DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 156 95 TM 004 603

AUTHOR Watkins, Debra A.; Anderson, Beverly L.
TITLE The Development of Techniques for Evaluating a School-Community Change Process.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [Apr 75]
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D. C., March 30-April 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Community Involvement; Community Role; Community Support; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Formative Evaluation; Rural Education; *Rural Schools

ABSTRACT

The authors describe (1) methods for evaluation of a strategy for community involvement in educational problem-solving being developed by a regional laboratory, and (2) initial results obtained in several schools and communities in western states. Critical elements of the strategy include outside change agents and representative school-community groups. Observational techniques, interviews, questionnaires, event logs, and historical records were used in the evaluation. Evaluation methods indicated whether the important strategy elements occurred and gave preliminary indications of the degree to which strategy objectives were attained. Increasing community involvement efforts make it incumbent upon evaluators to develop appropriate techniques for assessing their success. (Author)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNIQUES FOR EVALUATING A SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CHANGE PROCESS

PREPARED FOR AERA 1975

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNIQUES FOR EVALUATING A SCHOOL-COMMUNITY CHANGE PROCESS

Debra A. Watkins

Beverly L. Anderson

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Prepared for Presentation at the
AERA Convention, 1975

Published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation supported in part as a regional educational laboratory by funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the Institute should be inferred.

The purpose of this paper is to share some of the techniques evolved to evaluate a developing school-community change process. Work on this process is now being done by the staff of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory's Rural Education Program under a contract with the National Institute of Education. The process being developed is called the Rural Futures Development (RFD) Strategy and is aimed at helping rural school systems and their constituents initiate and carry out changes in their schools.

This paper is not intended to describe the RFD Strategy in detail. However, for orientation purposes we will provide a brief overview of the Strategy in the first section. In Section II we will describe briefly the three stages of Strategy testing being employed. In the third and major section we will discuss the variety of evaluation techniques employed during initial testing of one component of the Strategy. And in the final section we will present implications this initial testing experience has for those who must evaluate other school-community change processes.

Section I - What is Being Evaluated

The RFD Strategy has as its goal improved local problem solving through (1) increased control of educational change by local rural community members and school personnel and (2) improved support services for rural schools by state and regional education agencies.

To initiate use of the RFD Strategy, a state education agency must agree to employ the Strategy in a pilot site in the state. This site is chosen from regional educational service agencies and local school districts that indicate their willingness to participate in the Strategy.

Selected individuals from the regional agency that is chosen are then trained to become "process facilitators" in pilot communities and schools in the districts they serve. In addition, other personnel in the state and regional agencies are given training that will prepare them to support the process in the pilot site and to expand it to other sites. For example, certain state agency employees, through an apprenticeship, are trained to be future process facilitators.

After some initial training, process facilitators engage local citizens, educators, students and school board members in a comprehensive process for planning school change. In this process, local people identify a priority problem to be solved, select the solution from among others that have been proposed, implement the selected solution and evaluate its effectiveness in solving the problem.

The groups primarily involved in carrying out this process at the local level are (1) the school staff, (2) a school-community group (made up of representative educators, community members and students), (3) the school board and (4) school leaders.

The Rural Education Program is presently developing materials and procedures for use by community members, school staff members, school board members, school leaders, process facilitators and support agency personnel to implement the RFD Strategy. At present, the Strategy is in its second testing phase (discussed in the next section). This testing differs from previous testing in that, for the first time, it involves installing the entire Strategy in one western state. Information gathered through this test is critical to further refinement of the Strategy.

RFD Strategy Objectives

The RFD Strategy objectives can be divided into two general categories--process objectives and outcome objectives. *Process objectives* focus on the events that occur when the RFD Strategy is implemented appropriately. Examples of process events are formal and informal training sessions for process facilitators, meetings of school-community groups, agreements on budget allocations by school boards, and events in which certain systematic problem solving procedures are used in educational agencies. *Outcome objectives* describe changes that should take place by the end of a two-year implementation effort. These outcome objectives include: (1) improved communication about decision making among school personnel, students, school board members, and community members, (2) greater influence by students, school staff, and community members upon decisions made by the school board and staff,

(3) increased commitment on the part of state and regional education agencies to the use of procedures which promote local problem solving and decision making and (4) increased state and regional ability to support local problem solving activities. Thus, process objectives focus on means, and outcome objectives focus on ends. Refinement of these objectives continues as Strategy testing continues.

Basic Assumptions Underlying the RFD Strategy

The RFD Strategy is built on several basic assumptions about effective educational change: (1) people who are affected by decisions should help make those decisions, (2) communities and schools should learn how to select, from among several alternatives, the solutions they deem best to solve their own problems, (3) a systematic approach to solving problems helps people make the best use of available time and resources and (4) certain skills are needed by participants in decision making to ensure that problems are satisfactorily resolved. The RFD Strategy does not attempt to provide packaged solutions to rural problems. Rather, it provides a process that encourages local initiative and participation in determining educational change.

Theoretical Base of the Strategy

The theoretical base upon which the change strategy is built is derived primarily from the work of Havelock (1969), Lippett (1973), Bales (1970), Williamson (1971), and Schmuck

and Runkel (1972). Essential elements are: (1) establishing a linkage system for diffusing innovations, à la Havelock; (2) providing an external change agent--the process facilitator--to intervene in the system, as suggested by Lippett; (3) providing training in communication, problem solving and group process as described by Schmuck, Runkel and Bales; and (4) developing the school's organizational capacity to inquire into its own functioning at various levels, à la Williamson. The basic learning model upon which the Strategy is built is presented in the work of Woodruff (1971). For a further explanation of the theoretical base, see Sayers (1974).

Section II - How the Strategy Is Being Developed and Tested

Development

An iterative and interactive process of Strategy development and testing is being used by the Rural Education Program. Such a procedure is built on the program's strong commitment to field based development.

Initial development work on the RFD Strategy was done by having teams of developers work rather independently on major products and processes that should constitute the Strategy. For example, one group worked on the products and processes needed to establish *a school-community group* that would conduct an assessment of educational needs in the local community. Other developers have focused their work on the

products and processes needed to help the *school organization* incorporate desired changes (identified through the needs assessment) into the educational system. Other developers focused on developing products or processes to help *state and regional educational service agencies* to provide responsive support to *local educational agencies*.

The developer teams produced initial drafts of materials for community members, school personnel, school board members, process facilitators and support agency personnel to use in implementing the Strategy. They also developed plans for training process facilitators and other RFD personnel. During the development of such initial drafts of products and plans, the first phase of testing occurred.

The First Phase of Testing

The first phase of testing--*exploratory testing*--is primarily intended to obtain user and/or expert reactions to products and product pieces as initial drafts are developed. For expert or user review, the product must be in a tangible form and be accompanied by clear statements of its goals, objectives, and intended uses. Prior to such a review, limited trials of the product with intended users may also be carried out to answer selected development questions. Thus, separate elements of the Strategy were tested with experts and users before the entire Strategy was installed in a field site.

During exploratory testing, questions such as the following were asked: (1) What skills and knowledge are not adequately covered by the product? (2) What changes in product format, methodology and communication systems should be made? (3) Are Strategy and product objectives adequate? (5) What problems are likely to be encountered during implementation of the Strategy? (6) What is the cost of product or process use?

The Second Phase of Testing

Before embarking on the second phase of development and testing, developer teams were reconstituted so they no longer focused on organizations and institutions (i.e., community, school and support agencies). The new teams work across these areas in ways that provide greater opportunity for seeing where gaps and redundancies exist in the products and processes constituting the Strategy. For example, one team focuses on procedures for conducting all training sessions, one focuses on manuals process facilitators will use in working with both the community and school and another is actively engaged in installing the total Strategy in a site.

Total Strategy installation constitutes the basis for the second testing phase. This phase, referred to as *Site A testing*, is now in progress. It involves one state education agency and one local education agency or school district. Site A testing is primarily designed to determine where gaps or redundancies in the Strategy occur and whether or not

intended processes can be implemented. These determinations are based on how parts function in the total context of Strategy use. Thus, in Site A, evaluators are almost exclusively concerned with providing data that facilitate refinement and delineation of the Strategy definition and process objectives.

The Third Phase of Testing

For the third phase of testing, the Strategy, its component products and processes are intended to be in a close-to-final state. This testing phase is being referred to as *Site B testing*. It, like the Site A testing, will involve installing the entire Strategy in a site. But in Site B, installation will be on a broader and more complete scale than it was in Site A. It is planned that Site B will consist of a state education agency, at least *two* regional educational service agencies, at least *four* local education agencies and at least *two comparison* local education agencies. This phase of testing is intended to begin within the next nine months. (Because of the length of time required to complete each of these phases of Strategy testing--about two years--there is considerable overlap of the testing phases.)

In the Site B test, the evaluators will be concerned not only with the degree to which the Strategy is implemented (as reflected in the process objectives), but also with the extent to which the Strategy's outcome objectives are met. An evaluation design for Site B involving comparison sites

is planned to increase the validity of the evaluation and thus make it possible to more credibly attribute observed effects to the RFD Strategy.

The Purpose of Testing

The purpose of each phase of testing is strictly to provide Strategy developers and installers with formative evaluation data which will help them refine the Strategy. The sequence of exploratory testing, Site A testing, and Site B testing is designed to provide evaluative data appropriate for the particular state of the RFD Strategy's development.

Section III - Techniques Employed During Exploratory Testing

A discussion of the exploratory testing of all parts of the RFD Strategy is beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, we will restrict our discussion to the exploratory test of one part of the Strategy. Interest in community involvement in schools appears to be growing rapidly. If this is true, it is very important that evaluation procedures for assessing such activities exist. Good, pertinent evaluation can maximize the likelihood that any community involvement will be of value to both the community and the school. For this reason we have chosen to focus on the evaluation of that aspect of the RFD Strategy that is concerned with obtaining the community's involvement in instituting educational change.

During the exploratory testing phase of the RFD Strategy's development, the community aspect of the Strategy was the most extensively tested part. The evaluation work constituting this test was designed primarily to provide developers with information that would help them improve their materials and training procedures. However, a second purpose of testing was to help evaluators determine which kinds of evaluation techniques would be most useful for the subsequent testing phases.

During the exploratory testing phase, the major trial of the community aspect of the RFD Strategy occurred over an 18-month period. Fifty members of a state education agency were trained as process facilitators to establish school-community groups whose purpose was to conduct a needs assessment and work for the implementation of educational change based on that needs assessment. The training was done through seven formal two- or three-day training sessions conducted by developers. Concurrently, about 75 percent of the trainees engaged in field work. As process facilitators, they assisted rural communities in determining their local educational needs and establishing means to meet such needs.

The evaluation techniques that are discussed below were used to gather information from (1) process facilitator trainees during formal training sessions and while working in communities, (2) trainers of process facilitators, (3) community members where the process was being used and (4) documents

which contained data about the process. The evaluation techniques employed and discussed below are: skill self-rating scales, training session questionnaires, training observation schedules, logs of field events, school-community member questionnaires and interviews, process events check-lists and reviews of historical documents (such as newspaper articles, memos and trip reports). An overview of each technique showing what questions were addressed, the nature of the results obtained and the relative merits of each technique can be found in Table 1.

In the following discussion, we will provide examples of the use of each of these techniques. Since this paper is directed toward evaluators of community-school change processes, rather than those directly involved in conducting such processes, the discussion provides a minimal amount of detail concerning specific data gathered. Rather, it focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of various evaluation techniques for the exploratory testing of the community aspect of the RFD Strategy.

Training Session Evaluation Techniques

As mentioned earlier, seven formal training sessions were held for process facilitators. During the training sessions three types of evaluation techniques were used: (1) observation schedules, (2) skill self-ratings and (3) questionnaires focused on satisfaction with sessions.

Table 1

Summary of Techniques, Evaluation Questions, Findings and Relative Merits of Techniques Used During Exploratory Testing

Measurement Techniques	Examples of Evaluation Questions Addressed	Examples of Major Findings	Advantages of Technique Use	Disadvantages of Technique Use
1. Skills Self-Rating Scales	-Do process facilitator trainees acquire necessary skills? -Do trainees acquire confidence in their ability to perform process facilitator tasks?	-Preliminary data indicates trainees acquired skills and gained confidence at varying degrees across skills	-Assesses complicated skills -Techniques can be used easily with large number of respondents -Instrument easily administered -Data easily tabulated -Respondents were cooperative	-Technique dependent on respondent's security, self-awareness and honesty
2. Trainee Questionnaire	-What changes in format, training methodology or content are needed? -What skills and knowledge were not adequately covered by training?	-Format, training methodology and product content changes of varying magnitudes were needed	-Provides direct data on specific changes to make in products -Instrument easily administered -Close-ended items easily tabulated -Respondents were cooperative	-Difficult to weigh importance of divergent suggested changes -Open-ended items may elicit more data than is manageable
3. Nonparticipant Training Session Observation Schedule	-Are planned modes of training utilized?	-Two modes of training were implemented as planned	-Focuses on specific behaviors of trainers and trainees and characteristics of training session	-Requires training of observer
4. Participant Training Session Observation Schedule	-What specific strong and weak aspects of the training session do trainees identify?	-Boring and confusing areas were identified -Strong aspects of training sessions were identified	-Micro view of training process is obtained	-Time-consuming for respondents -Possible interference with training process -Difficult to analyze

Table 1 (continued)

Measurement Techniques	Examples of Evaluation Questions Addressed	Examples of Major Findings	Advantages of Technique Use	Disadvantages of Technique Use
5. Field Events Log	-What problems are encountered during implementation? -What additional materials are needed? -What are the specific events which are and/or should be occurring?	-Needed materials and problem areas were identified -Some clarification of events was provided	-Detailed data on which to base revisions and generate additional materials is obtainable -Allows for gathering of unique data from different situations	-Time-consuming for respondents -Difficult and time-consuming to analyze -Variation in level of detail provided by respondents
6. Process Events Checklist	-How much does it cost to carry out the process? -How much time is required to carry out the process? -Did anticipated events occur?	-Costs were estimated at approximately $5,000 per year per community served -Time allocations need modification to complete Strategy installation in two year time period -Some events occurred in all communities, others did not	-Instrument easily administered -Data easily analyzed	-Required more specific definition of events than was possible given the stage of development
7. Historical Documents Review -newspaper -memos -letters -trip reports -meeting minutes -agency budgets	-How much does it cost to carry out the process? -How much time is required to carry out the process? -Did anticipated events occur?	Same as item 6 above	-Data can be collected at any time -Some kind of documents (e.g., newspapers) easily acquired	-Information not always complete -Variation in level of detail of documents -Time consuming to analyze
8. School-Community Group Member and Administrator Questionnaire with Follow-up Interview	-Are groups representative of the local population? -What problems arose during implementation? -Did the process facilitator act appropriately?	-Some groups were not representative of the total population -Community people found needs assessment data tabulation time-consuming and attendance slacked off. A need to see accomplishments sooner was identified -School-Community Group members and administrators perceive that process facilitator acted appropriately	-Provided data on both success indicators and changes needed -Provides variety of options in ways to conduct follow-up interview (e.g., all respondents or sample of respondents, variation in time) -Allows comparison of responses of two different groups (i.e., School-Community Group members and administrators)	-Time-consuming to collect data

Nonparticipant and participant training session observation schedules. To provide developers with data that could help them improve the training sessions, it was first necessary to determine if training was actually occuring as planned. Certain components of training were to be conducted as seminars and others as exercises. Nonparticipant observation schedules were used to determine whether or not trainers actually conducted training according to the methodology intended. Two observers trained in the distinctive features of seminar and exercise methodologies recorded behaviors at each session.

During sessions a participant observation schedule was used to determine as specifically as possible the strong and weak areas of training. Two trainees were given an observation schedule and asked to record their reactions to the training. They were also asked to give a brief description of what was happening at five-minute intervals during the training session so that evaluators could determine when trainees became bored or confused by what was presented or done. Particularly clear or interesting points could also be detected in this way. Developers found this precise micro level data from both the nonparticipant and participant observation procedures to be helpful in (a) clarifying distinctions between the modes of training and (b) determining specific strong and weak parts of the training.

Skills self-rating scales. Skills self-rating scales were used at various points during the series of training sessions to determine if trainees felt that they were acquiring the skills being taught. The training was intended to provide trainees with skills in such areas as interpersonal communication, problem solving and helping others to locate resources. Self-ratings of trainee self-confidence in their skills were used to measure skills acquisition. One such self-rating scale was administered at the fourth training session on a pre-post basis. The scales were developed by evaluators following discussions with trainers concerning the critical skills to be learned by trainees. Trainees were classified as having high, low or no field experience when they responded to the rating scales. Appendix A contains the rating scales and the average responses for the three groups on both the pre- and the post-session ratings. Such data showing pre-post training differences between trainees with varying degrees of experience were useful to developers as they decided which aspects of the training needed strengthening. The data were also helpful to evaluators as they worked on refining skills self-rating scales for future testing activities.

To determine what content might have been overlooked in designing the training, we acquired from other experts in the field a broad sample of self-rating knowledge and skill items dealing with the same general areas as those taught in the workshop. Such items were used to construct another

self-rating instrument (see Appendix B) on which trainees were asked to rate their levels of knowledge or skill and to indicate whether on not they knew where to get help with weak areas. This served as a check on whether the training had adequately covered a content area.

A self-rating scale can be helpful in evaluating many kinds of training, and the data obtained can be quickly analyzed. Since a self-rating scale requires clear statements of the skills to be acquired, its preparation can also serve a useful function in helping trainers clarify their intents for the training session. Finally, self-ratings can be used in conjunction with peer and trainer ratings to produce an even more reliable estimate of the trainees' abilities.

Trainee questionnaires. Another technique used during exploratory testing of training was the administration to trainees of questionnaires using Likert scales, open-ended questions, and multiple choice response items. For example, trainees were asked to respond to a short ten-item form after each one-hour training event. Each trainee responded to one of two forms of the questionnaire so that more data could be gathered without over-burdening respondents. This technique was used to gather data on the technical quality of materials, contribution of materials to learning, degree to which events maintained trainee interest, clarity of concept development, appropriateness of the level of detail presented and adequacy of opportunity for discussion. For example, trainees were

asked if they preferred more, less or the same amount of reading material, practice in new behavior, structuring of work, discussion and theoretical framework. (See Appendix C for an example of one such questionnaire.) The data gathered were very helpful in giving developers ideas on how to improve the training sessions. On the basis of such data in conjunction with data gained through the other means discussed above, revisions were made in the training methodology, the format and content of materials, and the communication system used to convey the content of training. Multiple methods of data gathering were extremely useful in providing the scope and depth of evaluation necessary for this complex training program.

Community Event Evaluation Techniques

During exploratory testing of the community aspect of the RFD Strategy, the community change process was actually conducted in several sites in north central Washington and in Montana by process facilitators who were receiving training. All of the communities were isolated and small and had predominantly agricultural, mining or recreation based economies. To track the implementation of the process, evaluators employed three techniques: (1) field events logs, (2) process events checklists and historical document reviews and (3) school-community member questionnaires and interviews.

Field events log. Two process facilitators were asked to keep a regular log of all field activities. After every

community activity in which they participated, the process facilitators completed a debriefing form (see Appendix D) and put it in their log. Periodically these logs were sent back to the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) for synthesis. The field events log was useful in providing a detailed description of the change process as it was implemented in three communities. The constant reporting allowed process facilitators to note their immediate needs for materials or further training, as well as process activities which worked well or poorly. Further discussion of the field reports by NWREL developers and active process facilitators helped developers understand and incorporate this data when revising the change process and the manuals and materials used in implementing the process. Recording these kinds of data was time consuming for process facilitators and for those who synthesized the data into a narrative account. Although the data were useful, they were costly to gather and analyze. In addition, their accuracy was highly dependent on the process facilitators' perceptions. This "micro" view of the process, however, was very useful in providing examples of "how to do it" and "how not to do it" for inclusion in process facilitator manuals.

Process events checklist and review of historical documents. The second technique used was a process events checklist, the purpose of which was to determine if and when the events identified as critical to the community aspect of the Strategy had occurred in communities engaged in the

process. To confirm the dates and occurrence of events, checklist data were supplemented by data from historical documents. The process events checklist provided a "macro" view of the process. The checklists were constructed based on the community change model, which identified critical events that should occur in the community. These checklists were filled out by evaluators, based on discussions with process facilitators and review of historical documents. The historical documents reviewed included newspaper articles,[1] meeting minutes,[2] letters, memos, and trip report records. Such documents were found to be useful, but often not comprehensive, systematic, or detailed enough to provide all the information needed to document that critical events had occurred. The completion of the checklist allowed determination of how frequently a particular event occurred and served, along with other data collected, to help developers determine

---

[1]Although little systematic analysis of historical documents was conducted during exploratory testing, evaluators are now using a procedure for monitoring newspaper articles in the Site A evaluation based on a procedure considered during exploratory testing. This procedure is primarily an adaptation of a technique used by Morris and Guenter (1973). The procedure is designed to obtain a measure of both the quantity and the quality of newspaper articles about local education activities. The technique involves categorizing articles into various content areas, describing the tone of articles and simply counting column inches covering educational issues.

[2]Another technique that shows promise for future evaluations is content analysis of school board minutes used by Michel (1973).

which events were most critical to the change process and which were redundant or optional. These data allowed developers to eliminate, add or consolidate events to arrive at a more refined description of the process. This kind of overview of the process also allowed developers to sketch timelines for implementing the change process. These data indicated that the process will take more than the anticipated two years to implement. Based on these data, developers are now attempting to streamline the process to fit a two-year time frame. Costs were also calculated based on the time required to implement the process and the salaries and expenses budgeted for one process facilitator serving four communities.

School-community group member and administrator questionnaires and followup interviews. The third technique used to evaluate community events was the administration of a questionnaire and followup interview to school-community group (SCG) members and administrators who participated in the change process. The questionnaire consisted of Likert scale items, open-ended questions, and multiple choice response questions. Questions were asked about adequacy of group representation, attendance at meetings, decisions made by the group, major accomplishment of the group, skills learned, resources used, time/money spent on the process, SCG/school board relationships, constancy of group membership, communication adequacy, and degree of influence the SCG had on

school decisions. (See Appendix E for a copy of this instrument.)

Four school-community group members and four school administrators were mailed questionnaires. After completing the questionnaires, respondents met with evaluators for a general discussion. This was followed by individual interviews on only those questions that were answered incompletely or in an unclear manner. This procedure ensured complete and understandable responses for all items.

This technique of using a questionnaire with a followup interview proved to be well worth the extra time involved since it provided clear, complete responses from the small number of respondents. This technique provided data on important success indicators and provided formative feedback that could be useful in modifying the process and its accompanying products. It was also particularly helpful to evaluators in providing initial data from which to build more structured questionnaires for future use.

The variety of techniques used in evaluating community events provided both a micro and a macro view of the process. The combination of these views allowed the evaluation audience to better determine what was or was not occuring and how to change the process and products so that they might produce improved results. It is very unlikely that one technique alone could provide the scope and depth of data required to make these important determinations for a complex process.

Section IV - Implications of Testing for Other School-Community Change Processes

As mentioned earlier, the primary purpose of the evaluation work during exploratory testing was to provide developers with information that would help them prepare prototype drafts of products and define important elements of the Strategy. For evaluators there was another purpose: to determine the evaluation techniques and instruments that would be most useful for subsequent Strategy tests.

Based on exploratory testing experiences, evaluators have made certain decisions related to the future phases of testing. We feel that these decisions could also have significance for evaluators planning to test other school-community change processes.

One of the major decisions made is that it is essential to use a *variety* of evaluation techniques. The RFD Strategy is of such complexity that no one technique is adequate to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the Strategy. Questionnaires, onsite interviews, meeting observation schedules, logs, checklists, review of historical documents and reviews of work (e.g., needs assessment questionnaires and reports) by community and school groups are all planned for use in future Strategy testing. Such a variety is necessary to provide a long- and a short-range view of the process and a micro and macro view of events.

A second major decision is that it is critical for evaluation instruments to build as much as possible on *already existing instruments.* It is very time consuming to develop the high quality instruments which are critical to doing a credible evaluation. One way to save time is to make use of the work done by other evaluators and researchers working on related projects. The instrument development in which we are presently engaged, as preparation for future testing, involves extensive review of instruments used by other organizations that are involved in measuring school and community change. To facilitate such work, evaluators of RFD have gathered and organized a file of available instruments in the areas of community-school change and related skills. These instruments, along with those discussed in this paper are being used, as they appear appropriate, to develop more refined and valid instruments for future testing of the RFD Strategy. Instrument preparation also involves extensive review by evaluators within the Rural Education Program and NWREL for technical quality and protection of human subjects.

A third decision is to emphasize the importance of *interaction with developers* of the Strategy to ensure that objectives are clearly stated, instruments are focused on the most critical questions to be answered and the extent of structure of the instrument is appropriate for the information sought. Such interaction is deemed critical, not only to help evaluators determine priorities and procedures for data collection, but also to help developers articulate and identify the critical

skills to be communicated and the processes to be used. Given that our evaluation is strictly formative throughout all three phases of testing, such a dual purpose for this activity is especially important.

References

Bales, Robert F. Personality and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Havelock, Ronald G. A Guide to Innovation in Education. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1969.

Lippitt, Gordon L. Visualizing Change: Model Building and the Change Process. Fairfax, Virginia: NTL Learning Resources Corporation, Inc., 1973.

Michel, G. J. Easton's Demand Processing in the School Districts of Two States. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED077082), 1973.

Morris, John R.; Guenter, Cornelius. "The Press Relations of a School District: An Analysis of the Emergence of School Issues." Paper presented at AERA Convention, 1973.

Sayers, Jerry. "Theoretical Foundations of the Rural Futures Development Strategy." Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1974.

Schmuck, Richard; Runkel, Philip J.; Saturen, Stevel L.; Martel, Ronald T.; and Derr, C. Brooklyn. Handbook of Organizational Development in Schools. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1972.

Williamson, John N. The Inquiring School: A Study of Educational Self-Renewal. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1971.

Woodruff, Asahel D. "An Approach to Teacher Education." Paper presented at the Teacher Education Conference of the Aesthetic Education Program of Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, December 1971.

APPENDIX A

A Comparison of Pre-Post Average Gain Scores for Self-ratings* at Three Levels of Field Experience

Items	High Experience			Low Experience			No Experience		
	Pre $\bar{X}$	Post $\bar{X}$	Gain	Pre $\bar{X}$	Post $\bar{X}$	Gain	Pre $\bar{X}$	Post $\bar{X}$	Gain
	N = 12	N = 9		N = 24	N = 17		N = 12	N = 6	
I could help a school-community group use at least one method of creating task force teams to plan for the implementation of a new school program.	6.08	6.00	.11	4.96	5.65	.71	3.42	4.29	.57
I could help a school-community group use at least one method of creating specific implementation plans for a new school program.	5.67	5.78	.44	4.79	5.71	1.00	3.08	4.71	1.43
I could assist a school-community group in learning at least one method of creating specific monitoring and evaluation plans for a new school program.	5.08	5.78	.89	4.58	5.88	1.35	2.67	5.00	1.83
I could help others prepare a report to a school board.	6.25	6.44	.33	5.58	6.29	.77	4.75	6.00	.83
I could assist others in locating and using local resources for planning.	6.08	6.33	.44	5.33	5.65	.59	4.75	5.67	.67
I could help a school-community group locate and use outside resources for planning.	6.00	6.56	.67	5.33	5.94	.77	4.75	5.83	.67
I could help others use informal and formal mechanisms for communicating information about planning to the community.	5.75	6.11	.33	5.26	6.00	.81	4.25	5.33	.50
TOTAL	5.85	6.14	.46	5.12	5.87	.86	3.95	5.23	.93

*Items involved seven point Likert scale from "not at all confident" (1) to "very confident" (7).

APPENDIX B
EVALUATION SKILLS SELF-RATING SCALE

DIRECTIONS

In responding to this instrument, you are asked to do two things: first, react to a checklist of 32 items by indicating the level of competence you feel you possess in each specified area; second, indicate whether or not you know where to seek assistance in each area.

In using the checklist, please keep in mind the following interpretations for each of the three competency (ability or knowledge) categories you might choose:

High Degree of Knowledge or Ability

This category refers to a level of competence that enables you to proceed independently or take primary responsibility for an activity in the area.

Moderate Knowledge or Ability

This category refers to a level of competence less than that in the category above, but sufficient to enable you to communicate intelligently about the area or be a team member on an activity in the area.

Almost No Knowledge or Ability

This category refers to a level of competence insufficient to be classified in either of the first two categories.

In responding to each of the 32 items, please make two checkmarks; one in a column to the left of the item, and one in a column to the right of the item.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue Portland, Oregon
97204 Telephone (503) 224-3650

This instrument meets NWREL guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects.

Rural Futures Development (RFD) Strategy

How much knowledge or ability do you possess in each of the following areas?

(Check one column for each item)

By checking one column or the other, please indicate your ability to find resources to help you with each of these areas.

High Degree of Knowledge or Ability	Moderate Knowledge or Ability	Almost No Knowledge or Ability	Evaluation/Implementation Skills, Knowledge, Competencies	I Know Where to Get Help When I Need It	I Don't Know Where to Get Help When I Need It
			1. Ability to discuss the advantages of establishing evaluation systems in educational institutions		
			2. Ability to write in a style and at a level appropriate to a specified audience		
			3. Ability to determine the evaluative questions which must be asked in an evaluation and the information that must be gathered to answer those questions		
			4. Ability to help persons responsible for educational activities or institutions identify and articulate the objectives of the activity or institution		
			5. Knowledge of various evaluation models (e.g., Stake, CIPP)		
			6. Ability to identify and articulate an evaluation problem		
			7. Ability to design and conduct interviews for the purpose of collecting data		

How much knowledge or ability do you possess in each of the following areas?

(Check one column for each item)

By checking one column or the other, please indicate your ability to find resources to help you with each of these areas.

High Degree of Knowledge or Ability	Moderate Knowledge or Ability	Almost No Knowledge or Ability	Evaluation/Implementation Skills, Knowledge, Competencies	I Know Where to Get Help When I Need It	I Don't Know Where to Get Help When I Need It
			8. Ability to incorporate systematic evaluation procedures in plans for developing educational programs		
			9. Ability to plan data collection procedures appropriate to evaluation activity		
			10. Knowledge of general principles of instrument construction		
			11. Knowledge of specific questionnaire construction techniques		
			12. Knowledge of appropriate uses for questionnaires		
			13. Ability to construct instruments to assess attitudes and other affective variables		
			14. Ability to select appropriate standardized tests or instruments		
			15. Ability to write unambiguous items in vocabulary appropriate to the audience		

How much knowledge or ability do you possess in each of the following areas?

(Check one column for each item)

By checking one column or the other, please indicate your ability to find resources to help you with each of these areas.

High Degree of Knowledge or Ability	Moderate Knowledge or Ability	Almost No Knowledge or Ability	Evaluation/Implementation Skills, Knowledge, Competencies	I Know Where to Get Help When I Need It	I Don't Know Where to Get Help When I Need It
			16. Ability to design studies to control extraneous variables		
			17. Ability to state objectives in measurable terms		
			18. Ability to identify educational needs		
			19. Ability to determine what financial resources are necessary to conduct a program or project		
			20. Ability to use accounting procedures to operate a program or project budget		
			21. Ability to plan and manage day-to-day activities of an ongoing program or project		
			22. Knowledge of management and planning techniques (e.g., PERT, PPBS)		
			23. Knowledge of various formal and informal systems of recording observations of behavior (e.g., Interaction Analysis)		

How much knowledge or ability do you possess in each of the following areas?

(Check one column for each item)

By checking one column or the other, please indicate your ability to find resources to help you with each of these areas.

High Degree of Knowledge or Ability	Moderate Knowledge or Ability	Almost No Knowledge or Ability	Evaluation/Implementation Skills, Knowledge, Competencies	I Know Where to Get Help When I Need It	I Don't Know Where to Get Help When I Need It
			24. Ability to use formal or informal systems of recording observations of behavior		
			25. Knowledge of descriptive statistical techniques (e.g., means, standard deviations)		
			26. Knowledge of ANOVA or ANCOVA designs and techniques		
			27. Knowledge of instrument reliability, including types of reliability coefficients		
			28. Knowledge of instrument validity, including various approaches to determining validity		
			29. Knowledge of nonparametric statistical techniques		
			30. Knowledge of alternate methods of presenting data (e.g., graphs, tables)		
			31. Ability to plan an effective development program or project		
			32. Ability to organize and classify information into meaningful categories		

APPENDIX C

STAGE V AND VI TRAINING EVENT FEEDBACK FORM

I.D. Number_____ Event Number_____ Trainer_____

1. The materials will assist my work with the process:
   A great deal 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

2. The trainers were well-organized for the event:
   A great deal 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

3. The expected outcome of this event was:
   Very clear 5 4 3 2 1 Very unclear

4. To what extent was the expected outcome reached for you?
   Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 Completely

5. The content of this event was appropriate to my needs as a Process Facilitator:
   Strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 Strongly disagree

6. The trainer(s) were very effective in helping me to learn what I wanted to from this event:
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

7. My interest in the session was:
   Very high 5 4 3 2 1 Minimal

8. For future training of Process Facilitators this event should be:
   Required 5 4 3 2 1 Dropped

9. The event was:
   Too trainer dominated 5 4 3 2 1 Too trainee dominated

10. Please check the box that best describes what you recommend be done in future workshops for the following aspects of this event:

	Same	More	Less
A. Reading Material			
B. Structuring of the Work			
C. Amount of Practice in New Behavior			
D. Amount of Discussion			
E. Theory: Why to Do It			

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S.W. Second Avenue Portland, Oregon
97204 Telephone (503) 224-3650

This instrument meets NWREL guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects.

Rural Futures Development (RFD) Strategy

Appendix D

Stage _____
Event _____
Date _____
Community _____
PF's _____
_____
_____
Recorder _____
Time Used (in hours)
Field_____ Prep._____ Travel_____

CHANGE PROCESS DEBRIEF

(Please Print)

Check Appropriate Box(es):

Field Notes ☐
Interview ☐ } If not filled out by a PF
Observation ☐

No. of SCG in Attendance _____

EVENT INFORMATION

ACTIVITY TITLE:
/AC/

WHAT HAPPENED: (What did you do; what did they do)
/DO/

(attach other sheets if necessary)

WHY DID YOU DO WHAT YOU DID THE WAY YOU DID (What variables influenced your action):
/WH/

HOW SUCCESSFUL WAS THIS EVENT (Give indicators):
/SC/

HOW COULD IT BE IMPROVED:
/IP/

MATERIALS INFORMATION

MATERIALS USED (Give titles, or other descriptors):
/MU/

CHANGES YOU WOULD SUGGEST OR THAT YOU MADE (Please attach a copy of any revised material):
/MY/

MATERIALS NEEDED BUT NOT AVAILABLE (Describe):
/MX/

TRAINING INFORMATION

SKILLS YOU FEEL YOU USED DURING THE EVENT (That a new PF ought to be trained in):
/KL/

SKILLS YOU NEEDED, BUT DIDN'T HAVE:
/KG/

COMMENTS:
/AB/

PLANS MADE:
/FR/

APPENDIX E

SURVEY OF THE BREWSTER SCHOOL COMMUNITY GROUP - SCAT

Please respond in a concise and complete manner to the following questions. We are most interested in your feelings and opinions. Thank you.

I am a: ___ staff member
___ student
___ community member
___ administrator

1. a. How well does the SCG represent the ideas of all factions in your community? (Circle one)

Not at all representative 1 2 3 4 5 Very representative--all groups have a voice

b. What groups, if any, are not represented by the SCG?

2. Rate each group (i.e., students, staff, community) individually on the dimensions listed below. (All groups can have the same rating if that is the way you think it is.)

	Students	Teachers	Community Memb
a. Did they attend regularly during the first six months of SCG meetings? (Give them a rating from 1 to 5 where 1 means "seldom if ever attend meetings" and 5 means "attend almost all meetings".)			
b. Have they attended regularly during the last six months? (Rate from 1 to 5 as in item a above.)			
c. How active are they in the SCG group? (Rate from 1 to 5 where 1 means "very inactive" and 5 means "very active".)			
d. How interested was each group in the SCG? (Rate each from 1 to 5 where 1 means "very uninterested" and 5 means "very interested".)			
e. How influential was each group in SCG planning and decisions? (Rate each from 1 to 5 where 1 means "have very little influence" and 5 means "very influential".)			

3. a. Approximately how often were SCG meetings held? (Check one)

(1) _____ once a week
(2) _____ twice a month
(3) _____ once a month
(4) _____ once every two months
(5) _____ other (please specify) _____

Was there enough time to accomplish tasks? YES____ NO____

b. Approximately how often were TFT meetings held? (Check one)

(1) _____ once a week
(2) _____ twice a month
(3) _____ once a month
(4) _____ once every two months
(5) _____ other (please specify) _____

c. Did you have any prolonged recess of SCG activities? YES____ NO____ Why?

d. Why did people attend the meetings?

Why didn't people attend the meetings?

e. How often did people other than SCG members attend meetings? (Circle one)

Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

If so, can you categorize these people in terms of groups they might represent in the community?

4. a. What are the major goals or purposes of the SCG?

b. What are the tasks or functions which the SCG should be carrying out?

c. What are some decisions that the SCG has made?

d. What are the major accomplishments of the SCG up to this point in time?

5. Please list the top concerns that your community identified in the needs assessment survey and briefly describe what has been done (if anything) in relation to each concern:

	Needs/Concerns	Action Taken to Date
a.		
b.		
c.		
d.		

6. a. What resources (i.e., libraries, local agricultural extension agent, etc.) in your community have you used in your work with the SCG?

b. What resources (i.e., State Department of Education, Senator, etc.) outside of your community have you used?

7. a. Approximately how much money has your district spent to support SCG activities?

b. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend on SCG related activities? _____

8.

What recommendations has the SCG presented to the school board?	How did the board respond?

9. Has the school board ever asked the SCG for help? YES_____ NO_____
If so, what was the nature of their request?

10. Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with these statements:

a. The SCG has been able to resolve disagreements and make decisions without excessive use of time of loss of membership.

Strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 Strongly disagree

Comment:

b. The membership of the SCG has remained constant since the group was formed.

Strongly agree. 5 4 3 2 1 Strongly disagree

Comment:

c. The time and effort I've spent on SCG activities has been very worthwhile.

Strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 Strongly disagree

Comment:

d. Community people, students and staff are kept well informed about SCG activities.

Strongly agree 5 4 3 2 1 Strongly disagree

Comment:

11. a. Prior to becoming a member of the SCG I had:

Little or no voice in school decisions 1 2 3 4 5 A great deal of influence on school decisions

b. Now I have:

Little or no voice in school decisions 1 2 3 4 5 A great deal of influence on school decisions

If there was a change between ratings for a and b, do you feel it was due to the process? YES_____ NO_____

Please explain:

c. Given my present level of influence on school decisions, I would prefer: MORE_____ LESS_____ SAME_____

12. The rest of the staff, students and community members were kept informed about SCG activities by the following method(s): (Check all that apply)

a. _____ newspaper articles
b. _____ word of mouth
c. _____ radio announcements
d. _____ flyers/newsletters
e. _____ the "community notebook"
f. _____ other:_____

13. I have learned new skills as a result of participating in the School Community Group:

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

What do you feel you have learned?

14. What changes do you think would make the SCG more effective?

15. What personal benefits do you feel you have received from being a member of the SCG (i.e., a chance to see friends more often, learned more about the present school structure)?

16. Please give any other comments about the SCG, positive or negative, which you feel are important in the space below: