

Index

A

Accountability, 28. *See also* Responsibilities
Achievement tests, 115
Activities: defining, 17, 94; standards used to measure, 59
Administrative assistants' technology training, 18e
Adversary model, 91
Antecedent data, 104–105
Aptitude tests, 114–115
Art criticism model, 90–91
Audience, 94–95

B

Babbie, E., 121
Background information, 159–160
Baldrige Award, 29
Block grants, 175–176
Business of evaluating. *See* Evaluation business

C

Cause-and-effect relationship, 140
CBD (*Commerce Business Daily*), 176
Center for the Study of Evaluation, 53
CFDA (*Catalog of Federal and Domestic Assistance*), 175

Change-impact relationship, 26
Cluster random sample, 145
Coding interview data, 121
Company-Based Wellness Center evaluation design, 31e–33e
Composite data, 105
Conclusions/recommendations (report), 162–163
Confidentiality issues, 105
Consumer Reports, 86
Consumer's Union, 86
Contracts: evaluation business through federal, 175–176; long-term, 184; negotiating responsibilities, 179–180; preparing the, 182–183; pricing your services, 180–182
Correctional design, 141
Cost-benefit analysis, 85
Cox Foundation, 2, 22, 23, 120, 151. *See also* Grandview Retirement and Nursing Facility
Criterion-referenced test, 115
Cumulative scales, 112

D

Data: finding/reviewing existing, 104–106; forms of, 120–121; hard and soft, 161; methods of gathering new, 106–117; privacy and confidentiality issues of, 105. *See also* Data levels

Data analysis: defining, 18, 94; using different levels of data, 129*t*, 130*t*, 131*t*; evaluation as process of, 95; levels of data used in, 99, 101–103, 128–133; of standardized tests, 126–128; terminology associated with, 120, 122–128. *See also* Statistic

Data collection: defining, 18; design used for, 94; four levels data gathered during, 99, 101–103, 128–133; methods used for, 106–117; quantitative vs. qualitative approach to, 89, 100, 104; sample/sampling using in, 94, 142–148

Data levels: analysis using different, 128–132; interval, 99, 103; interval data, 99, 103, 131, 132–133; nominal, 99, 101–102, 128, 129*t*, 130*t*; ordinal, 99, 102–103, 129, 129–130, 131*t*, 132–133; ratio, 99, 103, 133. *See also* Data

Data sources: defining, 17, 94; information required prior to, 99–100; interviews as, 107–110; observational analysis as, 116–117; qualitative and quantitative, 100–101; scales as part of, 108–109, 111–113; scenario for gathering, 98–99; sentence completion tool used as, 113–114; tests used as, 114–116, 127–128

Decision-making: establishing needs for, 29–30; evaluation to help with future, 89; evaluation to prepare for, 4–5, 95; during program planning cycle, 37–41, 40*fig*; types of evaluation leading to, 49, 50*t*–51*t*. *See also* Evaluation decisions

Decision-making model, 89

Dental cleaning visits program: interval data on, 131, 132–133; nominal data on, 128–129*t*, 130*t*; ordinal data on, 129–130, 131*t*, 132–133; ratio data on, 133

Description of evaluation (report), 160

Design: differences between evaluation and research, 139–141; ex post facto (or correlational), 141; experimental, 139–140; quasi-experimental, 140–141. *See also* Evaluation design

Discrepancy model, 84–86

Discussion of program results, 161–162

Dutwin, D., 148

E

EDGAR (Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval) system, 170

Effectiveness: affirmative action example of questioning, 11*t*; defining, 3; evaluating, 6–7; program, 9

Efficiency: affirmative action example of questioning, 11*t*; defining, 3; evaluating, 5–6

Eisner, E. W., 90

Emergency business resources, 177–178

EPD (evaluator's program description): described, 41, 58; developing the, 60–66; dialogue used in, 61–63; finding data sources using, 100; information derived from, 59–60; used in monitoring process, 41, 59; questions based on, 58, 63; questions not specifically based on the, 65; side benefits of, 66

EPD (evaluator's program description) examples: for continuing education for pharmacists, 61–65, 64*t*, 68*e*; for high school career coordinators, 75*e*–77*e*; for hospitality industry promotion, 69*e*–71*e*; for public water conservation, 72*e*–74*e*

Equal appearing intervals scale, 111

Evaluation: of alternatives, 7–8; common denominators of, 3–4; comparing monitoring to, 41; formal reasons for, 10, 12; four levels of, 8–10; identifying areas to improve through, 8; practical application of, 12–13; program planning cycle and role of, 46–52; research vs., 82, 136–150; in terms of cycles, 14; two definitions of, 4–5, 95. *See also* Formative evaluation; Scenarios; Summative evaluation

Evaluation benefits: identifying new opportunities, 25; limitations of, 26–27; to sponsors and staff, 24–25; understanding of outcomes, 25–26

Evaluation business: emergency resources of, 177–178; establishing long-term contracts, 184; finding clients, 172–174; maintaining relationships with funding organizations, 183–184; negotiating/writing contracts, 178–183; operating in private sector, 176–177; operating in public sector,

- 175–176; overhead costs of, 181; proactive resources of, 174–175; reactive resources of, 177; RFP (request for proposals) bidding for, 174, 175–176, 177, 179. *See also* Evaluators
- Evaluation business market: existence of, 167–168; private sector, 170–172; public sector, 168–170
- Evaluation considerations: decision-making needs, 29–30; research for new solutions, 30; social and political situations, 27–29
- Evaluation decisions: additional considerations in making, 27–30; choosing an evaluation model, 80–81, 91, 92t–93t; considering benefits in, 24–26; considering limitations in, 26–27. *See also* Decision-making
- Evaluation design: activities, 17; choosing the format for, 91, 93–95; for Company-Based Wellness Center, 31e–33e; data analysis, 18; data collection, 18; data sources, 17; differences between research design and, 139–141; evaluation questions, 15, 17, 18e; form for format of, 166e; format for, 16e; for pharmacists continuing education program, 78e–79e; population sample, 17–18; program objectives, 18e; responsibility, 18. *See also* Design
- Evaluation Design Format, 166e
- Evaluation limitations, 26–27
- Evaluation models: adversary, 91; art criticism, 90–91; choosing, 80–81, 91, 92t–93t; decision-making, 89; differences among, 81–84; discrepancy, 84–86; evaluation questions as central to, 93; goal-based, 89–90; goal-free, 86–88; systems analysis, 90; tasks performed using, 83; transaction, 88–89. *See also* Program cycle framework; Qualitative approach; Quantitative approach
- Evaluation questions: administrative assistants' technology training, 18e; based on EPD, 58, 63; as central to all models, 93; coding data from, 121; described, 15, 17; not specifically based on the EPD, 65
- Evaluation report outline: advantages of using, 158; section 1: summary, 158–159; section 2: statement of evaluation's purpose, 159; section 3: background information, 159–160; section 4: description of evaluation study, 160; section 5: results, 161; section 6: discussion of program and results, 161–162; section 7: conclusions and recommendations, 162–163; summary of, 158
- Evaluation reports: communicating your findings in the, 152–153; focus of, 152, 154, 155t–157t; interim, 152; outline of, 158–163; overview of, 153–154; scenario on writing, 151–152s; summative, 152. *See also* Summative evaluation
- Evaluation-research continuum: determining from design, 139–141; determining from intent, 137–139; nonprobability sampling methods and, 146–147; probability sampling methods and, 144–146; qualitative and quantitative characteristics, 141–142; sampling issues, 142–144; sampling and surveys, 147–148
- Evaluators: building rapport between program staff and, 66; EPD (evaluator's program description) by, 57–79e; expertise of, 87, 174–175; implementation and formative evaluation by, 47–48; interviews by, 107–110, 121; maintaining relationship with funding organizations, 183–184; needs analysis by, 46, 50t; objectivity of, 163, 180; observations made by, 100, 116–117, 121; program planning by, 46–47; responsibilities of, 18, 94, 179–180; summative evaluation done by, 49; types of decision making by, 49, 52. *See also* Evaluation business
- Ex post facto design, 141
- Experimental design, 139–140
- Expertise: establishing your evaluation, 174–175; as evaluation issue, 87

F

- Face-to-face interviews, 121
- Federal block (or formula) grants, 175–176
- Federal categorical grants, 175
- Federal contracts: evaluation business through, 175–176; negotiating, 178–179

Federal funding studies, 168–170
 Feedback: evaluation report as, 158–163;
 transaction model use of, 88
 Feild, H. S., 101, 108, 131
 Final evaluation. *See* Summative evaluation
 Fixed alternative questions, 108
 Focus of report: comparing formative vs.
 summative, 154, 155*t*–157*t*; described,
 152; determining, 154
 Formative evaluation: comparing focus of
 summative and, 154, 155*t*–157*t*; com-
 paring summative and, 49; continued
 monitoring during, 48; described,
 13–14, 37; evaluator's role in, 47–48,
 51*t*; program cycle role by, 39–40*fig.*
See also Evaluation; Implementation
 Formula grants, 175–176
 The Foundation Center, 171–172, 176
 Freeman, H. E., 3, 28, 87
 Funding: evaluation role in federal,
 168–170; value of evaluation to seek-
 ing, 12
 Funnel questions, 108

G

Gatewood, R. D., 101, 108, 131
 Gay, L. R., 111
 Goal-based model, 89–90
 Goal-free model, 86–88
 Grandview Retirement and Nursing Facil-
 ity: continuing education programs at,
 1; data analysis by, 119–120; evalua-
 tion decision making at, 36–38; evalua-
 tion vs. research decision by,
 136–137; exploring possibility of gar-
 dening program at, 1–2; gathering data
 sources, 98–99; selecting an evaluation
 model, 80–81; writing evaluation
 report, 151–152; writing for grant to
 cover new program, 22–23. *See also*
 Cox Foundation
 Gray, L. R., 22, 23, 61, 96

H

Hallowell, J., 57–58, 80–81, 98–99,
 119–120, 151–152, 164
 “Hard data,” 161
 Hatry, H. P., 4, 39, 87, 100, 116, 121, 154
 The Health Foundation of Greater
 Cincinnati, 171
 Herrmann, M., 148

High school career coordinators EPD,
 75*e*–77*e*
 Hospitality industry promotion EPD,
 69*e*–71*e*
 HRD (human resource department), 19
 Hypothesis: defining, 81; development of,
 82–83

I

Impact: affirmative action example of ques-
 tioning, 11*t*; change and importance of,
 26; defining, 3; evaluating, 7; follow-up
 monitoring data used to determine,
 42–43; on the participants, 9
 Implementation: continued monitoring
 during, 48; evaluator's formative
 evaluation and, 47–48, 51*t*; program
 cycle role by, 40*fig.* *See also* Formative
 evaluation
 Inland Revenue Department (England), 66
 Input, 90
 Intent, 137–139. *See also* Objectives
 Interim evaluation report, 152
 Interval data: dental cleaning visits pro-
 gram, 131; described, 99, 103; mistak-
 enly treated as ordinal data, 132–133
 Interviews: advantages/disadvantages of
 using, 109–110; coding, 121; gathering
 data through, 107–110; structure,
 semistructured, and unstructured,
 107–108; telephone, 110; types of
 questions used during, 108–109
 ISO (International Organization for Stan-
 dardization), 91

J

Job-training program monitoring: data
 sources for, 43–44; data types for,
 44–46
 Judgment sample, 146

K

Kirkpatrick, D. L., 8, 9
 Kirshstein, R., 65

L

Latino surname sampling, 148
 “Learning moment,” 22
 Level Four evaluation, 9–10

Level One evaluation, 9
 Level Three evaluation, 9
 Level Two evaluation, 9
 Likert scale, 111
 Long-term contracts, 184

M

McMillan, J. H., 100
 Madaus, G. F., 88, 89, 90
 Mean, 124
 Measures of central tendency: defining, 120, 122–123; mean, 124; median, 124–125; mode, 123–124
 Measures of variability (range and standard deviation): defining, 120, 125–126; range, quartiles, percentiles, 126–127; standard deviation and variance, 127–128
 Median, 124–125
 Mental ability tests, 114–115
 MIS (management information systems), 42
 MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory), 115
 Mode, 123–124
 Monitoring: activities of, 41–43; comparing process of evaluation and, 41; defining, 38; EPD (evaluator's program description) used in, 41, 59; during implementation/formative evaluation, 48; information used to determine impact, 42–43; MIS (management information systems) performance of, 42; transaction model use of, 88
 Monitoring examples: data sources for job-training program, 43–44; data types for job-training program, 44–46
 Multistage random sample, 145–146

N

Needs assessment: evaluator role in, 46, 50*t*; program cycle role by, 39, 40*fig*
 Negotiating contracts, 178–179
 Newcomer, K. E., 4, 39, 87, 100, 116, 121, 154
 No Child Left Behind Act, 168–169
 Nominal data: dental cleaning visits, 128, 129*t*, 130*t*; described, 99, 101–102
 Nonprobability sampling methods, 146–147
 Norm-referenced test, 115

O

Objective attainment (or goal-based) model, 89–90
 Objectives: evaluation-research continuum and, 137–139; goal-based model, 89–90; program, 18e, 93. *See also* Intent
 Objectivity, 163, 180
 Observational analysis, 100, 116–117, 121
 Obtrusive observation, 116
 Office of Management and Budget, 169–170
 Open-ended (narrative) response format, 116
 Open-ended questions, 108, 109
 Opportunities identified, 25
 Ordinal data: dental cleaning visit, 129–130, 131*t*; described, 99, 102–103; mistakenly treating internal data as, 132–133
 Organizations: The Foundation Center database on philanthropic, 171–172, 176–177; maintaining relationships with funding, 183–184; mission and goals of, 39, 40*fig*; privacy and confidentiality issues of, 105; program planning cycle by, 37–41, 40*fig*
 Outcomes: defining, 25; increasing understanding of, 25–26, 138–139; standards used to measure, 59
 Output, 90
 Overhead costs, 181

P

Participation impressions, 9
 Percentiles (or centiles), 126–127
 Perkins Vocational Education Act, 184
 Personality tests, 115–116
 Pharmacists continuing education program: complete evaluation design for, 78e–79e; EPD (evaluator's program description) for, 61–65, 64*t*, 68e; gathering existing data for, 105–106
 Philanthropic organizations, 171–172, 176–177
 Political/social situations, 27–29
 Popham, W. J., 86, 88
 Population sample, 17–18. *See also* Samples
 Privacy issues, 105
 Private sector: conducting evaluation business in, 176–177; as evaluation business market, 170–172

Proactive business resources, 174–175
 Probability sampling method, 144–146
 Program cycle framework: discrepancy model corresponding with, 84–85; formative evaluation, 13–14, 37, 39–40*fig*, 47–49, 51*t*; four-stage, 53; needs assessment, 39, 40*fig*, 46, 50*t*; program planning, 30, 40*fig*, 46–47, 50*t*; summative evaluation, 13–14, 38, 39–40*fig*, 49, 51*t*. *See also* Evaluation models
 Program objectives, 18*e*, 93
 Program planning: evaluator role in, 46–47, 50*t*; program cycle role by, 39, 40*fig*
 Program planning cycle: defining, 37; evaluation roles during, 46–52; overlooked stakeholders during, 38–39; process of, 38; program phases during, 39–41, 40*fig*, 59*fig*
 Programs: activities of, 17, 59, 94; data analysis of dental cleaning visits, 128–133; EPD (evaluator's program description), 57–79*e*; evaluation to improve delivery of, 28–29; monitoring, 38, 41–43; objectives of, 93; value of evaluating, 10, 12
 Projective tests, 116
 Proposed gardening program. *See* Grandview Retirement and Nursing Facility
 Provus, M., 84
 Public records data, 104, 106
 Public sector: conducting evaluation business in, 175–176; as evaluation business market, 168–170
 Public water conservation EPD, 72*e*–74*e*
 Purposive sample, 146–147

Q

Qualitative approach: for data sources, 100–101; decision-making model use of, 89; defining, 81; evaluation vs. research and use of, 141–142; goal-based model use of, 90; goal-free model use of, 88; methodologies used in, 89, 100; nominal and ordinal data used in, 99, 101–103; quantitative data collection vs, 89, 100, 104. *See also* Evaluation models
 Quantitative approach: for data sources, 100–101; decision-making model use of, 89; defining, 81; evaluation vs. research and use of, 141–142; goal-

based model use of, 90; interval and ratio data used in, 99, 103; methodologies used in, 89, 101; quantitative data collection vs, 89, 100, 104. *See also* Evaluation models
 Quartiles, 126–127
 Quasi-experimental design, 140–141
 Questionnaire report, 161
 Questions: asked before sampling, 142–143; coding answers to interview, 121; report discussion content answering, 161–162; types of interview, 108–109
 Quinones, S., 65
 Quota sample, 146

R

Ramirez, M., 36, 37, 57, 119, 151, 152
 Ranges, 126–127
 Ratio data: dental cleaning visits, 133; described, 99, 103
 Reactive business resources, 177
 Recommendations/conclusions (report), 162–163
 Reports. *See* Evaluation reports
 Research design, 139–141
 Research-evaluation confusion, 82. *See also* Evaluation-research continuum
 Resources: defining, 23; evaluation business emergency, 177–178; evaluation business reactive, 177
 Responsibilities: defining evaluation, 18, 94; negotiating evaluation, 179–180. *See also* Accountability
 Results of evaluation, 161
 Return on investment evaluation, 9
 RFP (request for proposals), 174, 175–176, 177, 179
 Rivlan, A. M., 90
 Rossi, P. H., 3, 28, 87
 Ruth, 1–2, 22–23, 36–38, 151, 165

S

Samples: described, 94, 142; formula guidelines for size of, 143–144; identifying characteristics of individuals in, 143–144; population, 17–18; questions to be answered before selecting, 142–143
 Sampling methods: nonprobability, 146–147; probability, 144–146; questions to be answered before selecting,

- 142–143; surname, 148; surveys used as, 147–148
- Scale item questions, 108–109
- Scales: described, 111; questions with, 108–109; types of, 111–113
- Scenarios: choosing an evaluation model, 80–81; data analysis, 119–120; decision making, 36–38; evaluating need for new program, 1–2; evaluation or research?, 136–137; gathering data sources, 98–99; Pharmacy training program EPD, 61–65, 64t; writing evaluation report, 151–152; writing for a grant, 22–23. *See also* Evaluation
- School-to-career program, 29–30
- Scriven, M., 47, 86, 88, 89, 90
- Semantic differential scale, 112–113
- Semistructured interviews, 107
- Sentence completion technique, 113–114
- Simple random selection, 144
- Social/political situations, 27–29
- “Soft data,” 161
- Solutions: decision-making needs for finding, 29–30; evaluation to research for new, 30
- Sponsors: evaluation benefits to, 24–25; increasing outcome understanding by, 138–139; interest focus of, 95
- Staff: building rapport between evaluators and, 66; evaluation benefits to, 24–25; increasing outcome understanding by, 138–139; interest focus of, 95; interviewing, 107–110; transaction model findings shared with, 88–89
- Stake, R. E., 88
- Stakeholders: data sources information from, 100; defining, 23; increasing outcome understanding by, 138–139; interviewing, 107–110, 121; overlooked during program planning cycle, 38–39
- Stamp, Sir J., 66
- Standard deviation, 127–128
- Standardized tests: as data source, 114–116; percentile (or centiles) of, 126–127; presented in tables in reports, 161; standard deviation and variance of, 127–128
- Standards: activities and outcomes measured by, 59; comparing quality against industry, 29; defining, 23
- Statement of purpose (report), 159
- Statistics: defining, 120; measures of central tendency, 120, 122–125; standard deviation and variance, 127–128; two types of, 122. *See also* Data analysis
- Stratified random sample, 144–145
- Structured interviews, 107
- Stufflebeam, D., 88, 89, 90
- Subject-matter expertise, 87
- Subjectivity, 88
- Summary (report), 158–159
- Summative evaluation: comparing focus of formative and, 154, 155t–157t; comparing formative and, 49; described, 13–14, 38; evaluator’s role in, 49, 51t; program cycle role by, 39–40fig; written, 153. *See also* Evaluation; Evaluation reports
- Surname sampling, 148
- Surveys, 147–148
- Systematic random sample, 145
- Systems analysis model, 90
- ## T
- Technology Training for Administrative Assistants (course), 19
- Telephone interviews, 110
- Tests (standardized), 114–116, 126–128
- Third-part program evaluations. *See* Evaluation business
- Transaction model, 88–89
- ## U
- Unobtrusive observation, 116–117, 121
- Unstructured interviews, 107–108
- USDOE (U.S. Department of education), 169
- ## V
- Value scale, 112–113
- Variables, 139–140
- Variance, 128
- ## W
- Web sites: CBD (*Commerce Business Daily*), 176; CFDA (*Catalog of Federal and Domestic Assistance*), 175; The Foundation Center, 171, 176
- Wells, S. E., 1
- Wholey, J. S., 4, 39, 87, 100, 116, 121, 154
- Williams, B., 143

