ABSTRACT
                  A study identified strategies used in selected rural
states for evaluating the effectiveness of vocational programs and
services for handicapped and disadvantaged students. During the
study, the researcher examined the documents used by 13 rural states
to assess their vocational programs for handicapped and disadvantaged
individuals. This examination consisted of a content analysis of the
actual evaluation instruments and telephone interviews with
individuals involved in program evaluation in each state. Based on
this analysis, it appeared that the evaluation of vocational
education programs for handicapped and disadvantaged students is an
organized activity in most rural states, with 10 the 14 states in the
study sample having evaluation programs. Nine of these states
evaluated vocational programs for special needs students separately
from other vocational programs. The predominate evaluation strategy
used to assess these vocational programs was to have one or more
external evaluators visit each program to interview students and
teachers, view program facilities, and observe the program in
operation. Recommendations emerging from the study included calls to
specify state education agency (SEA) purposes for evaluating
vocational programs and to have state program evaluation systems
include a mechanism for assessing the impact of program evaluation of
the SEA on local education agencies and on specific programs and
services. (MN)

AN ANALYSIS OF STATE SYSTEMS FOR EVALUATING

HANDICAPPED AND DISADVANTAGED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

A Thesis Presented

by

James Robert Frasier

to

The Department of Vocational Education & Technology
and
The Department of Special Education,
Social Work, and Social Services

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For a Certificate of Advanced Study
College of Education and Social Services

Submitted
March 22, 1983

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

11

4

5

TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 (PL 88-210) encouraged states to develop vocational programs and services for unemployed youth, the socially disadvantaged, and the handicapped (Barlow, 1976; Williams, 1971). How well local education agencies (LEA's) implemented programs and services to meet the vocational training needs of these populations was to be determined by periodic state-level evaluations and evaluation findings reported to Congress by the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education in 1968 (PL 88-210).

After reviewing findings of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education's Report (Essex, 1968), which questioned whether vocational programs had served special needs populations, Congress required states in the 1968 Vocational Education Act Amendments to use specific percentages of federal funds for handicapped and disadvantaged programs and prescribed new vocational education program evaluation requirements (PL 90-576).

However, as noted by the General Accounting Office
(1974), Lee (1971) and Wentling (1980), evaluation
requirements mandated in the 1968 Amendments were a source
of confusion for many states: areas of state evaluation
responsibility remained unclear; federal evaluation
requirements remained vague; and a clear definition of
evaluation and evaluation procedures was lacking in the
legislation.

    In preparation for the 1976 Hearings on
Reauthorization of the 1968 Amendments, the U.S. Office of
Education contracted with the Olympus Research Corporation
to conduct a national assessment of vocational education
programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged.
Summarizing the general state of monitoring and evaluation
of vocational education programs for the handicapped, the
Olympus Research Corporation Report (1974) stated:

> Actual enrollment figures were not available, and
> in most states there was little information on
> completers, dropouts, and placements. Follow-up
> data were not available in any state. (p.206)

    The Olympus Research Corporation's Report (1976) on
the status of vocational education for disadvantaged
populations also found actual enrollment figures were
unavailable and observed program evaluation at state
education agency (SEA) and LEA levels was unsystematic and
inadequate:

2

8

> Considering the informality of the planning
> process, it should come as no surprise that the
> monitoring and evaluation of programs for the
> disadvantaged was equally as informal at both the
> state and local levels. (p.161)

In response to this continued lack of information
about the impact of vocational education and the confusion
of many states over federal evaluation requirements,
Congress prescribed at least 28 specific requirements
related to federal, state, and local program evaluation
activity in the 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments
(Wentling, 1980). Focusing on program evaluation by the
states, the 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments (PL
94-482) identified systematic program evaluation as a
responsibility of the SEA (Federal Rules and Regulations,
October 3, 1977):

> The State Board shall, during the five-year
> period of the State Plan, evaluate in
> quantitative terms the effectiveness of each
> formally organized program or project supported
> by Federal, state, and local funds. These
> evaluations shall be in terms of:
>
> a) planning and operational processes;
>
> b) results of student achievement;
>
> c) results of student employment success; and,
>
> d) results of additional services, as measured
> by a, b, and c of this section that the state
> provides to special populations. (pp.53842-3)

3

Although some states had evaluation systems in operation that needed only minor changes to comply with the 1976 mandates, most states had to develop entirely new evaluation systems capable of systematically evaluating all vocational programs (Smith & Holt, 1979, 1980; Wentling & Russo, 1978). Consequently most SEA's were faced with the common problem of developing, implementing and/or revising their respective evaluation systems with only a limited knowledge base available from other states.

Statement of the Problem

Vermont, like many other states, did not have a system for evaluating special needs programs and services as mandated in the 1976 Amendments. In an effort to comply with the evaluation mandates, the Vermont Division of Vocational Education recently contracted with the University of Vermont to develop a statewide system for the evaluation of handicapped and disadvantaged (H/D) programs.

One of the first activities undertaken by the University's project staff was to search for information about strategies used by other states to evaluate H/D programs and services. Perhaps, other states had successfully used a particular evaluation strategy and/or had encountered problems with an evaluation strategy that

4

could have provided valuable data for the project staff to consider in designing a Vermont system. However, an ERIC search of literature and telephone contacts with several individuals knowledgable about vocational program evaluation yielded only limited information about other states evaluation strategies.

Confronted with this lack of data, the University's project staff was presented with the problem of how to obtain information about the types of strategies used by other states to evaluate H/D programs that could be useful in designing a H/D program evaluation for the Vermont Division of Vocational Education.

Purpose of the Study

- The overall purpose of the study was to identify strategies used in selected states for evaluating the effectiveness of H/D vocational education programs and services as required by the 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments.

More specifically, the two central objectives of the study were:

   (1) To identify the types of evaluation strategies presently being used by rural states in

5

11

assessing the planning and operational processes
of vocational education programs and services
for handicapped and disadvantaged persons; and,

2. To make information gained from the study,
available for use in designing a statewide
system for evaluating handicapped and
disadvantaged vocational education programs in
Vermont.

Major Questions of the Study

The 1976 Amendments clearly emphasized the role of the
individual states in the overall evaluation of programs.
In order to gain a more complete understanding of how each
state had responded to the evaluation mandates, the study
sought to answer two major questions:

(1) What types of evaluation strategies were being
used by rural states to assess the planning and
operational processes of programs and services
designed for handicapped and disadvantaged
students enrolled in vocational education
programs?

(2) Were handicapped and disadvantaged programs and
services evaluated as a part of, or separate
from, rural states on-going systems for

6

evaluating all vocational education programs

within the periods of their five year plans?

Limitations of the Study

Initially, the University's project staff was
interested in securing information about the types of
strategies used by SEA's to evaluate H/D programs and
services in terms of program planning and operational
processes, results of student achievement, and results of
student employment success as required by the 1976
Amendments. However, an analysis of Vermont's Quality
Assessment System (QAS) For Evaluating Vocational Education
Programs revealed information within the QAS could be
adapted for determining results of H/D student achievement
and results of student employment success (Frasier &
Albright, Note 1). Based on this analysis, the Vermont
Division of Vocational Education and the University's
project staff decided to emphasize program planning and
operational processes in the design of a H/D program
evaluation system for Vermont. Therefore, to provide the
project staff with information for use during development
and refinement of a Vermont H/D program evaluation system,
the study was limited to identifying SEA evaluation

7

13

strategies for assessing program planning and operational processes.

   As the project staff was concerned with development of a SEA-level H/D program evaluation system, only SEA personnel were interviewed by telephone. Due to budgetary constraints and time lines imposed by an immediate need for information during design of a Vermont H/D program evaluation system, contact with persons knowledgeable about sample states evaluation practices was limited to a single telephone interview with each SEA's consultant for H/D programs. No attempt was made to include LEA personnel.

8

14

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Handicapped - "A person who is mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or other health impaired, or a person with learning disabilities, and who by reason of this handicap requires special education and related services in order to succeed in a regular vocational program and/or requires a modified vocational education program" (Federal Register, October 3, 1977:53864).

Disadvantaged - "Persons (other than handicapped persons) who have academic or economic disadvantages and require special services, assistance, or programs in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs" (Federal Register, October 3, 1977).

> Academic Disadvantaged ...means that a person: lacks reading and writing skills; lacks mathematical skills; or performs below grade level. (p. 53864)

> Economic Disadvantaged ...means: family income is at or below national poverty level; participant or parent(s) or guardian of the participant is unemployed; participant or parent of participant is recipient of public assistance; or participant is institutionalized or under State guardianship" (p. 53864)

Evaluation - "Evaluation is the process of delineating,
obtaining, and applying descriptive and judgemental
information; concerning some objects merit; as revealed by
its goals design, implementation, and results; and for
purposes of decision making and accountability."
(Stufflebeam, 1976)

Rural States - States that, according to the 1970 Census,
have more than 50 percent of their population living
neither in central cities nor in suburban areas (Bryan,
1981).

Planning and Operational Processes - These terms will
include questions developed to identify program planning
and operational processes in H/D evaluation documents (as
listed in Appendix G); AND, program planning and
operational processes such as:

(1)   Quality and availability of instructional offerings;
(2)   Guidance, counseling, and placement and follow-up
      services;
(3)   Capacity and condition of facilities and equipment;
(4)   Employer participation in cooperative programs
      vocational education;
(5)   Teacher/pupil ratios; and,
(6)   Teacher qualifications (Federal Register, October 3,
      1977:53842).

10

16

<u>Special Needs Populations</u> - Special needs populations are:
(1) Women;
(2) Members of minority groups;
(3) Handicapped persons;
(4) Disadvantaged persons; and
(5) Persons of limited English-speaking ability.
(Federal Register, October 3, 1977:53843)

11

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of literature relevant to SEA evaluation
practices in vocational education was conducted for the
purpose of examining how states have implemented the
evaluation of H/D vocational education programs as
prescribed by the 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments.
The literature search was implemented in two stages:
First, a search limited to state H/D program evaluation
practices; and, second, an expanded search that involved
all state-level vocational education program evaluation
practices.

H/D Program Evaluation Practices

An ERIC search of literature in August 1981
specifically related to SEA evaluation of H/D vocational
education programs since the 1976 Amendments, and an
expanded ERIC search of literature in January 1982 related
to SEA evaluation of vocational special needs programs,
disclosed only one related article by Wentling and Russo
(1978). This scarcity of information about vocational
special needs program evaluation was also noted in a recent

18

review of SEA special needs program evaluation practices by
Phelps (1980) and in a recent review of literature on the
evaluation of vocational education programs and services
for Limited English-Speaking populations by Thomas and
Margos (1982). Smith (1982) identified a similar lack of
writing in the professional literature on the evaluation
practices used by SEA's to conduct general education
program evaluation.

General SEA Program Evaluation Practices

A general survey of literature related to SEA
evaluation of vocational education programs since the 1976
Amendments identified a series of three studies contracted
by the National Institute For Education to determine the
progress of states in implementing the evaluation
requirements of the 1976 Amendments: the Contract Research
Corporation national survey on the status of evaluation
activity across the states (Smith & Holt, 1979, 1980); the
Abt Associates study of the extent to which the states had
implemented various provisions of the 1976 Amendments
(Beuke, Lukas, Brigham, Glick & Breen, 1980); and, the
Wentling national survey of State Directors For Vocational
Education to determine the extent to which program
evaluation requirements had been implemented in their

13

respective states (Wentling, 1981; Wentling & Barnard, 1982). However, of these three studies, only the Abt and Wentling studies provided information about the extent to which SEA's had evaluated the results of additional services for special needs populations.

Highlights of the Abt and Wentling Studies

The Abt Study - The major emphasis of the Abt Study (Beuke et al., 1980) was to determine the extent to which 15 sample states had implemented provisions of the 1976 Amendments related to: program improvement; educational, equity; and the distribution of federal funds. States were selected to ensure: geographical representation based on the four census regions; percent of the total potential vocational student population; and type of vocational governance structure used by the state to administer the 1976 Amendments. Data from state and local levels were collected during the 1979-80 school year by combining case study and survey methodologies. Interview data were supplemented by an analysis of documents collected in each of the 15 states surveyed.

Findings of the Abt Study (Beuke et al., 1980) related to the evaluation of special needs programs and services disclosed:

14

o Very little attention had been given to evaluating
   the results of additional programs and services
   for special needs populations.

o All sample states which had a formal program
   review process included some items on special
   needs populations, but the extent of attention
   given by states to the evaluation of special needs
   populations programs and services varied
   considerably.

o The primary emphasis of SEA evaluations related to
   special needs populations had been on access to
   vocational programs and services.

o Evaluation of special populations' achievement and
   employment success had not been conducted by SEA's
   in the 15 states surveyed.

o There appeared to be, among those states that gave
   a more extensive evaluation, a widely used
   evaluation strategy format of sequenced self-study
   by the local school district, external review by a
   team of individuals, and development of a local

15

improvement plan based on the results of the external team review. —

The Wentling Study - The major purpose of the Wentling Study (Wentling, 1981; Wentling & Barnard, 1982) was to determine the opinion of State Directors For Vocational Education concerning: 1) the extent to which the evaluation requirements of the 1976 Amendments had been implemented in their respective states and territories; and 2) how they perceived the effectiveness and utility of vocational program evaluation. A survey questionnaire, mailed to the state directors with a cover letter signed by the Executive Director of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, was the data collection method used in this study. The response rate was 88%.

A review of findings in the Wentling Study (Wentling, 1981; Wentling & Barnard, 1982) related to evaluation of special needs populations programs and services revealed:

0 By the spring of 1981, the evaluation of programs and services for special populations was not yet fully implemented in 29 states.

0 Very little had been done to evaluate the results of programs and services to special populations.

16

● A total of 36 state directors indicated they would
continue to evaluate programs and services for
special populations even if federal evaluation
requirements were eliminated.

However, a major limitation of the Abt and Wentling
studies was the aggregation of data under the generic
category of "special needs populations". Neither study
delineated state evaluation activities for each special
need population group. Consequently, specific information
related to how states evaluated handicapped and
disadvantaged programs was lacking in both studies.

17

23

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The analyses in the study were based on handicapped and disadvantaged program evaluation materials received from sample states and from telephone interviews conducted with H/D consultants following a review of each state's evaluation documents. Methods and procedures for selecting sample states, collecting and analyzing SEA evaluation documents, and conducting telephone interviews are described in this section.

Sample

Nineteen rural states (as identified by Bryan, 1981) formed the target population of the study. A stratified single-stage sampling method adapted from Moser & Kalton (1972) was used to assure an even geographic spread of selected states.

Target states were alphabetically ordered, numbered 1 through 19, and divided into four groups according to the four census regions: Northeast, North Central, South and West (U.S. Bureau of the Census). The regional grouping of these target states is shown in Appendix A.

18

As the Northeast Region had only three states and
Vermont was excluded from the selection process, two states
were selected from this group. A table of random numbers
was used to identify four states in each group until a
total of 14 states were selected as the sample.

Collection of H/D Evaluation Documents

A telephone request to individuals in SEA's
responsible for H/D vocational education programs (H/D
consultants) was the primary method used to obtain
evaluation documents.* A personal letter (shown in
Appendix B), was sent to each state H/D consultant within
two days following the first telephone contact. The
letter, adapted from Erdos (1970), reiterated the purposes
of the study, identified the H/D documents requested, and
expressed appreciation for the individual's anticipated
cooperation.

---

*Note: Two U.S. Office of Education Directories were used
to identify H/D consultants of sample states: (1) The 1981
Directory of State Officials with Responsibilities for
Vocational Education of Disadvantaged Youth; and, (2) The
1981 Directory of State Personnel Responsible for
Vocational Education of Handicapped Persons.

If state evaluation documents were not received within 15 working days after the initial telephone request, a follow-up telephone contact was made to inquire whether the requested documents had beem sent. A third and final telephone inquiry was made when the documents were not received within 30 working days after the initial telephone request.

Design of Instruments

Two categories of content analysis, the evaluation of program planning and the evaluation of program operational processes, were used in the study. Conceptually, these categories directly corresponded to two types of evaluation within the CIPP Evaluation Model (Stufflebeam, Foley, Gephart, Guba, Hammond, Merriman & Provus, 1971): evaluation of program planning processes with C - Context Evaluation; and evaluation of program operational processes with P - Process Evaluation.

Context Evaluation provides information for planning decisions by describing actual conditions, determining unmet needs and unused opportunities, and provides general information for determination of program goals. (p. 218)

Process Evaluation provides information for implementing features of the program, potential sources of program failure, and provides general information for determination of program improvement. (p. 229)

Questions for identifying the evaluation of H/D
program planning and operational processes were formulated
by a two-step process adapted from Stufflebeam's (1976)
framework for designing evaluation studies:

Step 1. General questions were delineated for
evaluation of program planning (Context Evaluation)
and program operational processes (Process
Evaluation).

Step 2. Specific questions for identifying the
evaluation of H/D program planning processes and
program operational processes were formulated from
the general questions developed in Step #1.

A similar two-step process was also suggested by
Wentling (1980) for use in developing questions to evaluate
the effectiveness of occupational education and training
programs.

The format of "IF YES-then" questions was adapted from
Stufflebeam's et al. (1971) contingency mode of context
evaluation. These questions, written to reflect the
meaning of each program planning and operational process
question within the content analysis instruments, were
formulated to probe for types of: a) evaluation designs.

21

used to implement H/D program evaluations; b) strategies used to "verify how" a program's planning and operational processes were being evaluated; and, c) strategies used to "verify the effectiveness" of a program's planning and operational processes.

Possible strategy types commonly used in evaluation were listed under each "IF YES-then" question to facilitate ease of recording information and to maintain continuity within each category of analysis. The formating of strategy types under each question is shown in Appendix C.

Validation of Instruments

Internal and external review procedures adapted from Sanders and Cunningham (1973) were used in the development of the content analysis instruments to maximize the potential of questions for identifying H/D program planning and operational processes.

Two internal reviews of the content analysis instruments were conducted by selected faculty members at the University of Vermont. The first internal review was done by three individuals who were selected for their prior work with handicapped and disadvantaged programs and/or experience with rural educational programs. The second internal review was carried out by another two individuals

22

28

selected for their expertise in evaluation of educational programs.

An external review was conducted by an independent panel of three experts. Experts were selected who had previously adapted the CIPP Model's (Stufflebeam et al., 1971) conceptual framework for designing vocational education evaluation systems, and/or who had specialized in designing evaluation systems for vocational special needs programs.

Throughout the internal and external review process, each person was given the same set of instructions for reviewing the content analysis instruments. Individuals were requested to critically review and comment on the appropriateness of: a) each content analysis question for identifying H/D program planning and operational processes and to offer additional questions that could be used to identify such processes; and, b) the "IF YES - then" question format for identifying types of SEA evaluation strategies. A sequential record of internal and external reviewer suggestions and the action taken in response to each reviewer's comments is presented in Appendix D.

The content analysis instruments used in the study are shown in Appendix E (planning processes) and in Appendix F (operational processes).

23

29

Analysis of H/D Evaluation Documents

States H/D evaluation documents were analyzed using a method of qualitative analysis for determining the presence of particular content (Berelson, 1971). The procedures employed are described in sequence below:

1. Before starting the analysis of a state's documents, the evaluation materials were read by the investigator in order to gain an appreciation for the organization, content and implementation procedures of the state's evaluation system.

2. Each state's documents were first analyzed for evaluative questions (hereafter referred to as indicators) indicating SEA efforts to evaluate program planning processes and, then, for SEA efforts to evaluate program operational processes.

3. To simplify use of the Planning and Operational Content Analysis Instruments, the presence/absence of each category's indicators (as suggested by Wentling, Note 2) were recorded on Code Sheets as shown in Appendix G.

24

4. After completion of the content analyses, the marked code sheet indicators triggered the selection of appropriate Content Analysis Instrument Indicator Sheets (Appendix H) within the content analysis instruments.

5. Evaluation strategy types were identified for each category of analysis indicator and recorded on the appropriate Content Analysis Indicator Sheets.

When the content analysis of all states were completed, a two-step analysis of data was conducted. First: State Category of Analysis Indicator Sheets were sorted by number. Second: The types of evaluation strategies used by each state, as marked under "IF YES - then" questions, were compiled in descriptive form.

Establishing Inter-rater Reliability

Inter-rater reliability was established through adaptation of a method suggested by Thomas (Note 3) for determining agreement between individuals using content analysis instruments.

31

Before a sample state's documents were analyzed, a non-involved state's H/D evaluation documents were jointly analyzed by an independent rater and the investigator. Throughout this joint analysis, each rater helped to train the other by: openly sharing information; discussing use of the instruments; clarifying the intent of questions; discussing and resolving differences; and noting reasons for similar judgements.

Following the joint analysis, the investigator worked alone to conduct a state-by-state content analysis of H/D evaluation documents. After the investigator had completed the analysis of documents from all sample states, the independent rater randomly selected and analyzed two state's evaluation documents. The number of agreements between raters divided by the number of agreements plus the number of disagreements were calculated to give the percentage score of inter-rater reliability for each content analysis instrument.

Telephone Interviews

H/D consultants of sample states were interviewed by phone after the content analysis of documents had been completed. Individuals interviewed were those who had been previously contacted for information about their respective

26

state's evaluation of H/D vocational programs. Before each
interview began, the purposes of the study were reiterated,
questions related to the study answered, and verbal
assurance was given to the person interviewed that
individual and state names would not be identified in
reporting of the study.

The telephone interviews with individuals whose states
did not have formally structured H/D program evaluation
instruments or procedures were very limited (Appendix I).
The questions asked were merely intended to: (1) verify the
state's lack of a formally structured H/D program
evaluation system; (2) inquire whether H/D programs were
evaluated as part of, or separate from, the state's
on-going system for evaluating all vocational education
programs within the period of the five year plan; and, (3)
ask about plans the state might have had regarding the
evaluation of H/D programs and services.

A more extensive telephone interview instrument was
developed for states with formally structured H/D program
evaluation instruments and procedures. The first part of
the interview was intended to: (1) verify how the documents
received were currently being used (e.g. under revision, no
longer in use); (2) inquire whether H/D programs were
evaluated as part of, or separate from, the state's
on-going system for evaluating all vocational education

27

3ვ

programs within the period of the five year plan; and, (3)
if necessary, clarify items about the state's H/D
evaluation system that had resulted from the content
analysis of SEA evaluation documents. The second part
involved a set of questions (Appendix J) that was intended
to probe for the opinion of H/D consultants concerning: a)
purposes for evaluating special needs programs; b) utility
of their respective state's evaluation instruments and
procedures for determining the effectiveness of H/D program
planning and operational processes; c) "use" of evaluation
results by the SEA and local education agencies; and d)
difficulties encountered in developing and in implementing
their respective state's H/D evaluation instruments and
procedures.

Telephone interview data were tabulated in descriptive
form, state by state, and used to supplement each state's
document analysis.

IV. RESULTS

The telephone request to sample states for H/D program evaluation documents resulted in the receipt of materials from 13 of 14 states.

Four categories of program evaluation activity were initially identified in the documents reviewed from sample states: (1) states with separate, formally structured, H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures; (2) states with formally structured H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures integrated into their total vocational education program evaluation system; (3) states conducting H/D program evaluation, but without formally structured instruments or procedures; and, (4) states not evaluating H/D vocational education programs. However, a fifth category of SEA program evaluation activity was added as a result of telephone interviews with the state H/D consultants. This fifth category consisted of states in the process of developing a H/D program evaluation system. These five categories of SEA evaluation activity are listed in Table 1.

29

Table 1

Sample States H/D
Program Evaluation Activity

Category	Number of States
States with separate, formalized, H/D program evaluation systems	4
States with formalized H/D program evaluation integrated into the 5 year state evaluation system	1
States conducting H/D program evaluation but without a formalized system	5
States in the process of developing a H/D program evaluation system	3
States not conducting H/D program evaluation	1
Total states	14

30

36

To facilitate clarity in the reporting of data analysis findings, the four states with separate, formally structured, H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures and the one state with H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures "integrated" into the total SEA vocational program evaluation system were combined into a single category entitled, "SEA's with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems. In order to maintain the anonymity of these five states and sustain continuity in reporting results of the study, each state was arbitrarily assigned a number from 1 to 5.

Findings reported in this section have been ordered to reflect: (1) the results of document analyses for states with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems; (2) the results of H/D consultant telephone interviews for states with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems; and, (3) the results of H/D consultant telephone interviews for states conducting evaluation, but without formally structured H/D program evaluation instruments or procedures.

31

1. Results of the Content Analyses

    A. Program Planning and Operational Processes

    A content analysis of materials received from five
sample states with formally structured H/D program
evaluation systems revealed each state's documents had
evaluative questions for assessing program planning and
operational processes. This finding was affirmed by
inter-rater reliability scores of 88 percent, using the
Content Analysis Instruments for Identifying Program
Planning Processes, and of 85 percent, using the Content
Analysis Instruments for Identifying Program Operational
Processes.

    The presence of states evaluative questions for
assessing program planning and operational processes are
identified by category of analysis indicators in Table 2.
In terms of program planning processes, the three most
commonly used indicators identified:

    0 whether the unmet needs of an individual student
       influenced the student's program goals and
       objectives;

    0 whether the individuals knowledgable about the needs
       of H/D students were involved in planning that

32

Table 2

Presence of SEA Evaluative Activity
by Category of Analysis Indicators

Indicators of Program Planning Processes	Presence by state						Indicators of Program Operational Processes	Presence by state				
	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5			S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?							1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?				X	
2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?		X			X		2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?		X			
3. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to identify those students in need of special services or programs in order to succeed in their vocational education program?			X		X		3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?		X			
4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA handicapped/disadvantaged program is serving only those students who are unable to succeed in their vocational education program?	X	X			X		4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants?	X	X	X	X	X
5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant prior to providing services?					X		5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?					
6. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs prior to the program providing services?			X		X		6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals & objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?					
7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives as a participant in the handicapped/disadvantaged program?	X	X	X	X	X		7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?				X	
8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?							8. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?				X	
9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?		X			X		9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?				X	
10. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students (e.g. handicapped/disadvantaged workers, advisory committee members) are involved in the planning that influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?	X	X	X	X			10. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the teacher qualifications to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?	X		X	X	
11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?												
12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has a plan for implementing the program's goals and objectives?												

Note. S = State

influenced formulation   of the LEA program's goals
and objectives; and,

● whether the local H/D program was serving only those
students who were unable to succeed in their regular
vocational education program.

In terms of program operational processes, the two most
commonly used indicators identified:

● whether people involved in and/or affected by a H/D
program were in agreement with the adequacy of
instructional resources available for use by the
participants; and,

● whether a program instructor(s) had the necessary
teacher qualifications to work with handicapped
and/or disadvantaged students.

B. Program Evaluation Designs

Through the content analysis of H/D evaluation
documents, two groups of H/D program evaluation designs
were identified: centralized and decentralized. States
with centralized evaluation designs had direct, on-site,
SEA involvement during evaluation activities and the final
program evaluation report was written by the SEA.
Conversely, states with decentralized evaluation designs

34

minimized direct SEA involvement during evaluation activities and the SEA did not write the final program evaluation report.

The evaluation designs of states #1 and #3 were centralized. In both states, the program teacher was responsible for conducting a self-evaluation using SEA prescribed instruments. Findings from the self-evaluation were then verified by the H/D consultant during an on-site verification team visit held to confirm all vocational teacher self-evaluations. The final program evaluation report was written by the H/D consultant using findings of the on-site verification visit.

States #2 and #4 had decentralized evaluation designs. In each of these states, a local evaluation team (its composition based on SEA guidelines) was responsible for conducting an evaluation of the program using SEA prescribed instruments. Following the evaluation, a member of the local team wrote the final program evaluation report and submitted it to the H/D consultant.

The evaluation design of state #5 was centralized, but a mixture of SEA and LEA directed program evaluation activities. In this state, an inter-disciplinary, self-study evaluation committee selected by the LEA (its composition based on SEA guidelines) was responsible for conducting a school-wide evaluation of all supportive

35

41

services provided to vocational special needs students.
After completion of this study, an SEA appointed external
evaluation team, using the same type of SEA evaluation
instrument as used by the LEA, conducted an evaluation of
the school's supportive services to special needs students.
However, the final evaluation report was written by the
state consultant for vocational special needs using: (a)
the results of the LEA self-study; (b) the vocational
special needs external evaluation team's findings; and (c)
the reports of two other external evaluation teams that had
assessed regular vocational programs and the school's
compliance with state and federal vocational education
laws.

The analysis of state's H/D program evaluation designs
revealed each of the five sample states with formally
structured H/D program evaluation systems:

- utilized SEA designated Likert-type scales to
  quantitatively record the extent of program planning
  and operational processes;

- used the same evaluation design for assessing the
  effectiveness of program planning processes as it
  used for assessing the effectiveness of program
  operational processes; and,

42

● ᵢ employed the same evaluation design to evaluate H/D
programs as it used to evaluate other vocational
education programs.

C. Program Evaluation Strategies

Evaluation strategies in four of five states involved
the use of an external individual(s) in the evaluative
process. In the one state not involving an external
evaluator(s), the evaluative strategy was to survey
individuals involved in and/or affected by all vocational
programs.

The four external evaluation strategies identified to
assess the effectiveness of H/D program planning and
operational processes were:

1. The H/D consultant (state #1). The consultant
conducted an on-site visit to view the program in
operation, talk with the program's students and
instructor, and review program and student records.
Based on this visit, the consultant verified the
program instructor's self-evaluation of program
effectiveness.

37

43

2. A special needs "expert" appointed by the H/D consultant (state #3). The expert was appointed from a group of individuals selected and trained by the H/D consultant. The consultant or expert conducted an on-site visit to view the program in operation, talk with the instructor, and review program and student records. Based on this visit, the evaluator verified the program instructor's self-evaluation of the program's effectiveness.

3. An LEA appointed team of individuals, its composition prescribed by the SEA, employed in vocations not directly related to education (state #4). Usually, this team has been composed of local H/D program advisory committee members. An evening meeting of team members was held to discuss SEA formulated questions about the program and to rate the program's effectiveness.

4. An SEA appointed team of special needs experts from outside the LEA (state #5). Experts from other school districts - persons employed as vocational special needs instructors or in occupations related to the education of handicapped and/or disadvantaged individuals - conducted an on-site visit,

interviewed students and the program staff, viewed
the program in operation, and reviewed program and
student records. Based on this visit, the team
members evaluated the program's effectiveness using
a SEA developed instrument.

In the one state not involving an external evaluator
(state #2), the LEA conducted an opinion survey (its
composition determined by the SEA) of individuals involved
in and/or affected by vocational education programs. Four
groups of individuals (randomly selected by SEA prescribed
percentages) were surveyed: parents, students, school
professional staff and advisory committee members.
Instruments were individualized for each survey group and
contained questions related to the effectiveness of all
vocational education programs. Individual responses were
tabulated, recorded as group mean scores and reported on an
SEA prescribed form.

2. Telephone Interview Results For States With Formally
   Structured Evaluation Systems

The H/D consultant telephone interviews for states
with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems
revealed a generally positive opinion about the purposes,

39

.45 .

effectiveness, utility, and value of their respective
state's H/D program evaluation system.

When asked whether H/D programs were evaluated as part
of, or separate from, their state's on-going system for
evaluating all vocational education programs within the
period of their SEA's Five Year Plan, consultants in four
states (states #1, #3, #4, and #5) answered they evaluated
H/D programs as a separate activity and with separate
instruments. The consultant of state #2 responded H/D
program evaluation was included within - was part of - the
SEA's evaluation instrument used for evaluating all
vocational education programs. All consultants indicated
H/D program evaluation was conducted at the same time as
the SEA was evaluating all other vocational education
programs as required in the 1976 Amendments.

In response to the question: "What are the purposes
for evaluating H/D programs and services in your state?",
all consultants stated it was to provide information for
program improvement. Thirteen additional purposes related
to program planning and operational processes were also
identified by consultants. These purposes are listed in
Table 3.

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest,
consultants assigned a number value of 3 or 4 when asked
how well their state's H/D evaluation system was able to

40

46

Table 3

H/D Consultants Opinions About the
Purposes for Evaluating H/D Programs

Purposes	Consultant opinions by state				
	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
To determine whether the LEA program is serving H/D students	X				X
To determine whether the LEA is doing what it said it would do to meet the needs of H/D students (e.g. meeting objectives stated in the funding proposal	X				
To provide information for program improvement	X	X	X	X	X
To evaluate program planning processes	X				
To identify student progress		X			
To identify teaching management problems		X			
To identify inservice needs of H/D instructors		X			
To gain information of what is actually happening in H/D programs for informing the state legislature and parent groups		X			
To be accountable for use of federal funds		X			
To determine whether the program is providing quality level services to H/D students			X		
To determine whether services are being provided to H/D students in a non-threatening environment			X		
To meet federal evaluation requirements				X	
To help the LEA determine local H/D program needs					X
To determine what the H/D program is doing					X

Note. S = state

determine the effectiveness of local program planning processes. When asked to rate their system's ability to determine the effectiveness of local program operational processes, consultants of states with an on-site, SEA appointed, evaluation team component assigned a numerical value of 4.5 and 5, while consultants of states without an on-site, SEA appointed, evaluation team component rated their system's effectiveness as 1 and 2.5. Consultant ratings are graphically illustrated in Table 4.

When asked whether their state had encountered any difficulties during development of its H/D program evaluation system, all consultants responded they were unaware of any particular problems or were not employed by the SEA at the time the system was developed. However, two consultants mentioned they had encountered difficulties during the implementation of their state's H/D program evaluation system. The consultant of state #1 disclosed the state's H/D program evaluation system did not readily apply to all H/D programs and that more than one system was needed for evaluation of H/D programs and services. The consultant of state #2 outlined three difficulties encountered by the SEA in using its survey instruments: (1) the LEA's found it time consuming to administer, collect and tabulate the questionnaires; (2) the LEA's needed more

42

Table 4

Consultant Ratings of How Well Their System Can
Assess H/D Program Planning and Operational Processes

Type of Process	Consultant ratings by state				
	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
Program planning processes	4	4	3	4	4
Program operational processes	4.5	2.5	5	1	5

Note. S = State

Ratings are on a scale of 1 to 5 with
5 being the highest.

43

49

help from the consultant to interpret survey results than SEA time and travel funds could provide; and, (3) the questions in the surveys were too complex or too technical for some respondents.

With the exception of one state's difficulty in using its survey instruments, all consultants expressed a belief that reaction of local personnel to their state's evaluation of H/D programs had been good to excellent. When asked the question: "How do you as a state consultant think the local level vocational educators use results of H/D program evaluations?", the following responses were received:

> "They take it to heart and 90% of the LEA's implement recommendations. We know this because our State Advisory Council for Vocational Education did an evaluation of how LEA's perceived our H/D evaluation system." (state #1)

> "They take the evaluation seriously. It has resulted in people from the community becoming involved in planning processes and using program advisory committee members. It gives a real purpose to advisory committee meetings." (state #2)

> "Yes and No. If they like the evaluation, they seem to keep the program. If not, they drop it and make a new application for another handicapped or disadvantaged program. They don't seem to like improving on what they have." (state #3)

44

"They attempt to implement recommendations because
it is their own local people making recommendations,
not the state." (state #4)

"The LEA's implement them. If they don't we don't
fund the program again." (state #5)

In response to the question: "How do you as a state
consultant use results of H/D program evaluations?", all
consultants reported using results for monitoring whether
program evaluation recommendations had been implemented by
the LEA. Consultants of states with centralized evaluation
designs indicated using program evaluation findings to make
recommendations for program improvement and, when visiting
H/D programs, to determine whether these recommendations
had been implemented. Similarly, the consultants of states
with decentralized evaluation designs, when visiting H/D
programs, mentioned using results for determining whether
the LEA had implemented recommendations made by the locally
appointed program evaluation team. The specific responses
of consultants are listed in Table 5.

Table 5

Reported Use of
Program Evaluation Results

Results Reported by Consultants	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
To make recommendations for program improvement	X		X		X
To see if recommendations for program improvement have been implemented when visiting the H/D program	X		X		X
To see if local recommendations made by the locally appointed evaluation team have been implemented when visiting the H/D program		X		X	
To develop a state plan of action for working with the LEA		X			
To determine whether the program will be refunded		X			
To design inservice programs for H/D instructors		X			

Note. S = State

46

3. <u>Telephone Interview Results For States Conducting</u>
<u>Evaluations But Without Formally Structured Evaluation</u>
<u>Instruments or Procedures</u>

The H/D consultant telephone interviews for states
conducting H/D program evaluations, but <u>without</u> formally
structured evaluation instruments or procedures, disclosed
each of these states evaluated H/D programs: (1) at the
same time as all other vocational education programs; and,
(2) with instruments and/or procedures different than those
used in the state's on-going system for evaluating all
vocational education programs.

During telephone interviews, consultants in these
states revealed they controlled the evaluation design by
acting as the external evaluator. The consultant: a) made
an on-site visit; b) determined whether the program was
meetings its goals and objectives as stated in its funding
proposal; and, c) wrote the final program evaluation
report.

Consultants in this group expressed they knew their
H/D programs well and, thus, did not need to conduct an
evaluation using formally structured instruments and/or
procedures. Some consultants referred to using H/D program
standards "if necessary" to aid in the evaluation of a
"marginal" program. Others indicated they evaluated
programs through informal visits and observations of the

47

program over an indefinite period of time. Three
consultants expressed a personal desire to have a formally
structured H/D program evaluation system, but each was
doubtful whether federal and/or state funds would be made
available to develop and implement such a system.

Telephone interviews identified three states in the
process of developing their H/D program evaluation systems.
The consultants of two states disclosed their SEA's were in
the process of developing entirely new SEA evaluation
systems based on results of Federal monitoring reviews by
the U.S. Department of Education. The other state's
consultant disclosed a new SEA evaluation-system was being
developed to meet evaluation guidelines recently mandated
by the State Director of Vocational Education.

One state did not evaluate H/D vocational education
programs. This state's consultant stated the SEA had never
conducted evaluations of H/D programs in the past, nor was
the consultant aware of plans to conduct such evaluations
in the future.

48

54

V. CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of handicapped and disadvantaged vocational education appeared to be an organized activity in most rural states. More than two-thirds of the sample states, 10 of 14 states, evaluated H/D programs.

Although all states evaluated H/D programs at the same time as all other vocational education programs were being evaluated, only one state evaluated H/D programs as part of its total SEA vocational education program evaluation system. In the other nine states, H/D programs were evaluated separately, apart from, other vocational education programs.

The predominate evaluation strategy used for assessing H/D programs was to have an external evaluator(s) visit each program to talk with the instructor(s), interview students, view program facilities and records, observe the program in operation, and report findings to the SEA. In the one state without an external evaluator component, the strategy was to include H/D program assessment questions within the SEA's opinion survey administered to individuals involved in and/or affected by all vocational education programs.

Based on the analysis of documents provided by states with formally structured evaluation instruments and procedures, the types of strategies used for assessing H/D program planning and operational processes were determined by each state's preference for either a SEA controlled (centralized) or a LEA controlled (decentralized) evaluation design. States with a centralized evaluation design utilized control strategies for conducting evaluations which overtly involved the H/D consultant in all phases of each program evaluation, limited the extent of LEA involvement in program evaluation activities, and placed responsibility for writing the final program evaluation report on the H/D consultant. In contrast, states with a decentralized evaluation design utilized control strategies for conducting evaluations which minimized involvement of the H/D consultant in program evaluation activities, encouraged LEA involvement during program evaluation activities, and excluded the H/D consultant from participation in preparation of the final program evaluation report.

However, regardless of whether the SEA preferred a centralized or a decentralized evaluation design, all SEA's with formally structured evaluation instruments and procedures used the same strategies for controlling the content of evaluative questions and the recording of

50

evaluator's assessments. In each state, this control was effected through the joint strategies of requiring an evaluator(s) to use SEA prescribed: (1) questions for assessing the effectiveness of program planning and operational processes; and, (2) Likert-type scales for recording their opinions about the extent of H/D program planning and operational processes.

All states conducting H/D program evaluation but without formally structured instruments or procedures had centralized evaluation designs. Among these states, the sole evaluation strategy was to have the H/D consultant act as an external evaluator, but without formal SEA strategies for assessing the effectiveness of program planning and operational processes. In essence, the H/D consultant determined the conduct, content and recording of program evaluations on a program-by-program basis.

57

VI. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The number of operational process indicators recorded
by the researcher appeared to have little relationship with
consultant ratings of how effectively their evaluation
systems were able to assess H/D program operational
processes. For Example: State # 3 had six indicators and
state # 5 had one indicator of program operational
processes (see Table 2 on page 33). But, on a scale of 1
to 5, 5 being the highest, each of these state's
consultants rated their evaluation system's effectiveness
as "5" (see Table 4 on page 43). Apparently, regardless of
how many indicators were present in the SEA's evaluation
documents, some other factor(s) must have influenced the
ratings of consultants about the effectiveness of their
systems for assessing program operational processes.

One influencing factor appeared to be the extent of
SEA involvement in activities during assessment of LEA
program operational processes. In states with an on-site,
SEA appointed, evaluation team component (states #1, #3 and
#5), consultants rated their evaluation system as very
effective for assessing program operational processes.
But, in states without an on-site, SEA appointed,

evaluation team component (states #2 and #4), consultants rated their system as less than effective for assessing program operational processes.

This observation suggests the need for further research to determine whether the LEA's of sample states would agree with reported consultant ratings of their SEA evaluation system's effectiveness. If, for example, LEA's of states with centralized evaluation designs (states #1, #2 and #3) reported direct SEA involvement increased the effectiveness of program evaluations and the LEA's of states with decentralized evaluation designs (states #2 and #4) identified the lack of direct SEA involvement decreased the effectiveness of program evaluations, then the degree of SEA involvement may proportionately increase program evaluation effectiveness. Perhaps, if SEA involvement increases the effectiveness of program evaluations, then SEA participation in ʰ l evaluation activities should be part of each state's program evaluation design.

Another discrepancy in the study data became apparent when consultant opinions about the "purposes" for conducting evaluations were compared with their opinions about how they as consultants "used" program evaluation results. Of the 14 purposes for evaluating H/D programs reported by consultants (see Table 3 on page 41), only the purpose of program evaluation "to provide information for

53

program improvement" was mentioned by all consultants.
However, as can be seen in Table 5 on page 46, consultants
used program evaluation results for making program
improvement recommendations and for determining whether
program improvement recommendations had been implemented by
the LEA's. Evidently, although not mentioned by
consultants, another purpose of program evaluation was to
provide criteria for determining whether LEA's had
implemented program improvement recommendations.

Based on this analysis of data, it was unclear to the
researcher whether consultants were providing technical
assistance when they visited programs (e.g. offering
equipment modification suggestions and curriculum revisions
to meet the learning needs of a handicapped student),
and/or, whether consultants were making compliance checks
when they visited programs (e.g. monitoring the extent of
program improvement in order to determine if the program
should be refunded). Perhaps, as reflected in the
following comments of consultants about how they thought
LEA's used program evaluation results, SEA's mostly "used"
results to provide information for compliance checks:

> "LEA's implement them (recommendations for program
> improvement). If they don't, we don't refund the
> program again" (p. 44); and,

> "If the LEA likes the evaluation, they seem to keep
> the program. If not, they drop it and make a new

application for another H/D program. They don't
seem to like improving on what they had". (p.45)

However, if SEA's use program evaluation results for
the predominate purpose of providing information to make
program compliance checks, LEA's may simply be making
program improvements in order to secure refunding or
terminating programs to avoid SEA monitoring practices. A
study focusing on LEA program implementation practices
could be helpful in defining the state's role in working
with LEA's about program improvement matters.

To developers of state systems for evaluating H/D
programs and services, the following general
recommendations are offered:

- Identify the SEA's specific purposes for evaluating
  H/D programs and services.

- Determine the extent to which the SEA will be
  directly involved in evaluation activities (e.g.
  during LEA orientation meetings, during the actual
  conduct of the evaluation, during preparation of the
  final program evaluation report).

- Establish with the SEA who will be responsible for
  the actual conduct of the program evaluations (e.g.
  the H/D consultant, a LEA or SEA appointed

55

61

evaluation team, an independent third party
evaluator).

● Have the SEA define and enumerate how program
  evaluation results will be used after programs have
  been evaluated.

● Build into the state's H/D program evaluation system
  a mechanism for assessing the impact of program
  evaluation on the SEA, LEA's, and programs and
  services for handicapped and disadvantaged
  vocational education students.

62

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Frasier, J. & Albright, L. Toward Building A Special
    Needs Evaluation Component Into The QAS. Burlington,
    Vt.: Department of Vocational Education and
    Technology, 1981.

2. Thomas, H.B. Personal Communication, April 19, 1982.

3. Wentling, T.L. Personal Communication, April 19, 1982.

57

63

REFERENCES

Barlow, M. 200 Years of Vocational Education: Special
Bicentennial Issue. _American Vocational Journal_.
1976, Vol. 51, No. 5, pp. 81-82.

Berelson, B. _Content Analysis in Communication Research_.
New York: Hafner Publishing Co. 1971.

Beuke, V.L.; Lukas, C.V.; Brigham, N.; Glick, G.S. ; and
Breen, J.P. _Implementation of the Education_
Amendments of 1976: A Study of State and Social
Compliance and Evaluation Practices. Prepared under
NIE Contract No. 400-78-0041. Cambridge,
Massachusetts: Abt Associates, Inc., December 1980.

Bryan, F.M. _Politics in the Rural States: People,_
Parties, and Processes. Boulder: West-view Press,
1981.

Essex, M.W. _Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man_
and His Work. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government
Printing Office, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction
Service No. ED 021-151)

Erdos, P.L. _Professional Mail Surveys_. New York:
McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Federal Rules and Regulations, October 3, 1977 (Department
of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of
Education). Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government
Printing Office, 1974.

General Accounting Office. _What is the Role of Federal_
Assistance for Vocational Education? (Report to
Congress by the Comptroller General of the United
States, December 31, 1974). Washington, D.C.: U.S.
Government Printing Office, 1974.

58

Lee, A.M. Project Baseline: Historical Foundations of
    Vocational Education Statistics. Educational
    Researcher, 1977, 67, pp. 3-9.

Moser, C.A., & Kalton, G. Survey Methods in Social
    Investigation. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Olympus Research Corporation. An Assessment of Vocational
    Education Programs for the Handicapped Under Part B of
    the 1968/Amendments to the Vocational Education Act.
    Salt Lake City: Olympus Research Corporation, 1974.
    (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 101-501)

Olympus Research Corporation. An Assessment of Vocational
    Education Programs for the Disadvantaged Under Part A
    and Section 102 (b) of the 1968 Amendments to the
    Vocational Education Act. Salt Lake City: Olympus
    Research Corporation, 1976. (ERIC Document
    Reproduction No. ED 133-368)

Phelps, L.A. Research on Vocational Education Programs for
    Special Populations: Research Review. In T.L.
    Wentling (Ed.) Arrive: Annual Review of Research in
    Vocational Education, Vol. one. Urbana: University of
    Illinois and Illinois State Board of Education, 1980.

P.L. 88-210. Vocational Education Act of 1963. United
    States Statutes at Large. Washington D.C.: U.S.
    Government Printing Office, 1964, Vol. 77.

P.L. 90-576. 1968 Vocational Education Act Amendments.
    United States Statutes at Large. Washington D.C.:
    U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969, Vol. 82.

P.L. 94-482. 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments.
    United States Statutes at Large. Washington D.C.; U.S.
    Government Printing Office, 1978, Vol. 90, Part 2.

59

Sanders, J.R., & Cunningham, D.J. A Structure for
    Formative Evaluation in Project Development. Review
    of Educational Research, 1973, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp.
    217-236.

Smith, M.L. The Context of Evaluation Practice in State
    Departments of Education. Educational Evaluation and
    Policy Analysis Vol. 4, No. 3, 1982, pp.373-386.

Smith, E.G., & Holt, N.L. State Evaluation of Vocational
    Education Programs: A National Study of Evaluation
    Procedures and Practices. The Journal of Vocational
    Education Research, 1980, Vol. V., No. 1, pp. 17-39.

Smith, E.G., & Holt, N.L. State of the Art of Vocational
    Education Evaluation: State Evaluation Procedures and
    Practices Belmont, Massachusetts: CRC Education and
    Human Development, Inc., January 1979.

Stufflebeam, D.L. Evaluating the Context, Input, Process
    and Product of Education. Paper presented at the
    International Congress on the Evaluation of Physical
    Education, Jyvaskyla, Finland, 1976.

Stufflebeam, D.L., Foley, W.J., Gephart, W.J., Guba, E.G.,
    Hammond, R.I., Merriman, H.O., & Provus, M.M.
    Education Evaluation and Decision Making. Ithica:
    F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1971.

Thomas, H.B., & Margos, M.A. A Study to Identify the Unique
    Criteria and Standards Required for the Evaluation of
    Bilingual Vocational Education Programs. Paper
    presented at the meeting of the American Educational
    Research Association, New York, March 1982.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. City and County Data Book, 1977
    (A Statistical Abstract Supplement). Washington,
    D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

60

Wentling, T.L. A Survey of State Evaluation Practices in
    Vocational Education. Prepared under NIE Contract No.
    P-81-0126. Champaign, Illinois: University of
    Illinois, July 1981.

Wentling, T.L. Evaluating Occupational Education and
    Training Programs. Second Edition. Boston: Allyn and
    Bacon, 1980.

Wentling, T.L., & Barnard, W.S. A Study of State
    Evaluation Practices in Vocational Education. The
    Journal of Vocational Education Research, 1982, Vol.
    VII, No. 3, pp. 23-31.

Wentling, T.L., & Russo, R.P. A Review of Bases and
    Systems for the Evaluation of Services Provided to
    Special Needs Learners. The Journal of Vocational
    Education Research, 1978, Vol. III, No. 4, pp. 31-44.

Williams, E.J. Research Implications of Vocational
    Education for the Disadvantaged. In G. Law (Ed.)
    Contemporary Concepts in Vocational Education.
    Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association,
    1971.

67

APPENDIX A

GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES
AND RURAL STATES WITHIN EACH DIVISION

62

68

FOUR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

AND RURAL STATES WITHIN EACH DIVISION*

Geographic Division	Percent of Population Outside Central Cities and Suburbs
Northeast	
Maine	79
New Hampshire	73
**Vermont	100
North Central	
Iowa	65
Kansas	58
Nebraska	57
North Dakota	88
South Dakota	86
South	
Arkansas	69
Mississippi	82
Kentucky	60
North Carolina	62
South Carolina	61
West Virginia	68
West	
Alaska	100
Idaho	84
Montana	75
New Mexico	69
Wyoming	100

*The four geographic divisions are taken from the U.S. Bureau of the
County and City Data Book, 1977 and the identification of rural state
their respective percent of populations outside of central cities an
from Politics in the Rural States: People, Parties and Processes by P.

**Vermont w   tted from the stratified random selection of states.

63

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO EACH STATE'S
HANDICAPPED AND DISADVANTAGED CONSULTANT

64

The University of Vermont

DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION & TECHNOLOGY
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING BUILDING
BURLINGTON, VERMONT 05405
(802) 656-2001

February 3, 1982

Special Programs Unit
Department of Public Instruction
Division of Vocational Education
Fducation Building,

Dear

Thank you for favorably receiving my phone inquiry yesterday
about information concerning   evaluation of
secondary handicapped and disadvantaged vocational education
programs.

As I indicated to you in our conversation, the University of
Vermont is under contract with the Vermont Division of Vocational
Education to develop an evaluation system for secondary handicapped
and disadvantaged programs. Our effort is to develop a two level,
SEA-administered, evaluation system that can be:

1) integrated into Vermont's regular 5 year cycle for
   evaluation of all programs as per the 1976 evaluation
   mandates; and,

2) used as an independent instrument in the evaluation of
   an individual handicapped or disadvantaged program at
   the discretion of the Vermont Special Needs Consultant.

When we have completed the evaluation system our project develops
for the Vermont Division of Vocational Education, I will send you a
copy of the document.

I look forward to receiving   handicapped and
disadvantaged evaluation materials. Thank you for you help and
cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jim Frasier
Evaluation Project Coordinator

An Equal Opportunity Employer

APPENDIX C

FORMATING OF "IF YES-THEN"
QUESTION VARIABLES

66

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether

_____ LEA Self-evaluation	_____ using LEA developed instruments
_____ External Evaluation Team	_____ using SEA developed instruments
_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"	_____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments
_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation	_____ other
_____ Evaluation by State Consultant	
_____ other	

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other _____		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other _____		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other _____		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other _____		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other _____		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document:

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other _____		
Personal Interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other _____		
Review of student =records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other _____		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other _____		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other _____		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

APPENDIX D

RECORD OF REVIEWER CRITIQUES
AND
ACTION TAKEN

68

Procedures

The following three criteria were established by the researcher for determining the utility of reviewer's comments:

1. Only those reviewer comments and/or suggestions which clearly expanded the focus of the study were not added to the instruments. These were recorded as "BSTS" (Beyond the Scope of the Study).

2. All additions and/or modifications suggested by each reviewer would be added to the content analysis instruments.

3. Only those deletions suggested by the External Review Panel would be excluded from the content analysis instruments.

This appendix has been divided into three sections: (a) First Internal Review; (b) Second Internal Review; and (c) External Review Panel. Each section has a summary of individual reviewer's comments and a statement of action taken by the researcher in response to the reviewer's comments. The content analysis instruments used by each grouping of reviewers are presented at the end of each section.

76

FIRST INTERNAL REVIEW

70

77

Comments of Reviewer #1	Action Taken
No Comments	N/A

Comments of Reviewer #2	Action Taken
Intent of questions was unclear and wording of questions seemed awkward	All questions were reworded

Comments of Reviewer #3	Action Taken
Uncertain about the intent of differences between second and third "IF YES:" questions	Comment noted by researcher

MAJOR QUESTION:

What types of evaluation strategies are being used
by the SEA to evaluate the Planning Processes of
programs and services designed by LEAs for the
disadvantaged and handicapped students enrolled in
vocational education programs?

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE STRUCTURE OF A SEA's EVALUATION DESIGN

I. Are disadvantaged and handicapped programs and services evaluated as part of, or separate from, the state's ongoing system for evaluating all vocational education programs within the period of the five year state plan?

_____ as part of

_____ separate from

If separate from, how often are disadvantaged and/or handicapped programs and services evaluated by the SEA?

Every _____ for handicapped programs & services

Every _____ for disadvantaged programs & services

II. Are disadvantaged and handicapped programs and services evaluated with a common instrument, or with individually designed instruments?

_____ with a common instrument

_____ with individual, separate instruments

_____ with an inter-agency evaluation instrument designed in cooperation with vocational & special education

III. What is the present "use" status of the SEA's evaluation documents utilized for evaluation of handicapped and/or disadvantaged programs and services?

_____ currently being used without revision

_____ currently being used but with revisions or modifications

_____ currently being used but under revision

_____ no evaluation document currently being used, but the SEA is developing one for use within one year

_____ no evaluation document currently being used, nor does the SEA have plans for developing one

_____ no evaluation document(s) were furnished by the SEA for use in this study

What are the major evaluation strategy formats used by the SEA to evaluation the Planning Processes of LEA Programs and Services for disadvantaged and handicapped vocational education students?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other _____	___	___

What are the evaluation strategies used by the SEAs to verify planning processes and to determine the effectiveness of procedures used in planning processes?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other	___	___
Personal Interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other	___	___

1. Does the SEA evaluate the need for the program or service by assessing the LEA's efforts to identify and utilize resources and services available in the school and community for handicapped & disadvantaged students?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the LEA's efforts to identify and utilize such resources & services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA-developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA-developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other _____	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify LEA efforts to identify and utilize such resources and services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
Personal Interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify LEA efforts to identify & utilize such resources & services		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify such resources and sevices?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
Personal Interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other _____	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify & utilize such resources & services		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

84

2. Does the SEA evaluate how the handicapped or disadvantaged student is identified as needing services in order to succeed in a vocational education program?

_____ Yes _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how students in need of services are identified?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other_____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that students are correctly identified as needing services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other_____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other_____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other_____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other_____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other_____		
The SEA does not seek to verify that students are correctly identified as needing services		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify students in need of special services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other_____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other_____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out rates		
- other_____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other_____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other_____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify students in need of special services		

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

3. Does the SEA evaluate if only those handicapped & disadvantaged students unable to succeed in a vocational education program are served by the program or service?

_____ Yes _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine that only such students are served?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other _____	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that only students needing services are served?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Personal interviews with - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of student - records	___	___
- test scores	___	___
- drop-out ratios	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
- Grant Application (RFR)	___	___
- End of year program report	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports	___	___
- Compliance reports	___	___
- Minimum program standards	___	___
- other _____	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify that only students needing services are served	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to ensure that only such students are served?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Personal interviews with - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of student - records	___	___
- test scores	___	___
- drop-out rates	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
- End of year program report	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports	___	___
- Compliance reports	___	___
- Minimum program standards	___	___
- other _____	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to ensure that only handicapped & Disadvantaged students are served	___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

76

88

4. Does the SEA evaluate how the program or service assesses the unmet needs of individual program or service participants?/

_____Yes _____No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how a student's unmet needs are identified?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA Instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that a student's unmet needs are correctly identified?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of = students		
= parents		
= administrators		
= vocational faculty		
= pupil support personnel		
= program advisory committee		
= other _____		
Personal interviews with = students		
= parents		
= administrators		
= vocational faculty		
= pupil support personnel		
= program advisory committee		
= other _____		
Review of student = records		
= test scores		
= drop-out ratios		
= other _____		
Review of LEA = 1 and 5 year Plans		
= Grant Application (RFP)		
= End of year program report		
= other		
Review of SEA = Consultant's visit reports		
= Compliance reports		
= Minimum program standards		
= other _____		
The SEA does not seek to verify how the unmet needs of a student are identified		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify the unmet needs of a student?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of = students		
= parents		
= administrators		
= vocational faculty		
= pupil support personnel		
= program advisory committee		
= other _____		
Personal interviews with = students		
= parents		
= administrators		
= vocational faculty		
= pupil support personnel		
= program advisory committee		
= other _____		
Review of student = records		
= test scores		
= drop-out rates		
= other _____		
Review of LEA = 1 and 5 year Plans		
= Grant Application (RFP)		
= End of year program report		
= other		
Review of SEA = Consultant's visit reports		
= Compliance reports		
= Minimum program standards		
= other _____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify the unmet needs of students		

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

5. Does the SEA evaluate how people knowledgeable about the student are involved in the assessment which identifies the student's unmet needs?

___ Yes ___ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the involvement of people knowledgeable about the student in the assessment which identifies the student's unmet needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other _____	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify LEA efforts to involve such people in the assessment?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	students	___	___
	parents	___	___
	administrators	___	___
	vocational faculty	___	___
	pupil support personnel	___	___
	program advisory committee	___	___
	other	___	___
Personal interviews with	students	___	___
	parents	___	___
	administrators	___	___
	vocational faculty	___	___
	pupil support personnel	___	___
	program advisory committee	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of student	records	___	___
	test scores	___	___
	drop-out ratios	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of LEA	1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	End of year program report	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of SEA	Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	Compliance reports	___	___
	Minimum program standards	___	___
	other	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the involvement of such people in the assessment.		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve people in the assessment which identifies the student's unmet needs?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	students	___	___
	parents	___	___
	administrators	___	___
	vocational faculty	___	___
	pupil support personnel	___	___
	program advisory committee	___	___
	other	___	___
Personal interviews with	students	___	___
	parents	___	___
	administrators	___	___
	vocational faculty	___	___
	pupil support personnel	___	___
	program advisory committee	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of student	records	___	___
	test scores	___	___
	drop-out rates	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of LEA	1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	End of year program report	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of SEA	Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	Compliance reports	___	___
	Minimum program standards	___	___
	other	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve people in the assessment which identifies the student's unmet needs		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

78

92

Does the SEA evaluate how the unmet needs of individual Program or service participants influence the formation of goals and objectives for each individual participant?

    ___ Yes   ___ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how individual participants influence the formation of their respective goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that individual participants influence the formation of their respective goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other _____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other _____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other		
The SEA does not seek to verify that individual participants influence formation of goals & objectives		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used by the LEA with individual participants to provide for influencing the formation of their respective goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other _____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other _____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to provide for participant's influencing of their respective goals & objectives		

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

MICROFILMED FROM
BEST AVAILABLE COPY

7. Does the SEA evaluate how the unmet needs of program or service participants influence formation of the LEA's program or service goals and objectives?

___ Yes ___ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how individual participant's unmet needs influence the formation of the LEA's program or service goals & objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other _____	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that individual participant's unment needs influence the formation of the LEA's program or service goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of -- students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Personal interviews with - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of student - records	___	___
- test scores	___	___
- drop-out ratios	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
- End of year program report	___	___
- other _____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports	___	___
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards	___	___
- other _____	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify how participant's unmet needs influence program goals & objectives	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used by the LEA with participants to provide for their influencing the formation of the LEA's program or service goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Personal interviews with - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of student - records	___	___
- test scores	___	___
- drop-out rates	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
- End of year program report	___	___
- other _____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports	___	___
- Compliance reports	___	___
- Minimum program standards	___	___
- other _____	___	___

The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to provide for the participation of program participants in the formation of LEA program goals and objectives ___ ___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

8. Does the SEA evaluate how the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning process which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

_____ Yes _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how the vocational instructor is involved in such planning?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the vocational instructor is involved in the planning process?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other _____		

The SEA does not seek to verify the vocational instructor's involvement in such planning

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used by the LEA to involve the vocational instructor in planning which develops the goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out rates		
- other		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other		

The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve the vocational instructor in planning which develops the goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

87

9. Does the SEA evaluate how people knowledgeable about the needs of disadvantaged and handicapped persons are involved in the planning which influences the formation of the program or service's goals and objectives?
        ___ Yes ___ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how such knowledgeable persons are involved in planning?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the involvement of such persons in the planning which influences program goals & objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other		
The SEA does not seek to verify how such persons are involved in planning		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve knowledgeable persons in the planning which influences the formation of program or service's goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out rates		
- other		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve such persons in this type of planning		

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

82

MAJOR QUESTION:

What types of evaluation strategies are being used
by the SEA to evaluate the Operational Processes
of programs and services designed by LEAs for the
disadvantaged and handicapped students enrolled in
vocational education programs?

1. ...the program or service is being implemented as
originally ...

Yes _No_

... strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine
... or service is being implemented as originally planned?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
...ation		
...veloped instruments		
...uation		
...developed instruments		
...uation Team		
...developed instruments		
...luation Team		
...developed instruments		
...valuation by an "expert"		
SEA developed instruments		
...l evaluation by an "expert"		
...ng LEA developed instruments		
...endent Third Party Evaluation		
...ing neither SEA or LEA instruments		
...luation by State Consultant		
using SEA developed instruments		
...valuation by State Consultant		
using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant		
using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the
program or service is being implemented as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other _____		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other _____		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other _____		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other		

The SEA does _not_ seek to verify if the
program or service is being implemented as planned

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effec...ness
of procedures used to implement the program or service?

		Disadvantaged	...apped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other _____		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other _____		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out rates		
	- other _____		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other _____		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other		

The SEA does _not_ seek to verify the effectiveness
of procedures used to implement the program or
service

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

2. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which people involved in and affected by the program or service are in agreement with the purpose(s) of the program or service?

        _____ Yes   _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine
if the individuals affected or involved in the program are in agreement?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team, using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the persons involved or affected by the program are in agreement with the purpose(s)?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other _____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other		

The SEA does not seek to verify if the individuals are in agreement with the purpose(s) _____ _____

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to assess the agreement of individuals with the purpose(s)?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out rates		
- other _____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other _____		

The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to assess agreement of individuals _____ _____

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

3. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which people involved in and affected by the program or service are aware of the services provided by the program or service?

___ Yes   ___ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the extent of individual's awareness?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent of individual's awareness of the services provided by the program or service?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other ____		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other ____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the extent of individual's awareness			

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to assess the extent of individual awareness?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out rates		
	- other ____		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other ____		

The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to assess the extent of individual's awareness

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

96

4. Does the SEA evaluate what effect the program or service is having on a participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

        _____ Yes   _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the effect of the program or service upon the participant's performance?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other _____	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effect of the program or service upon the participant's performance?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Personal interviews with - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of student - records	___	___
- test scores	___	___
- drop-out ratios	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
- End of year program report	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports	___	___
- Compliance reports	___	___
- Minimum program standards	___	___
- other _____	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effect of the program or service upon the participant	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of the program or service upon the participant's performance?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Personal interviews with - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of student - records	___	___
- test scores	___	___
- drop-out rates	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
- End of year program report	___	___
- other _____	___	___
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports	___	___
- Compliance reports	___	___
- Minimum program standards	___	___
- other _____	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of the program or service upon the participant's performance in a vocational education program	___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

5. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which people involved in and affected by
the program or service are in agreement with the adequacy, capacity and condition
instructional resources available for use by participants?
_____ Yes _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the
availability of such resources to participants?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other_____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent of
the availability of such resources to participants?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other_____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other_____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other_____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other_____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other_____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the extent of availability of such resoureces to participants		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness
of such instructional resources available for use by participants?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other_____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other_____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out rates		
- other_____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other_____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other_____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of such resources available for use by participants		

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

6. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which the program or service is able to meet stated program or service goals?

＿＿Yes ＿＿No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the extent to which program or service goals are being met?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other＿＿＿＿＿＿＿		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent to which program or service goals are being met?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other＿＿＿＿		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other＿＿＿		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other＿＿＿		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other＿＿＿		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other＿＿＿		
The SEA does not seek to verify the extent to which the program or service goals are being met			

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of the program or service in meeting stated program or service goals?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other＿＿＿＿		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other＿＿＿		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out rates		
	- other＿＿＿		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other＿＿＿		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other＿＿＿		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of the program or service in meeting stated goals			

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

68

7. Does the SEA evaluate how the project staff indentifies and records what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program or service?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program or service?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA Instruments	___	___
Other ___	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent to which staff actually record what takes place each day?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	students	___	___
	parents	___	___
	administrators	___	___
	vocational faculty	___	___
	pupil support personnel	___	___
	program advisory committee	___	___
	other	___	___
Personal interviews with	students	___	___
	parents	___	___
	administrators	___	___
	vocational faculty	___	___
	pupil support personnel	___	___
	program advisory committee	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of student	records	___	___
	test scores	___	___
	drop-out ratios	___	___
	other ___	___	___
Review of LEA	1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	End of year program report	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of SEA	Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	Compliance reports	___	___
	Minimum program standards	___	___
	other	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify what takes place each day of the program's operation		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of the staff's recording of what actually takes place each day?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	students	___	___
	parents	___	___
	administrators	___	___
	vocational faculty	___	___
	pupil support personnel	___	___
	program advisory committee	___	___
	other	___	___
Personal interviews with	students	___	___
	parents	___	___
	administrators	___	___
	vocational faculty	___	___
	pupil support personnel	___	___
	program advisory committee	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of student	records	___	___
	test scores	___	___
	drop-out rates	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of LEA	1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	End of year program report	___	___
	other	___	___
Review of SEA	Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	Compliance reports	___	___
	Minimum program standards	___	___
	other	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of the staff's recording of daily operations		___	

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

8. Does the SEA evaluate how the LEA identifies and monitors on a continuous basis the potential of participants to succeed in their vocational program without the program or service?

          ___Yes   ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how the staff monitors participant's potential to succeed without the program or service?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other _____	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the continous staff monitoring of participant's potential to succeed with the program?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other	___	___
Personal interviews with - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of student - records	___	___
- test scores	___	___
- drop-out ratios	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
- End of year program report	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports	___	___
- Compliance reports	___	___
- Minimum program standards	___	___
- other	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the staff's monitoring of participant's potential	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of staff's monitoring procedures to determine the potential of a participant's ability to succeed in a vocational program without the program or service?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other	___	___
Personal interviews with - students	___	___
- parents	___	___
- administrators	___	___
- vocational faculty	___	___
- pupil support personnel	___	___
- program advisory committee	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of student - records	___	___
- test scores	___	___
- drop-out rates	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
- End of year program report	___	___
- other	___	___
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports	___	___
- Compliance reports	___	___
- Minimum program standards	___	___
- other	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of staff's monitoring procedures	___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

9. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which people involved in and affected by the program or service believe the instructional offerings are available to disadvantaged and handicapped students?

_____ Yes   _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the extent to which the program or service is available?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent to which the program or service is available to students?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
*Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other		
The SEA does not seek to verify the extent to which the program or service is available		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of the procedures used to make the program available to handicapped and disadvantaged students?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out rates		
- other _____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other _____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to make the program available		

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

92

118

119

10. Does the SEA evaluate the extnet to which people involved in and affected by the program or service believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student needs?

Yes ___ No ___

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine that such instructional offerings are appropriately matched with student needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out ratios		
- other _____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other _____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other _____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the matching of instruction based on student needs		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to match instructional offerings with student needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Personal interviews with - students		
- parents		
- administrators		
- vocational faculty		
- pupil support personnel		
- program advisory committee		
- other _____		
Review of student - records		
- test scores		
- drop-out rates		
- other _____		
Review of LEA - 1 and 5 year Plans		
- Grant Application (RFP)		
- End of year program report		
- other _____		
Review of SEA - Consultant's visit reports		
- Compliance reports		
- Minimum program standards		
- other _____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to match student needs with appropriate instruction		

<u>COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:</u>

93

121

SECOND INTERNAL REVIEW

93

122

Comments of Reviewer #1	Action Taken
<u>Delete</u> Operational Process Instrument Question: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff identifies and monitors on a continous basis the potential of participants to succeed in their respective vocational programs without the program? (hereafter referred to as Operational Process Instrument Question #8)	Noted by researcher
<u>Delete</u> Operational Process Instrument Question: "Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program believe the instructional offerings are available to those disadvantaged and handicapped students most in need of the program? (hereafter referred to as Operational Process Instrument Question #9)	Noted by researcher

124

Comments of Reviewer #2	Action Taken
<u>D</u>elete Operational Process Instrument Question #8	Noted by researcher
<u>Add</u> to Operational Process Instrument the question: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?"	Question added
Add to Operational Process Instrument the question: "Does the SEA evalutate whether the program's instructor has the teacher qualifications to work with handicapped and/or disadvantaged persons?"	Question added
<u>Add</u> to Planning Process Instrument the question: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for implementing major program goals and objectives?"	Question added
Restructure listing of strategy format possibilities to maximize potential combinations	Listing restructured
<u>D</u>evelop letter code for possible answers to "If Yes" questions and highlight with a boxlike enclosure	Code developed & enclosed
<u>D</u>ivide each phase of the content analysis sheet by boxing "If Yes" questions	Questions were enclosed

95

PROPOSED USE OF THIS INSTRUMENT

This instrument will be used for conducting a <u>qualitative content analysis</u> of documents used by state education agencies (SEAs) to evaluate the effectiveness of local education agency (LEA) vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

MAJOR QUESTION OF THIS INSTRUMENT

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by SEAs to evaluate <u>OPERATIONAL PROCESSES</u> of LEA vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student?

Prepared by
Jim Frasier

127

I have developed the questions listed below to identify whether SEA evaluation documents address the evaluation of program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

As you read these questions, will you please

1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of each question's value in identifying program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES; and,

2. offer additional questions you think could be used to identify program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

---

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been implemented as originally planned?

2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy, capacity and/or condition of instructional resources available for use by participants?

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participants performance in their respective vocational education program?

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been able to meet stated program goals?

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the project staff identifies and records what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program?

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff identifies and monitors on a continuous basis the potential of participants to succeed in their respective vocational programs without the program?

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program believe the instructional offerings are available to those disadvantaged and handicapped students most in need of the program?

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student needs?

I will use the same "If yes...then" instrument format to identify the types of evaluation strategies being used by SEAs to evaluate program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

As you read the questions on the opposite side of this page, will you please

1. substitute questions within the instrument format;

2. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of using the "If yes...then" format to identify OPERATIONAL PROCESSES; and,

3. if appropriate, offer an alternative format for use in identifying types of evaluation strategies using SEA evaluation documents.

originally planned?

_____ Yes _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine
if the program or service is being implemented as originally planned?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the
program or service is being implemented as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	students		
	parents		
	administrators		
	vocational faculty		
	pupil support personnel		
	program advisory committee		
	other _____		
Personal Interviews with	students		
	parents		
	administrators		
	vocational faculty		
	pupil support personnel		
	program advisory committee		
	other _____		
Review of student	records		
	test scores		
	drop-out ratios		
	other _____		
Review of LEA	1 and 5 year Plans		
	Grant Application (RFP)		
	End of year program report		
	other _____		
Review of SEA	Consultant's visit reports		
	Compliance reports		
	Minimum program standards		
	other _____		

The SEA does not seek to verify if the
program or service is being implemented as planned

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness
of procedures used to implement the program or service?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	students		
	parents		
	administrators		
	vocational faculty		
	pupil support personnel		
	program advisory committee		
	other _____		
Personal Interviews with	students		
	parents		
	administrators		
	vocational faculty		
	pupil support personnel		
	program advisory committee		
	other _____		
Review of student	records		
	test scores		
	drop-out rates		
	other _____		
Review of LEA	1 and 5 year Plans		
	Grant Application (RFP)		
	End of year program report		
	other _____		
Review of SEA	Consultant's visit reports		
	Compliance reports		
	Minimum program standards		
	other _____		

The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness
of procedures used to implement the program or
service

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

86

PROPOSED USE OF THIS INSTRUMENT

This instrument will be used for conducting a <u>qualitative content analysis</u> of documents used by state education agencies (SEAs) to evaluate the effectiveness of local education agency (LEA) vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

MAJOR QUESTION OF THIS INSTRUMENT

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by SEAs to evaluate the <u>PLANNING PROCESSES</u> of LEA vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student?

Prepared by
Jim Frasier

I have developed the questions listed below to identify whether SEA evaluation documents address the evaluation of program PLANNING PROCESSES.

As you read these questions, will you please

1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of each question's value in identifying program PLANNING PROCESSES; and,

2. offer additional questions you think could be used to identify program PLANNING PROCESSES.

_____

1. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA program to identify students needing this program "in order to succeed in their vocational education program"?

3. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program is serving only those handicapped/disadvantaged students unable to succeed in their vocational education program?

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant?

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, counselors, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs?

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of their respective program goals and objectives?

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students are involved in the planning which influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

I have developed an "If yes...then" instrument format to identify the types of evaluation strategies being used by SEAs to evaluate program PLANNING PROCESSES.

As you review the questions on the opposite side of this page, will you please

1. substitute questions within the instrument format;

2. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of using the "If yes...then" format to identify PLANNING PROCESSES; and,

3. If appropriate, offer an alternative format for use in identifying types of evaluation strategies using SEA evaluation documents.

100

1. Does the SEA evaluate the need for the program or service by assessing the LEA's efforts to identify and utilize resources and services available in the school and community for handicapped & disadvantaged students?

_____ Yes _____ No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the LEA's efforts to identify and utilize such resources & services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other _____		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify LEA efforts to identify and utilize such resources and services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of = students		
= parents		
= administrators		
= vocational faculty		
= pupil support personnel		
= program advisory committee		
= other _____		
Personal interviews with = students		
= parents		
= administrators		
= vocational faculty		
= pupil support personnel		
= program advisory committee		
= other _____		
Review of student = records		
= test scores		
= drop-out ratios		
= other _____		
Review of LEA = 1 and 5 year Plans		
= Grant Application (RFP)		
= End of year program report		
= other		
Review of SEA = Consultant's visit reports		
= Compliance reports		
= Minimum program standards		
= other _____		
The SEA does not seek to verify LEA efforts to identify & utilize such resources & services		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify such resources and sevices?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of = students		
= parents		
= administrators		
= vocational faculty		
= pupil support personnel		
= program advisory committee		
= other _____		
Personal interviews with = students		
= parents		
= administrators		
= vocational faculty		
= pupil support personnel		
= program advisory committee		
= other _____		
Review of student = records		
= test scores		
= drop-out rates		
= other _____		
Review of LEA = 1 and 5 year Plans		
= Grant Application (RFP)		
= End of year program report		
= other		
Review of SEA = Consultant's visit reports		
= Compliance reports		
= Minimum program standards		
= other _____		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify & utilize such resources & services		

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

137
102

Comments of Reviewer #1	Action Taken
Add to Operational Process Instrument a question about whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned	Question #5 added
Add to Operational Process Instrument a question about whether the parents and appropriate staff participated in implementation of the student's individualized program	Question #6 added
Reword in Planning Process Instrument Question #3 to focus on the efforts made by LEA's to identify those individuals in need of special services or programs	Question #3 reworded
Delete in Operational Process Instrument Question #8	Question #8 deleted
Delete in Operational Process Instrument Question #9	Question #9 deleted
Delete in Operational Process Instrument Question #12: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the necessary qualifications to work with H/D vocational students unmet needs?"	No action taken question formulated from PL 94-482 requirements

103

Comments of Reviewer #1 (continued)	Action Taken
Expand format to identify reasons for why a particular content analysis indicator was not addressed by the SEA	No action (BSTS)
Identify time interval for how often the SEA addressed a content analysis indicator	No action (BSTS)
Establish the extent to which SEA evaluation practices have been established for implementing content analysis indicators	No action (BSTS)
Add to Operational Process Instrument questions which focus on whether the SEA had evaluated the appropriateness and effectiveness of LEA's due process procedures	No action (BSTS)
Add to Operational Process Instrument questions which focus on in-service needs activities provided to teachers	No action (BSTS)
Add to Planning Process Instrument a question which focuses on the planning processes used by LEA to establish individual IEP's for students	No action (BSTS)
Regroup questions in Planning Process Instrument to identify evaluation practices used by SEA's with students, parents, teachers or vocational instructors	No action (BSTS)

Note: (BSTS) =s Beyond Scope of The Study

104

Comments of Reviewer #2	Action Taken
Question #1 in Operational Process Instrument: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been implemented as originally planned?" is the same as Question #6: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been able to meet stated program goals?", if you can assume that the original plan includes goals.	Question #6 deleted
Add to Question #1 in Operational Process Instrument: "...or an improvement over that which was planned."	Deleted the word "orginally" from Question #1
Indicated the phrase "people involved in and/or affected by" in Operational Process Instruments was "too vague".	No action taken- researcher intended to be non-categorical
Delete Question #7 in Operational Process Instrument: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff identifies and records what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program?". This would require an inter-action analysis.	Question #7 deleted
Questioned how it would be possible to answer Operational Process Question #8	Question #8 deleted

105

142

143

Comments of Reviewer #2 (Continued)	Action Taken
Question the significance of Operational Process Question #9	Question #9 deleted
Questioned what would be an acceptable indicator that a teacher had the necessary qualifications to work with H/D students (Operational Process Instrument Question #12).	No action taken question formulated from PL 94-482 requirements
Reword Question #4 in Planning Process Instrument: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program is serving only those H/D students unable to succeed in their vocational education program?" to emphasize a program specifically designed to meet the needs of H/D students.	Question #4 reworded
Reword Question #7 in Planning Process Instrument: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of their respective program goals and objectives?" to clearly identify meaning of "their".	Question #7 reworded
Operationally define "Planning Processes" and "Operational Processes"	No action taken – instrument indicators operationally define these processes
Add question(s) related to assure the unique requirements of H/D students have been met in Planning and Operational Processes Instruments.	No action taken (BSTS)

Comments of Reviewer #3	Action Taken
No comments	N/A

PROPOSED USE OF THIS INSTRUMENT

This instrument will be used for conducting a <u>qualitative content analysis</u> of documents used by state education agencies (SEAs) to evaluate the effectiveness of local education agency (LEA) vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

The actual content analysis of SEA documents will be done by Jim Frasier. This instrument will not be mailed to a SEA nor will a SEA be requested to conduct a content analysis of evaluation documents using this instrument.

MAJOR QUESTION OF THIS INSTRUMENT

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by SEAs to evaluate the <u>PLANNING PROCESSES</u> of LEA vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student?

Prepared by

James Frasier
Agricultural Engineering Bldg.
Dept. of Voc. Ed. & Technology
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT   05405

I have developed the questions listed below to identify whether SEA
evaluation documents address the evaluation of program <u>OPERATIONAL PROCESSES</u>.

As you read these questions, will you please

    1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of each
       question's value in identifying program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES; and,

    2. offer additional questions you think could be used to identify
       program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

---

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been implemented as
   originally planned?

2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by
   the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?

3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by
   the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by
   the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional
   resources available for use by participants?

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the
   participants' performance in their respective vocational education
   programs?

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been able to meet
   stated program goals?

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff identifies and records
   what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program?

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff monitors on a
   continuous basis the potential of participants to succeed in their
   respective vocational programs <u>without</u> the program?

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by
   the program believe the instructional offerings are available to those
   disadvantaged and handicapped students <u>most</u> in need of the program?

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by
   the program believe the instructional offerings available are
   appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?

11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/
   pupil ratio to service the unmet needs of student participants?

12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the
   necessary teacher qualifications to work successfully with handicapped/
   disadvantaged vocational students' unmet needs?

The same "If Yes.....then" format used in the planning instrument will be
developed to identify the types of evaluation strategies being used by SEAs
to evaluate program <u>OPERATIONAL PROCESSES</u>.

As you review the questions on the opposite side of this page, will you
please

    1) substitute questions within the instrument format;

    2) critically review and comment on the appropriateness of using
       the "If yes.....then" format to identify OPERATIONAL PROCESSES; and,

    3) if appropriate, offer an alternative format for use in identifying
       types of evaluation strategies using SEA evaluation documents.

<u>COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:</u>

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

___ YES   ___ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

___ LEA Self-evaluation

___ External Evaluation Team

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

other _____

___ using LEA developed instruments

___ using SEA developed instruments

___ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

other _____

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of = students		
= parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal Interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student =records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program star__		
=other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA program implementation of planned goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal Interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student =records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

PROPOSED USE OF THIS INSTRUMENT

This instrument will be used for conducting a qualitative content analysis of documents used by state education agencies (SEAs) to evaluate the effectiveness of local education agency (LEA) vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

The actual content analysis of SEA documents will be done by Jim Frasier. This instrument will not be mailed to a SEA nor will a SEA be requested to conduct a content analysis of evaluation documents using this instrument.

MAJOR QUESTION OF THIS INSTRUMENT

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by SEAs to evaluate OPERATIONAL PROCESSES of LEA vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student?

Prepared by

James Frasier
Agricultural Engineering Building
Dept. of Voc. Ed. and Technology
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT   05405

I have developed the questions listed below to identify whether SEA evaluation documents address the evaluation of program PLANNING PROCESSES.

As you read these questions, will you please

    1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of each question's value in identifying program PLANNING PROCESSES; and,

    2. offer additional questions you think could be used to identify program PLANNING PROCESSES.

---

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

3. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA program to identify students needing this program "in order to succeed in their vocational education program?

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program is serving only those handicapped/disadvantaged students unable to succeed in their vocational education program?

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant prior to providing services?

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs prior to the program providing services?

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of their respective program goals and objectives?

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students (handicapped/disadvantaged workers, advisory committee members) are involved in the planning which influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?

12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has a plan for implementing the program's goals and objectives?

I have developed an "If yes.....then" instrument format to identify the types of evaluation strategies being used by SEAs to evaluate program PLANNING PROCESSES.

As you review the content analysis instrument's format, will you please

    1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of the "If yes.....then" format; and,

    2. if appropriate, offer an alternative format for use in identifying types of evaluation strategies using SEA evaluation documents.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify
   locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

   ___YES   ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation <u>strategy</u> formats are used to determine whether
the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available resources
and/or services?

___ LEA Self-evaluation

___ External Evaluation Team

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

___ using LEA developed instruments

___ using SEA developed Instruments

___ using neither SEA or LEA developed
instruments

___ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA has
sought to identify such locally available resources and/or services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other _____		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other _____		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other _____		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other _____		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit-reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other _____		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of
LEA procedures to identify such locally available resources and/or
services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other _____		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other _____		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other _____		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other _____		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other _____		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

<u>COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:</u>

APPENDIX E

THE CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT
FOR
EVALUATION OF PLANNING PROCESSES

115

159

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

_____ YES   _____ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available resources and/or services?

_____ LEA Self-evaluation

_____ External Evaluation Team

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other _____

_____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ other _____

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│ D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs │
│ H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs   │
│ D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs        │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA has sought to identify such locally available resources and/or services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures to identify such locally available resources and/or services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student =records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

160

161

116

2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally
   available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

___ YES   ___ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether
the LEA has sought to utilize such resources and/or services?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed
                                             instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

> D = s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H = s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H = s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA has
made efforts to utilize such resources and/or services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other _____		
Personal Interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other _____		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other _____		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other _____		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other _____		

X = s YES   ? = s UNCLEAR   No Response = s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of
LEA procedures for utilizing such resources and/or services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other _____		
Personal Interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other _____		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other _____		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other _____		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other _____		

X = s YES   ? = s UNCLEAR   No Response = s Not present in Document

---

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

162

163

3. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to identify those students
   in need of special services or programs in order to succeed in their
   vocational education programs?

   ___YES   ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether
    students needing the program are identified?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed
                                            instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

> D = s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H = s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H = s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA determines
    that students needing the program are identified?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other ____		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other ____		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other ____		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of
    LEA procedures for identifying students needing the program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program is serving only those handicapped/disadvantaged students,unable to succeed in their vocational education program?

_____YES   _____NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether only such students are being served?

_____ LEA Self-evaluation   _____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation Team   _____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"   _____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation   _____ other_____

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other_____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA determines that only such students are being served?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of = students		
- parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other_____		
Personal Interviews with =students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student =records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR.   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for ensuring that only such students are being served?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of =students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal interviews with =students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant prior to providing services?

_____ YES   _____ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA assesses the unmet needs of each individual participant prior to providing services?

_____ LEA Self-evaluation   _____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation Team   _____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"   _____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation   _____ other _____

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA assesses individual participant's unmet needs prior to providing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for assessing individual participant's unmet needs prior to providing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

<u>COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:</u>

120

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student
   (e.g. parents, teachers, special educators) are involved in assessment
   activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs prior to the
   program providing services?

                         ___YES   ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether
such individuals are involved in assessment activities prior to
the program providing services?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed
                                              instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

```
D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs
```

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA involves
such individuals in assessment activities prior to providing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other ___		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other ___		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other ___		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other ___		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other ___		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of
LEA procedures for involving such individuals in assessment
activities prior to providing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other ___		
Personal interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other ___		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other ___		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other ___		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other ___		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

---

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives as a participant in the handicapped/disadvantaged program?

_____ YES   _____ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation <u>strategy formats</u> are used to determine whether the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives?

_____ LEA Self-evaluation

_____ External Evaluation Team

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other _____

_____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used <u>to verify how</u> the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used <u>to verify the effectiveness</u> of LEA procedures for allowing the unmet needs of an individual student to influence the student's program and goals?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

___LEA Self-evaluation   ___using LEA developed instruments

___External Evaluation Team   ___using SEA developed instruments

___External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___other_____

___Evaluation by State Consultant

___other_____

> D = s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H = s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H = s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other_____		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other_____		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other_____		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other_____		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other_____		

X = s YES   7 = s UNCLEAR   No Response = s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for enabling the unmet needs of individual students to influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X = s YES   7 = s UNCLEAR   No Response = s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

123

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

_____ YES _____ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the vocational instructor is involved in such planning?

_____ LEA Self-evaluation   _____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation Team   _____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"   _____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation   _____ other _____

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other _____

> D = s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H = s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H = s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the vocational instructor is involved in such planning?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other		
Personal Interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other		

> X = s YES   ? = s UNCLEAR   No Response = s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for involving the vocational instructor in such planning?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other		
Personal Interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other		

> X = s YES   ? = s UNCLEAR   No Response = s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

124

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students(handicapped/disadvantaged workers, advisory committee members) are involved in the planning which influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

    ___ YES   ___ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether such individuals are involved in the planning of LEA program goals and objectives?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how such individuals are involved in the planning of LEA program goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of = students		
= parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal Interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student =records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other		

X =s YES   7 =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for involving such individuals in the planning of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student =records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other		

X =s YES   7 =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

<u>COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:</u>

125

11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines
    for completing major program goals and objectives?

                          _YES   _NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether
        the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals
        and objectives?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert" ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed
                                           instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

    ┌───┐
    │ D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs   │
    │ H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs   │
    │ D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs   │
    └───┘

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA established
        timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?

                                          Disadvantaged   Handicapped

Written survey of - students
                  = parents
                  -administrators
                  -vocational faculty
                  -pupil support personnel
                  -program advisory committee
                  -other
Personal Interviews with -students
                  -parents
                  -administrators
                  -vocational faculty
                  -pupil support personnel
                  -program advisory committee
                  -other
Review of student -records
                  -test scores
                  -drop-out ratios
                  -other
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans
                  -Grant Application (RFP)
                  -End of year program report
                  -other
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports
                  -Compliance reports
                  -Minimum program standards
                  -other

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of
        LEA procedures for establishing timelines to complete major program
        goals and objectives?

                                                    Disadvantaged   Handicapped

Written survey of =students
                  =parents
                  -administrators
                  -vocational faculty
                  -pupil support personnel
                  -program advisory committee
                  -other
Personal interviews with =students
                  -parents
                  -administrators
                  -vocational faculty
                  -pupil support personnel
                  -program advisory committee
                  -other
Review of student -records
                  -test scores
                  -drop-out ratios
                  -other
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans
                  -Grant Application (RFP)
                  -End of year program report
                  -other
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports
                  -Compliance reports
                  -Minimum program standards
                  -other

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has a plan for implementing program goals and objectives?

_____YES   _____NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA has a plan for implementing program goals and objectives?

_____ LEA Self-evaluation

_____ External Evaluation Team

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other _____

_____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify that the LEA has a plan for implementing program goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA's plan for implementing program goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

183

APPENDIX F

THE CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT
FOR
EVALUATION OF OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

128

184

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

___ YES   ___ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

> D = s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H = s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H = s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other _____		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other _____		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other _____		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other _____		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other _____		

X = s YES   ? = s UNCLEAR   No Response = s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA program implementation of planned goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	=students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal interviews with	=students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X = s YES   ? = s UNCLEAR   No Response = s Not present in Document

---

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the
program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?

           ___YES   ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether
people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the
program's purpose(s)?

____ LEA Self-evaluation   ____ using LEA developed instruments

____ External Evaluation Team   ____ using SEA developed instruments

____ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ____ using neither SEA or LEA developed
                                             instruments

____ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ____ other

____ Evaluation by State Consultant

____ other _____

| D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs |
| H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs |
| D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs |

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how people involved in
and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other	___	___

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the
LEA program to determine the awareness of people about the program's purposes?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other	___	___

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

187

3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

_____ YES   _____ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

_____ LEA Self-evaluation

_____ External Evaluation Team

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other _____

_____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ other _____

```
D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs
```

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how people involved in and/or affected by the program are awar. the services provided by the program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	=administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program to determine the awareness of people about the services provided by this program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	=students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal interviews with	=students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	=Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants?

                    ___ YES   ___ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the instructional resources available for use by participants are adequate?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	=administrators		
	=vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	=students		
	=parents		
	=administrators		
	=vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA program instructional resources available for use by the participants?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	=parents		
	=administrators		
	=vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	=students		
	=parents		
	=administrators		
	=vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	=End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

132

19

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?

YES _____ NO _____

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?

_____ LEA Self-evaluation   _____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation Team   _____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"   _____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation   _____ other _____

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to [...] how goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in [...] tional program have been implemented by the program as planned?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
= parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student =records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of th LEA program's implementation of goals and objectives planned to help student succeed in a vocational program?

	Disadvantaged	Han[...]
Written survey of =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student =records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

133

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

                    __YES   __NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

__ LEA Self-evaluation   __ using LEA developed instruments

__ External Evaluation Team   __ using SEA developed instruments

__ External Evaluation by an "expert"   __ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

__ Independent Third Party Evaluation   __ other _____

__ Evaluation by State Consultant

__ other _____

```
 D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
 H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
 D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs
```

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	=administrators		
	=vocational faculty		
	=pupil support personnel		
	=program advisory committee		
	=other ___		
Personal Interviews with	=students		
	=parents		
	=administrators		
	=vocational faculty		
	=pupil support personnel		
	=program advisory committee		
	=other ___		
Review of student	=records		
	=test scores		
	=drop-out ratios		
	=other		
Review of LEA	=1 and 5 year plans		
	=Grant Application (RFP)		
	=End of year program report		
	=other ___		
Review of SEA	=Consultant's visit reports		
	=Compliance reports		
	=Minimum program standards		
	=other ___		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the vocational instructor's participation in the implementation of program goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	=students		
	=parents		
	=administrators		
	=vocational faculty		
	=pupil support personnel		
	=program advisory committee		
	=other ___		
Personal interviews with	=students		
	=parents		
	=administrators		
	=vocational faculty		
	=pupil support personnel		
	=program advisory committee		
	=other ___		
Review of student	=records		
	=test scores		
	=drop-out ratios		
	=other		
Review of LEA	=1 and 5 year plans		
	=Grant Application (RFP)		
	=End of year program report		
	=other		
Review of SEA	=Consultant's visit reports		
	=Compliance reports		
	=Minimum program standards		
	=other ___		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

_____ YES _____ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether

_____ LEA Self-evaluation   _____ using LEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation Team   _____ using SEA developed instruments

_____ External Evaluation by an "expert"   _____ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____ Independent Third Party Evaluation   _____ other _____

_____ Evaluation by State Consultant

_____ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the program is having an effect on the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of = students		
- parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

---

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program's efforts to effect the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of -students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal interviews with =students		
-parents		
-administrators		
=vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

---

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

135

197   198

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?
___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?

___ LEA Self-evaluation

___ External Evaluation Team

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

___ using LEA developed instruments

___ using SEA developed instruments

___ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___ other _____

| D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs |
| H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs |
| D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs |

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student -records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program to appropriately match instructional offerings available with identified student unmet needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of -students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Personal interviews with =students		
=parents		
=administrators		
=vocational faculty		
=pupil support personnel		
=program advisory committee		
=other		
Review of student -records		
=test scores		
=drop-out ratios		
=other		
Review of LEA =1 and 5 year plans		
=Grant Application (RFP)		
=End of year program report		
=other		
Review of SEA =Consultant's visit reports		
=Compliance reports		
=Minimum program standards		
=other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

136

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?

___YES   X ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

_X_ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

> D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
> H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
> D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the program has determined an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program's teacher/pupil ratio?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the teacher
qualifications to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?

___ YES   ___ NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation <u>strategy formats</u> are used to determine whether the
teacher has the qualifications to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?

___ LEA Self-evaluation   ___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team   ___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert"   ___ using neither SEA or LEA developed
                                               instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation   ___ other _____

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other _____

```
D  =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H  =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs
```

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used <u>to verify how</u> the LEA determined that
the teacher was qualified to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES-   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the
LEA program in determining the qualifications of the teacher to work with
handicapped/disadvantaged students?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)	X	
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES   ? =s UNCLEAR   No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT, ANALYSIS:

APPENDIX G

PLANNING AND OPERATIONAL CONTENT ANALYSIS
CODE SHEETS

139

205

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

　　　　　　　　　　YES 　　　　NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

___ LEA Self-evaluation 　　　　　　___ using LEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation Team 　　　　___ using SEA developed instruments

___ External Evaluation by an "expert" 　___ using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___ Independent Third Party Evaluation 　___ other

___ Evaluation by State Consultant

___ other

```
D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs
```

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of - students		
- parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES 　　　　? =s UNCLEAR 　　　　No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA program implementation of planned goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Personal Interviews with -students		
-parents		
-administrators		
-vocational faculty		
-pupil support personnel		
-program advisory committee		
-other		
Review of student -records		
-test scores		
-drop-out ratios		
-other		
Review of LEA -1 and 5 year plans		
-Grant Application (RFP)		
-End of year program report		
-other		
Review of SEA -Consultant's visit reports		
-Compliance reports		
-Minimum program standards		
-other		

X =s YES 　　　　? =s UNCLEAR 　　　　No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

APPENDIX H

CONTENT ANALYSIS INDICATOR SHEET
(Example)

141

208

	IF YES, IDENTIFY	
NO	YES	Page #	Item #

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and or services?

3. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to identify those students in need of special services or programs in order to succeed in their vocational education program?

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA handicapped/ disadvantaged program is serving only those students who are unable to succeed in their vocational education program?

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA Program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant prior to providing services?

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs prior to the program providing services?

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives a participant in the handicapped/ disadvantaged program?

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students (e.g. handicapped/disadvantaged workers, advisory committee members) are involved in the planning that influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?

12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has a plan for implementing the program's goals and objectives?

	IF YES, IDENTIFY	
NO	YES	Page #	Item #

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?

3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants?

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals & objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the teacher qualifications to work with handicapped/ disadvantaged students?

APPENDIX I

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR
STATES WITHOUT H/D EVALUATION SYSTEMS

143

211

1. Your state does not have a special needs evaluation system: RIGHT?

2. Did you state ever have a special needs evaluation system?

3. Are special needs projects and/or services evaluated within or as part of a larger evaluation system in your state...like an evaluation system for all vocational programs every 5 years?

4. Are you planning to develop a special needs evaluation system or are you in the process of developing one?

    IF YES: Who are you working with to develop the evaluation system?

    IF YES: Can you give me what you consider to be the purposes for evaluating special needs projects in your state?

    _____program improvement
    _____meeting Federal evaluation mandates
    _____improve program planning
    _____determine future funding

    IF YES: WILL it be part of a larger state evaluation system or separate from it?

144
212

APPENDIX J

<u>TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE</u>
FOR
STATES WITH H/D EVALUATION SYSTEMS

145

1. Can you please tell me what are the purposes for evaluating special needs projects and services in your state?

_____ program improvement
_____ meeting Federal evaluation mandates
_____ improve program planning
_____ determine future funding

2. Do you think that your state system for evaluating special needs projects and services is able to determine the effectiveness of local project planning processes?

_____ (probe: can you give me some examples?)

On a scale of 1 to 5 --- 5 being the highest --- what number value would you give to your state system's ability to determine the effectiveness of local project planning processes?

1   2   3   4   5

146

214

3. Do you think that your state system for evaluating special needs projects and services is able to determine the effectiveness of local project operational processes? (Probe: Can you give me some examples?)

On a scale of 1 to 5 --- 5 being the highest --- what number value would you give to your state system's ability to determine the effectiveness of local project operational processes?

    1   2   3   4   5

4. Were there any difficulties that you or your state encountered in <u>developing</u> your special needs evaluation system?

5. Have you encountered any difficulties in <u>implementing</u> your special needs evaluation system?

215

147

6. How do you as a state consultant use the results of special needs evaluations?

7. How do you as a state consultant think the local level vocational educators use the results of special needs evaluations?

8. Based on your knowledge as a state consultant, "What has been the reaction of local level personnel to your state evaluation system for special needs projects and services?

9. In reviewing your evaluation document, my judgement is that your special needs evaluation ___ is ___ is not ___ integrated into your state's 5 year evaluation of all vocational programs.   Is that correct?

148

216

10. Can you please give me some examples of the types of
    special needs projects you are evaluating with the
    instruments you sent me?

WELL, DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD OR TALK ABOUT
THAT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE QUESTIONS I HAVE ASKED YOU?

WELL, THANK YOU VERY MUCH

OH, BY THE WAY, BOB WATSON SAID HE WILL BE SENDING YOU A COPY
OF THE EVALUATION SYSTEM WE DESIGNED. IT HAS JUST GONE TO THE
PRINTERS SO I WOULD THINK YOU WILL HAVE ONE IN AUGUST SOMETIME.

149