evaluation questions were appropriate, select appropriate evaluation methods, and decide on their data-collection plan. "One thing I learned is there's information and data all over the place. You just need to know where it is and how to collect it. Many think data collection means gathering test scores. There's so much more to it than test scores, you also need to know what you're collecting it for." (1) (IS+, SM+) Neutral: •didn't recall how CRDG taught him/her to collect evaluation data. The data-collection method was a student questionnaire and the interviewee struggled with getting all the students to complete the questionnaire. (1) (LA)	Positive: •the on-going consultations with CRDG was most helpful because they were able to become clear about the focus of the evaluation, the evaluation design, and the procedures for collecting data. (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •CRDG "walked us through it. . . . They emphasized total quality control in collection techniques." (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •CRDG and the interviewee(s) identified the school's needs for evaluation data. Then, they selected questionnaires as the appropriate methods, identify respondent groups, and develop a data-collection plan. CRDG sent the interviewee various existing questionnaires which became the basis of the evaluation questionnaire. (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •CRDG "taught [us] that evaluation is like other science. It's based on solid principles and can be objective and you can really measure solid things. . . . It reinforced for me the need for solid data." (1) (IS+, SM+, ZPD+) •a main point in discussions with CRDG was that the data-collection plan was based on the purpose of the evaluation, that is, the decision between teachers or students as the respondent group is dependent on how the findings would be used. (1) (IS+, LA, SM+, ZPD+)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
5. Were the timing of the consultation sessions appropriate? (Interviewer prompt terms: too early in the school year, too late in the school year? Too early in the project, too late in the project?)	Positive: •the timing of the professional development about evaluations was good. (4) (ZPD+) Mixed: •it would have been nice to start earlier, but it was still "O.K." (1) (ZPD)	Positive: •the timing was good. (3) (ZPD+) Negative: •it was a little late. (1) (ZPD-) No response. (1)
6. How appropriate was the length of the consultation sessions?	Positive: •the length of the sessions were fine. The interviewees added that the discussions and written materials were very good, the length was good because there was enough time for CRDG staff to meet with small groups, there was enough time to talk to CRDG staff in small groups, and he/she would have liked more time for the small group meeting. (4) (ZPD+) No response. (1)	Positive: •stated that the length of the professional development sessions were good. (5) (ZPD+)
7. How appropriate was the focus of the consultation sessions about collecting evaluation data? (Interviewer prompts: too broad, narrow, complicated, simple?)	Positive: •the focus was appropriate. (5) (ZPD+)	Positive: •the focus was appropriate. (5) (ZPD+)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
8. How good was the coverage of concepts about collecting evaluation data or the procedures for appropriately collecting the data? (Interviewer prompts: difficulty, breadth)	Positive: •coverage of concepts was good. (5) (ZPD+)	Positive: •coverage of concepts was good. (5) (ZPD+)
9. How helpful was the personal consultation (if any) after the workshop, for example, by fax, e-mail, phone, or in person?	Positive: •the personal consultation with CRDG was helpful. Some comments were, "good," "very helpful in every respect—printouts, discussions, followup," "very helpful," "the email was terrific . . . [CRDG staff]'s organization was good," and "they were helpful." (SM+, ZPD+)	Positive: •the personal consultation was helpful. Some comments were "that was the best part," "that was great," and "I think that's what kept us on task. . . . {CRDG staff] was always accessible." (5) (SM+, ZPD+)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
10. Did you have enough opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation?	Positive: •there were sufficient opportunities to ask questions. (3) (ZPD+) neutral: •did not directly address the question, but their responses are noteworthy. (2) The written materials, discussion and followup were very helpful. The discussions were helpful when he/she was unsure about developing the questionnaire. Communicating by e-mail was very helpful and CRDG staff were very focused and organized during their communications, "[CRDG staff] would have a number of things [he/she] wanted to cover and we would just go over it and then at the end we'd go over O.K. what is pending that we're going to get back to each other. So when I left I would have 1, 2, 3 assignments that I would be doing and dates specific that I would do them by." (SM+, ZPD+)	Positive: •they had sufficient opportunities to ask questions during this phase of the evaluation. (5) (ZPD+)
11. How good were CRDG's answers to your questions or concerns? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their answers)	Positive: •CRDG's answers to questions were helpful. (4) (SM+, ZPD+) •wasn't very involved in the evaluation during this phase, but others who were involved were making progress with CRDG's help. (1) (ZPD+)	Positive: •CRDG's answers to their questions were "good," "very clear," "helpful," "excellent," and "very specific." (5) (SM+, ZPD+)

164

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
12. When CRDG monitored your progress and reminded you about next steps, how helpful were they? (Interviewer prompts: meaningfulness and clarity of their assistance)	Positive: •CRDG's reminders and monitoring were very helpful. One interviewee added that the e-mail communication was particularly helpful. (5) (ZPD+)	Positive: •CRDG's reminders and monitoring kept them on task. (5) (ZPD+)
13. How was CRDG's pace? (Interviewer's prompts: Did you ever think they tried to lead you too much? Were they too fast? Too slow? Too early or too late?)	Positive: •CRDG's pace was appropriate. Some comments from interviewees were, "O.K.," "perfect," "fine,"or "good." (5) (ZPD+)	Positive: •Some comments were that CRDG's pace was "O.K," "good," "thank goodness they were there to remind us," and "I remember once I had called [CRDG staff] and what was nice was that it felt OK even if she wasn't certain what I as talking about. 'That's OK, why don't you just send it in and we'll take a look at it.' That was a wonderful response." (5) (ZPD+)
14. Overall, how helpful was consultation with CRDG in clarifying your tasks in this phase? (Interviewer prompts: memos; task descriptions; communications in person, on the telephone, by e-mail)	Positive: •the consultation helped to clarify their tasks. Some comments were: "Good," "perfect," "very helpful," "the whole thing was good. . . . In particular the email was terrific," and "excellent." (5) (SM+, ZPD+)	Positive: •the consultations were helpful in clarifying the evaluation tasks. Some comments were: "very helpful," "sometimes I wasn't real clear what they were saying but when we talked enough, it clarified," and "definitely the personal service was most effective." (4) (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •"didn't necessarily want to hear it" and "I felt they were telling us one way, but the evaluation may be different; like they [CRDG] had a lot of confusions about the evaluation tasks." (1) (SM-, ZPD-)

(Table B1. Data to Address the First Evaluation Question: Aspects of the Professional Development (PD) that was Provided to a Sample of Public-School Administrators and Personnel in how to Conduct Summative Evaluations Influenced their Learning of Program Evaluation Skills, continued)

Questions	Administrators	School Personnel
15. Overall, to what extent did the consultation and printed guidelines provide sufficient information for you to appropriately collect evaluation data?	Positive: •CRDG provided them with adequate information to conduct the evaluation tasks. (5) (ZPD+)	Positive: •One interviewee added that sometimes they were not clear about the tasks at first, but the consultation with CRDG helped them to understand the process. (5) (IS+, SM, ZPD+)
16. How well did CRDG explain the importance of appropriately collecting evaluation data?	Positive: •recalled CRDG discussing the importance of the evaluation tasks and they also knew it was important. (4) (IS+, SC+, SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •CRDG staff must have assumed that he/she knew the importance and didn't really discuss it because "I knew it was important." (1) (SC+)	Positive: •CRDG discussed the importance of the evaluation tasks and they knew it was important. (5) (IS+, SC+, ZPD+)
19. How appropriate and fair were the division of responsibilities for the tasks among school staff and CRDG staff?	Positive: •the division of responsibilities were fair. (3) (ZPD+) •especially appreciated that CRDG did the analyses of data. (2) (ZPD+)	Positive: •the division of responsibilities were fair. (1) (ZPD+) •were "shocked" to receive the evaluation instruments ready to run off and distribute. (1) (ZPD+) •the interviewees took the major responsibility for data collection. (1) (ZPD+) Neutral: •weren't sure what CRDG's role was supposed to be, "So how would we know if the division was appropriate?" (1) (ZPD) •appreciated CRDG's contacting the data-entry service to work with them so they didn't have to compile all the data themselves. (1) (ZPD)

166

Table B2. Data to Address the Second Evaluation Question: What characteristics of Administrators or School Personnel who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Abounded for Learning Program Evaluation Skills?

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
	Background information	
1. What experiences have you had in evaluations previous to this evaluation?	Positive: •substantial prior experience with conducting evaluation tasks. (3) (PE+) •moderate levels of prior experience, but the interviewees stated that they were highly motivated to be involved in the evaluations. (2) (PE, SC+)	Moderate: •moderate levels of prior experiences with conducting evaluations (3) (PE) Neutral: •low levels to no prior experiences. (2) (PE-)
2. At the beginning of this year's evaluation, how did you feel about being selected to participate in it?	Positive: •the school staff "were really excited" about being involved in the evaluation. (1) (SC+) •they volunteered for the in-service education sessions about evaluations. The school staff members believed that evaluations are important because they build accountability into a project. (1) (MO+, SC+) •were required to participate in the evaluation, which was "fine" because they wanted to see if they could validate the project. (1) (SC+, MO+) •didn't have a problem with being involved in the evaluation. (2) (SC+)	Positive: •very open to the idea of the evaluation because they believed they needed some type of evaluation for their projects. (2) (SC+, MO+) •felt "fine" and "good" about participating in the evaluation despite their negative prior experiences with evaluation tasks. (1) (PE-, SC+) •they were required to participate in the evaluation as part of the grant, "so it didn't phase me." (1) (SC+) Mixed: •mixed feelings were reported between the two interviewees where one interviewee felt "mixed to negative" and the other interviewee felt "excited." (1) (SC)

NOTE: IN=internalization, IS=intersubjectivity, LA=learner's attention to components, LE=learner's environment, MO=motivation, PE=prior experience, SC=socio-cultural aspects, SM=semiotic mediation, ZPD=zone of proximal development. See Table 1 for an explanation of the codes. + indicates a positive comments, - indicates a negative comment, and no sign indicates a comment that is moderate, neutral, mixed, or unclear.

(Table B2. Data to Address the Second Evaluation Question: What Characteristics of Administrators or School Personnel Who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills?)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
3. How do you feel now about having been selected to participate?	Positive: •the evaluation was important to their project so they could measure the effectiveness of their efforts. (1) (MO+, SC+) •wasn't directly involved in the evaluation, tasks, claimed that the school's evaluation capacity at the school was enhanced because, in the evaluation process, the coordinators developed questionnaires and teachers became accustomed to responding to questionnaires. (1) (LE+, SC+) •became "a lot more comfortable with the idea of quantifying this information." (1) (SC+, IS+, ZPD+) •the experience was fine but did not offer elaboration. (1) (SC+) Mixed: •the evaluation was "useful" but the evaluation began late in the project and he/she wasn't able to collect data from all participants and not have had enough data for a good evaluation. (1) (SC+, ZPD-)	Positive: •their participation was a "learning experience in the most positive way" and they "were trying to apply it in other ways." (1) (SC+, ZPD+) •enjoyed learning about conducting evaluations, and the other interviewee was "pleased the way the teachers have responded to the need." (1) (LE+, MO+) •participation in the evaluation was "fine although the first year I was totally overwhelmed," and the other interviewee stated that his/her participation in the evaluation was "good because I knew I was going to learn a lot more despite the stress." (1) (SC+) Neutral: •wanted to wait to form an opinion about participating in the evaluation until they had the evaluation results, gained a better understanding about questions to ask in the evaluation and "that was really good." (1) (SC+)

(Table B2. Data to Address the Second Evaluation Question: What Characteristics of Administrators or School Personnel Who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills?)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
4. If there is a change in how you feel, what brought about that change?	Positive: •became "a lot more comfortable with the idea of quantifying this information." (1) (ZPD+) •the evaluation was useful but he/she was unsure that there were enough respondents because data was collected late in the project. (1) (SC+, ZPD-) Neutral: •no changes. (1) (ZPD) No response. (2)	Negative: •unhappy about the amount of data that were collected for the evaluation "I don't want all this data and then they don't need all of it." (1) (ZPD-) Mixed: •some struggle "getting buy in" from others at the school, but they were glad that they were able to get strong support from the principal and support from the teachers. (1) (LE, SC) •they learned a lot of useful information but they were "nervous about the design that we did—we kind of designed what we were going to do halfway into our program here so we settled on doing an eval based on some tests we had taken. . . . Not everybody took all the pre or post tests." (1) (PE, SM, ZPD-) Neutral: •no change (1) (ZPD) No response. (2)

(Table B2. Data to Address the Second Evaluation Question: What Characteristics of Administrators or School Personnel Who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills?)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
5. Why do you believe you were selected to participate in the evaluation?	Positive: •the school staff "were really excited" about being involved in the evaluation. (1) (LE+, SC+) •they volunteered for the professional development education sessions about evaluations and that the school staff members believed that evaluations are important to build accountability into a project. (1) (MO+, SC+) •believed that they were required to participate in the evaluation, which was "fine" because they wanted to see if they could validate the project. (1) (MO+, SC+) •agreeable to participating in the evaluation.(2) (SC+)	Positive: •very open to the idea of the evaluation, because they believed they needed some type of evaluation for their projects. (2) (MO+, SC+) •felt "fine" and "good" about participating in the evaluation despite their negative prior experiences with evaluation tasks. (1) (PE-, SC+) •they were required to participate in the evaluation as part of the grant, "so it didn't phase me." (1) (SC) Mixed: •opposing feelings of "mixed to negative" and "excited." (1) (SC)
13. What were your attitudes toward evaluation in general before this year?	Positive: •evaluations are necessary, important, and extremely critical because the information tells them if they are doing the right thing or not. (3) (MO+) Neutral: •had a "moderate" level of understanding about evaluation before the year and felt that the evaluations sections were the weakest sections in the grants that he/she wrote. (1) (PE-) No response. (1)	Positive: •important to their projects because they would be able to see the results of their efforts. (3) (MO+, SC+) Negative: •evaluations were stressful and the data collection was ill timed because it occurred at the end of the year. (1) (SC-, ZPD-) Mixed: •evaluations are necessary but "cumbersome" and that they weren't able to conduct an evaluation before the year in which they worked with CRDG. (1) (MO+, SC-, PE-)

(Table B2. Data to Address the Second Evaluation Question: What Characteristics of Administrators or School Personnel Who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills?)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
14&15. At this point, how do you feel about evaluations in general? If there's a change, what brought it about?	Positive: •able to use the opportunity of working with CRDG to take a further examination of their project. In that first interview, the staff were able to work collaboratively to decide on the focus of the teacher questionnaire and write the items. (1) (MO+, SC+, ZPD+) •appreciated that the professional development education sessions on conducting evaluations was part of the grant. (1) (SC+) •gained more understanding about conducting evaluations by working with CRDG. (1) (ZPD+) No response. (2)	Positive: •evaluations were very important and they felt more positive about evaluations. (1) (MO+, SC+, ZPD+) •realized how important assessment is and stated that "if you can't evaluate what you're doing, you might be wasting all your time . . . it drives your actions." (1) (MO+, •evaluations are very essential. (1) (MO+) •the support from CRDG made the evaluation process easier because CRDG staff were "responsive and hands-on." (1) (SM+, ZPD+) Negative: •felt the same about evaluations as at the beginning of the year (that is, that evaluations are stressful and difficult because of the data-collection time frames). (1) (SC-, ZPD-)

171

Table B3. Data to Address the Third Evaluation Question: What Aspects of the School Environment of the Administrators and School Personnel who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills?

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
	Background information	
6&7. At the beginning of this school year, how many others at the school were aware of your participation in the evaluation? What positions did they hold?	Positive: •everyone at the schools were aware of the interviewees' participation in the evaluation. In one interview, everyone in the school were informed. In another interview, all teacher leaders, coordinators, and department heads knew about it. (2) (LE+) Moderate: •only principals and coordinators were aware of the interviewees' involvement in the evaluation. (3) (LE)	Moderate: •only principals and coordinators were aware. (2) (LE) Mixed: •all or almost all school staff were told about the interviewee's participation in the evaluation but the staff were not very interested in it. (1) (LE) •all or almost all school staff knew about the interviewees' participation in the evaluation, but did not know very much about the evaluation. (2) (LE)
8. Before the evaluation began, what do you think your school administrators' and other staff's attitudes were about your having to do the evaluation?	Positive: •either everyone knew about and were comfortable with the evaluation or some people knew about the evaluation and were motivated about the tasks. (4) (LE+, SC+) Neutral: •administrators just wanted to know what they needed to do. (1) (LE)	Mixed: •the school staff who knew about the evaluation were willing to cooperate with the evaluation but did not think the evaluation was very important or did not comprehend it. (3) (MO-, LE, SC+) •the school staff just accepted that the interviewee had to do the evaluation. (1) (LE) •administrators were supportive, but the interviewees weren't sure about the attitudes of other school staff. (1) (LE, SC+)

NOTE: IN=internalization, IS=intersubjectivity, LA=learner's attention to components, LE=learner's environment, MO=motivation, PE=prior experience, SC=socio-cultural aspects, SM=semiotic mediation, ZPD=zone of proximal development. See Table 1 for an explanation of the codes. + indicates a positive comments, - indicates a negative comment, and no sign indicates a comment that is moderate, neutral, mixed, or unclear.

(Table B3. Data to Address the Third Evaluation Question: What Aspects of the School
Environment of the Administrators and School Personnel who Participated in the Professional
Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills? Continued)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
9&10. At this point in the school year, how many others at the school are now aware of your participation in the evaluation? What positions do they hold?	Positive: •all or almost all staff knew about the interviewees' participation in the evaluation at the end of the school year. (3) (LE+) •slight increases in the school staffs' awareness about the interviewees' participation in the evaluation where there had been lower levels of awareness before the evaluation training. (2) (LE+)	Positive: •all or almost all faculty and staff knew about the interviewees' participation in the evaluation. (4) (LE+) Mixed: •project teachers knew about it, but maybe not all teachers. (1) (LE)
11. What do you think their attitudes are now about having the evaluation done at the school?	Positive: •the school staff were comfortable with doing evaluations. (2) (LE+, SC+) Unclear: •the administrators and school staffs' attitudes at the end of the year were reported as unclear. (2) (LE) No response. (1)	Positive: •improvement of attitudes. (4) (LE+, SC+) Neutral: •school staff accepted that the interviewee had to do the evaluation. (1) (LE)

(Table B3. Data to Address the Third Evaluation Question: What Aspects of the School Environment of the Administrators and School Personnel who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills? Continued)

174

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
Writing a project description		
20. Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks? (Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection)	Positive: •adequate resources (2) (LE+) Moderate: •moderate resources (1) (LE) Negative: •inadequate resources (1) (LE-) •One no response	Positive: •adequate resources (1) (LE+) Moderate: •moderate resources (2) (LE) Negative: •inadequate resources (1) (LE-) No response. (1)
22–25. How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about writing a project description? If you consulted with others at your school, what types of information did they provide, how do you think they felt about being consulted about writing a project description, and to what extent did the information you got help you to write the project description?	Positive: •everyone at the school was informed about the evaluation and many provided feedback. (1) (LE+) •several school staff (including administrators and coordinators) were informed and provided feedback. (1) (LE+) •everyone at the school was informed about the evaluation, receiving feedback from some staff, and had extensive consultation with the project consultant. (1) (LE+) Unclear: •did not consult anyone, but it was not necessary. (1) (LE) No response. (1)	Unclear: •at most, the principal was consulted and information was provided to a few other staff. (2) (LE) •did not consult with anyone. (2) (LE) No response. (1)

(Table B3. Data to Address the Third Evaluation Question: What Aspects of the School Environment of the Administrators and School Personnel who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills? Continued)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
26–28. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *role or status* in your school? If it has changed, how so? Why do you think it has changed?	Positive: •the school staff became clearer about the value of the evaluation. (1) (LE+) Neutral: •no changes. (3) (LE) No response. (1)	Neutral: •no changes. (4) (LE) No response. (1)
29–31. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *level of influence* on school decisions and activities? If it has changed, how so? Why do you think it has changed?	Positive: •increased in the whole school complex. (1) (LE+) •believed that the evaluation influenced the staff to clarify their value of accountability. (1) (LE+) Neutral: •no changes. (3) (LE)	Neutral: •no changes. (4) (LE) No response. (1)
Developing an evaluation design and selecting methods		
21. Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks? (Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection)	Positive: •adequate resources (3) (LE+) Moderate: •moderate levels of resources (1) (LE) Negative: •inadequate resources. (1) (LE-)	Positive: •adequate resources. (4) (LE+) Negative: •inadequate resources. The school administration was not supportive of the evaluation tasks. (1) (LE-)

(Table B3. Data to Address the Third Evaluation Question: What Aspects of the School
Environment of the Administrators and School Personnel who Participated in the Professional
Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills? Continued)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
23–26. How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods, what types of information did they provide, how do you think they felt about being consulted about developing an evaluation plan and selecting evaluation methods, and to what extent did the information you got help you to develop an evaluation plan and select evaluation methods?	Positive: •everyone at the school was involved in the evaluation. (1) (LE+) •project consultants were involved and staff had opportunities for input. (1) (LE+) Moderate: •some staff gave input into the evaluation. (1) (LE) Unclear: •not necessary to consult anyone. (1) (LE) •was not very involved in the tasks for this component. (1) (LE)	Moderate: •the principal and some teachers were consulted to plan the evaluation. (1) (LE) •the project teachers were consulted. (1) (LE) •the principal and one other staff member were consulted. (1) (LE) Unclear: •only the principal was consulted. (1) (LE) •the principal was just informed (1) (LE)
27–29. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *role or status* in your school? If it has changed, how so? Why do you think it has changed?	Positive: •looked on as more of a facilitator and others at the school assumed the main responsibility for the evaluation. (1) (LE+) Neutral: •no changes. But it was also reported that the interviewees' role or status may have changed depending on the evaluation findings. (1) (LE) •no changes. (3) (LE)	Positive: •the staff may have had a more positive view because the interviewees' participation in the evaluation meant that the other staff did not have to do the evaluation tasks. (1) (LE+) Neutral: •no change but that this might have changed depending on the evaluation findings. (1) (LE) •no changes. (3) (LE)

(Table B3. Data to Address the Third Evaluation Question: What Aspects of the School Environment of the Administrators and School Personnel who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills? Continued)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
30–32. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *level of influence* on school decisions and activities? If it has changed, how so? Why do you think it has changed?	Positive: •increase of influence in the complex. (1) (LE+) •able to further convince the school staff of the importance of conducting evaluations. (1) (LE+) Neutral: •no changes. (2) (LE) No response. (1)	Positive: •an increased level of influence evidenced by the principal's providing more staff to work on the evaluation. (1) (LE+) •the importance of the evaluation had increased their level of influence because other schools were interested in the findings to make decisions about adopting the project. (1) (LE+) Neutral: •no changes. (3) (LE)

	Collecting evaluation data	
18. Did you have adequate resources to devote to the evaluation tasks? (Interviewer prompts: personnel availability, funds, and arrangements for data collection)	Positive: •adequate resources. One interviewee stated that the school environment was very open to the evaluation tasks and they had many school wide meetings to discuss the project and evaluation. (2) (LE+) Negative: •inadequate resources. (1) (LE-) Moderate: •moderate resources. (2) (LE)	Positive: •adequate resources. (3) (LE+) Negative: •inadequate resources. (1) (LE-) •did not directly address the question. Instead, they stated that they were overwhelmed with the amount of data collected, "the only thing that would have been horrendous would be the compiling of it." They were looking forward to CRDG's help, "[CRDG staff] told us about a data service and she made the contact for us which was wonderful … " (1) (LE-)

177

(Table B3. Data to Address the Third Evaluation Question: What Aspects of the School Environment of the Administrators and School Personnel who Participated in the Professional Development Sessions Accounted for Learning Program Evaluation Skills? Continued)

Questions	Administrators	School personnel
20–23. How much did you consult with others at your school when making decisions about collecting evaluation data? If you consulted with others at your school, what types of information did they provide, how do you think they felt about being consulted about collecting evaluation data, and to what extent did the information you got help you to appropriately collection evaluation data?	Positive: •school-wide involvement. (1) (LE+) Moderate: •a few others at the school were consulted. (3) (LE) Unclear: •it was not necessary to consult with anyone else. (1) (LE)	Positive: •it was reported that teachers provided input. (1) (LE+) Moderate: •the principal and some teachers provided input. (1) (LE+) Unclear: •some teachers were consulted. (1) (LE) •the principal was the only one consulted. (2) (LE)
24–26. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *role or status* in your school? If it has changed, how so? Why do you think it has changed?	Neutral: •no changes. (5) (LE)	Neutral: •no changes. (2) (LE) Unclear: •their role or status with others at the school might have changed depending on the evaluation findings. (2) (LE) •others thought that the interviewee already had a lot of power because of his/her control over their budgets. (1) (LE)
27–29. Has your participation in this phase of the evaluation training and evaluation tasks changed your *level of influence* on school decisions and activities? If it has changed, how so? Why do you think it has changed?	Neutral: •no changes. (3) (LE) No response. (2)	Negative: •reported that "they just think I'm a nag." (1) (LE-) •the interviewee used up "IOU's" in order to get the evaluation tasks completed. (1) (LE-) Neutral: •no changes. (3) (LE)

References

Babbie, E. (1989). *The practice of social research* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bayer, A. S. (1996). Orchestrating a text mediational view of vygotsky in a college classroom. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 3*(3), 165–184.

Borg, W. R., Gall, J. P., & Gall, M. D. (1993). *Applying educational research: A practical guide.* New York: Longman.

Brandon, P. R. (1997). *A summary of evaluation and research findings on Special Needs Schools, a site-managed program.* (Report No. 029697001). Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Curriculum Research & Development Group, Evaluation Office.

Brandon, P. R., & Higa, T. F. (1997a). *Developing evaluation designs and collecting data in school-conducted evaluations of site-managed projects.* Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Curriculum Research & Development Group, Evaluation Office.

Brandon, P. R., & Higa, T. F. (1997b). *A report on the evaluation services provided to the Incentive and Innovation Grants Program in School Year 1996–97.* (Report No. 029697001). Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Curriculum Research & Development Group, Evaluation Office.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruffee, K. A. (1995). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

Cousins, J. B., & Earl, L. M. (1992). The case for participatory evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14,* 397–418.

Cousins, J. B., & Earl, L. M. (Eds.). (1995). *Participatory evaluation in education: Studies in evaluation use and organizational learning.* London: Falmer.

Dalton, S. (1989, April). *Teachers as assessors and assistors.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Galusha, J. M. (1998). *The role of subject matter in adult learning.* Hattiesburg, MI: University of Southern Mississippi. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 416 379).

Guy, T. C. (1999). Culture as context for adult education: The need for culturally relevant adult education. In S. Imel (Ed.), *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* (pp. 5–19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holton, E. F., III, & Swanson, R. A. (1999). *Reframing the andragogical model of adult learning.* (Report No. CE 078 963). Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 431 933).

Incentive and Innovation Grants Program, H. B. 2156, H. Draft 2, S, Draft 2, C. Draft 1, 4/30/93.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. *The Sage CommText Series, no. 5.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lee, L. E., & Cousins, J. B. (1995). Participation in evaluation of funded school improvement: Effects and supporting conditions. In J. B. Cousins & L. M. Earl (Eds.), *Participatory evaluation in education: Studies in evaluation use and organizational learning* (pp. 72–85). London: Falmer.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Nevo, D. (1994). Combining internal and external evaluation: A case for school-based evaluation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 20*(1), 87–98.

Nevo, D. (1995). *School-based evaluation: A dialogue for school improvement.* Great Yarmouth, England: Pergamon.

Office of Accountability and School Instructional Support. (1997a). *Memorandum of agreement (Incentive and Innovation Grants Program).* Honolulu: Hawai'i Department of Education.

Office of Accountability and School Instructional Support. (1997b). *Memorandum of agreement (Special Needs Schools Program).* Honolulu: Hawai'i Department of Education.

Office of Instructional Services. (1989). *Special-needs schools: Administrators' handbook.* Honolulu: Hawai'i Department of Education.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Pressley, M., & McCormick, C. B. (1995). *Advanced educational psychology for educators, researchers, and policymakers.* New York: HarperCollins.

Rogoff, B., Baker-Sennett, J., Lacasa, P., & Goldsmith, D. (1995). Development through participation in sociocultural activity. *New directions for child development, 67,* 45–65.

Rommetveit, R. (1979). On the architecture of intersubjectivity. In R. Rommetveit & R. Blaker (Eds.), *Studies of language, thought, and verbal communication* (pp. 98–108). London: Academic.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life.* New York: Cambridge.

Tirrell, M. K. (1985, March). *Teaching assistants as teachers and writers: Developmental issues in TA training.* Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Minneapolis.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Walberg, H. J., & Haertel, G. D. (Eds.). (1990). *The international encyclopedia of educational evaluation.* Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Wang, Z., Brandon, P. R., Higa, T. F., & Saka, S. (1996). *The merit and worth of projects in the Incentive and Innovation Grants Program during School Year 1994–95.* (Report No. 029596002). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Curriculum Research & Development Group, Evaluation Office.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University.

Wertsch, J. V., & Bivens, J. A. (1992). The social origins of individual mental functioning: Alternatives and perspectives. *The Quarter Newsletter of the Laboratory of comparative Human Cognition, 14*(2), 35–44.

Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P., & Newcomer, K. E. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of practical program evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.