

INDEX

A

- Abbey, Ed/case study, 85–90
- Action research model: case study/professional development, 114–115, 116–117; overview, 115–116
- Activities documenting: case study/student performance in mathematics, 46–47; description, 17; in logic models, 79
- Activities output documenting: description, 18; in logic models, 79
- Advocacy programs: case study/evaluators-in-training confidentiality issues, 120–127. *See also* Mentoring programs
- After-school programming: case study/statewide evaluation, 99–106; classes for parents, 101; competitive funds and, 100; curriculum categories, 101; goals, 100–101; higher collaboration of services, 102; models for, 100; overview, 100–102; partnering and, 101, 102, 104; variability in, 104–105
- Aggregating findings, 121
- American Evaluation Association: overview, 10–11; special interest groups (SIGs) of, 11; website, 11
- Audio recording interviews/focus groups, 28–29
- Authentic assessment movement, 69
- Awards (RFP), 43, 81

B

- Barriers: to internal evaluation/evaluators, 11–12; to programs, 88–90
- Baseline data, 95, 96
- Benchmarks: case study/professional development technology project, 78; description/function, 13, 78; example, 13; in RFP, 41
- Benson, Sara/case study, 134–135
- Blended approach (literacy instructional methods), 7
- Body of evaluation report, 30
- Breadth of program evaluation, 132–133

- Brothers, Stephanie/case study, 55–62
- Brown, Samantha/case study, 76–81
- Budget narrative (RFP), 42
- Budgets: restrictions to, 42; in RFP, 42
- Budget summary (RFP), 42

C

- Case studies: community-based mentor program, 55–72; evaluators-in-training/confidentiality issues, 119–127; framework overview, 15; high school science program expansion, 85–90; increasing parental involvement, 131–137; literacy achievement, 93–97; mathematics training program for teachers, 109–117; professional development technology project, 75–81; statewide after-school initiative, 99–106; student performance in mathematics/inquiry-based instruction, 39–53; technology/student teachers, 65–72
- Changing practices: example, 4; literacy instructional methods example, 7; program evaluation vs. research, 6–7
- Checklists: overview, 26; summer camp survey example, 24
- Clients: case study/community-based mentor program, 58, 60–63; description, 6; evaluation findings and, 32–33; finding, 40; trust and, 58, 60–63
- Community-based mentor program, 55–72
- Competitive funding: after-school programming and, 100; increasing parental involvement and, 132
- Confidentiality: aggregating findings and, 121; challenges with, 121–122, 124–127; legal issues with, 124; surveys, 22
- Confidentiality/case studies: evaluators-in-training, 119–127; technology and student teachers, 68
- Cover page (evaluation report), 29
- Curriculum for after-school programming, 101

D

- Data: access issues, 67–68, 72; baseline data, 95, 96; ex post facto data, 80; importance, 81; invalid data, 61–62; program evaluation vs. research, 6. *See also specific data types*
- Data collection tools: overview, 19, 21–29; preestablished tools/instruments, 59; standardized instruments, 59. *See also specific tools*
- Debriefing, 123
- Demographic information: overview, 27; summer camp survey example, 25
- Depth of program evaluation, 133
- Director of special projects (key informant), 132

E

- ELA. *See* English Language Arts (ELA) assessment
- ELL (English language learner), 134
- End outcomes: documenting description, 18; evaluation objectives and, 17; in logic models, 79
- English Language Arts (ELA) assessment: Reading Right program, 94, 95, 96–97; SINI list and, 42
- English language learner (ELL), 134
- Evaluation. *See* Program evaluation
- Evaluation capacity: case study/community-based mentor program, 58, 60–61; definition/overview, 58–59
- Evaluation findings: client and, 32–33; dissemination/use, 32–33
- Evaluation matrix: example/summer camp, 20; overview, 19; trust and, 19; use, 16
- Evaluation matrix/case studies: community-based mentor program, 60; student performance in mathematics, 47–48
- Evaluation objectives: definition, 12–13; examples, 13, 15–16, 33–34; formative evaluation objectives, 16; general categories of, 17–18; for grant-funded projects, 16; literacy program example, 16–17; overview, 16–17; program modifications, 33–34; summative evaluation objectives, 16; summer camp project, 15–16; trust and, 16; use, 13
- Evaluation objectives/case studies: high school science program expansion, 87;

student performance in mathematics, 46–47; technology and student teachers, 67

- Evaluation plan: description, 41; project activities, 46; in RFP, 41; writing, 45–47
- Evaluation plan/case studies: community-based mentor program, 58–62; evaluators in-training confidentiality issues, 122–127; high school science program expansion, 86–89; increasing parental involvement, 132–136; literacy achievement, 95; mathematics training program for teachers, 111–113; professional development technology project, 78–79, 80–81; statewide after-school initiative, 105–106; technology and student teachers, 65–68
- Evaluation program theory, 55
- Evaluation questions, 95
- Evaluation reports: case study/student performance in mathematics, 50–51; example of objective/finding, 30–32; formative data (overview), 9; importance of, 56, 77; program evaluation vs. research, 7–8; request for proposal (RFP), 77; sections overview, 29–30; timing, 29
- Evaluators. *See* Program evaluators
- Executive summary (evaluation report), 29–30
- Experimental design, 94
- Expertise-oriented evaluation approach, 13–14
- Ex post facto data/evaluation, 80
- External evaluation/evaluators: description, 11; evaluation plan and, 41; examples, 3–4, 41, 56, 67, 81, 94; RFP process and, 42; trust and, 12
- Extraneous variables: case study/literacy achievement, 97; research, 94

F

- Focus groups: overview, 27–28; video/audio recording, 28–29
- Focus groups/case studies: community-based mentor program, 61; evaluators in-training confidentiality issues, 122; high school science program expansion, 87, 88, 89; mathematics training program for teachers, 111
- Formative data: case study/student performance in mathematics, 48–49; de-

- scription, 9; reporting methods overview, 9; summative data vs., 9
- Formative evaluation: case study/high school science program expansion, 88–90; data type and, 8; description, 4, 8, 9–10, 18; example, 4; purpose, 4, 6, 9; research vs., 9–10; summary table on, 8
- Formative evaluation objectives, 16
- Free response/open-ended questions, 26–27
- Fuller, Dennis/case study, 94–97
- Funding agencies: examples, 42; in RFP process, 42, 43
- Funding cycle, 94
- G**
- GED (General Educational Diploma), 101, 133
- Goal-free evaluation approach, 13
- Grant writer and RFP, 41
- “Grassroots” reading curriculum, 96–97
- H**
- Hard outcomes, 17, 18, 79. *See also* End outcomes
- Hernandez, Sophia/case study, 134–135
- Higher collaboration of services, 102
- High school science program expansion, 85–90
- I**
- “Identifying the gap,” 44. *See also* Needs assessment
- Inquiry-based teaching: case study/high school science program expansion, 86; case study/technology and student teachers, 71; student performance in mathematics, 39–53
- Intermediate outcomes, 79
- Internal evaluation/evaluators: barriers, 11–12; description, 11, 12; examples, 67
- Interview protocols: description/use, 27; example/summer camp evaluation, 28
- Interviews: case study/increasing parental involvement, 133; case study/literacy achievement, 95; video/audio recording, 28–29
- Interviews, one-to-one: case study/high school science program expansion, 86–87; overview, 27
- Interviews, semistructured: case study/mathematics training program for teachers, 111, 112; description, 49, 111
- Introduction (evaluation report), 30
- Item analysis, 110
- J**
- Jackson, Linda/case study, 132–137
- Jackson, Matt/case study, 132–137
- Jackson, Seth/case study, 109–117
- Journals for collecting data, 29
- K**
- Key informant (director of special projects), 132
- L**
- Lamb, Margaret/case study, 94–97
- Larson, Tina/case study, 100–106
- Likert scales: overview, 26; summer camp survey example, 22–23, 24–25
- Lincoln, Barbara/case study, 109–117
- Literacy: achievement case study, 93–97; “grassroots” reading curriculum, 96–97
- Lodico, M.G., 115
- Logic models: case study/professional development technology project, 79; description/components, 79; overview, 80
- M**
- Mathematics: case study/inquiry-based instruction, 39–53; case study/training program for teachers, 109–117; SINI list and, 42
- Mentoring programs: advocacy program, 120–127; case study/community-based program, 55–72; case study/evaluators-in-training confidentiality issues, 119–127; case study/high school science program expansion, 86, 87
- Meta-evaluations, 86
- Methods (evaluation report), 30
- Mixed-method approach: case study/community-based mentor program, 58; case study/increasing parental involvement, 132; description, 58
- Models for after-school programming, 100
- N**
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 14

Need for project (RFP), 41
 Needs assessment: definition, 44, 110; item analysis with, 110
 Needs assessment/case studies: mathematics training program for teachers, 110; student performance in mathematics, 44
 Nephews, Dana/case study, 120–122, 123–125, 126

O

Objective-based approach: description, 12–13, 14. *See also* Evaluation objectives
 Observation/case studies: evaluators in-training confidentiality issues, 122–127; mathematics training program for teachers, 111; student performance in mathematics, 49
 Observer effect: case study/evaluators in-training confidentiality issues, 125, 127–128; case study/increasing parental involvement, 133–137, 138; description, 127–128, 138
 One-to-one interviews. *See* Interviews, one-to-one
 Open-ended/free response questions, 26–27
 Outcomes: goal-free evaluation approach and, 13; intermediate outcomes, 79. *See also* End outcomes

P

Parental involvement case study, 131–137
 Parent centers, 133–137
 Parenting classes, 101
 Participant access, 5–6
 Participatory-oriented evaluation, 14, 55–56
 Partnering and after-school programming, 101, 102, 104
 Phonics approach, 7
 Photography for collecting data, 29
 Portfolios: stakeholders and, 69; technology and, 69; use/overview, 69
 Portfolios/case studies: high school science program expansion, 86, 87; technology and student teachers, 68, 70–72
 Preestablished tools/instruments, 59
 Probes: description/use, 27; examples, 28
 Professional development: action research model, 114–115, 116–117; technology project, 75–81; top-down approach, 113–114

Professional development/case studies: mathematics training program for teachers, 110–113; student performance in mathematics/inquiry-based instruction, 39–53; technology integration, 65–72
 Program developers, 87–88, 89
 Program evaluation: definition, 5; purpose, 5; research vs., 5–8, 9–10; as unpredictable, 90, 134–137; vignette on, 3–4
 Program evaluators: background diversity, 10, 56–57; bids and, 100, 102; case study/in-training confidentiality issues, 119–127; training, 10, 56. *See also* External evaluation/evaluators; Internal evaluation/evaluators
 Program implementation documenting, 18
 Programs: barriers to, 88–90; definition, 5; description, 5
 Project access, 5–6
 Project activities (evaluation plan), 46
 Project narrative (RFP), 41, 45
 Proven practices: case study/literacy achievement, 94, 96, 97; description, 94

Q

Qualitative data: case study/literacy achievement, 95; formative/summative evaluation and, 8; mixed-method approach, 58; uses, 9
 Qualitative research: definition, 5; example, 6
 Quantitative data: case study/literacy achievement, 95; formative/summative evaluation and, 8; mixed-method approach, 58
 Quantitative research, 5
 Quasi-experimental design, 94

R

Reading Right program, 94–97
 Reliability, 59
 Reports. *See* Evaluation reports
 Request for proposal (RFP): after-school programming and, 100, 102; awards, 43, 81; components overview, 41–42; eligibility and, 42, 43, 52–53; evaluation reports for, 77; process, 42–43; process summary, 43
 Research: changing practices and, 6–7; definition, 5; extraneous variables, 94;

formative evaluation vs., 9–10; program evaluation vs., 5–8, 9–10; purpose, 5.

See also specific research types

RFP. *See* Request for proposal (RFP)

Rogers, P.J., 80

S

Sanders, Thomas/case study, 40–53

School cooperative bureaus, 40

School in Need of Improvement (SINI) list, 42, 53

Science Away!, 87

Science program (high school) expansion, 85–90

Self-report measures. *See* Surveys

Semistructured interviews. *See* Interviews, semistructured

SIGs (special interest groups), 11

Simpson, Jason/case study, 66–72

SINI (School in Need of Improvement) list, 42, 53

Smith, Shirah/case study, 119–127

Special interest groups (SIGs), 11

Stakeholders: case study/high school science program expansion, 86–87; portfolios and, 69; in RFP, 41; surveys and, 21

Standards: instruments, 59; measures, 42; preestablished tools/instruments and, 59

Statewide after-school initiative/evaluation, 99–106

Stevenson, Daphne/case study, 66–72

Summative data: case study/student performance in mathematics, 48–49; description, 9; examples, 9; formative data vs., 9

Summative evaluation: case study/mathematics training program for teachers, 111; data type and, 8; description, 4, 8, 9; example, 4; purpose, 4, 6, 9; summary table on, 8

Summative evaluation objectives, 16

Surveys: designing, 21; example/summer camp, 22–25; ex post facto data and, 80;

in needs assessment, 44; overview, 21; pre-post surveys use, 49, 87; pretesting, 21; recommendations on, 26; stakeholders and, 21

Surveys/case studies: evaluators in-training confidentiality issues, 122; high school science program expansion, 86–87, 88–89; increasing parental involvement, 133; literacy achievement, 95; mathematics training program for teachers, 111; professional development technology project, 80; statewide after-school initiative, 105; student performance in mathematics, 49

T

Teacher candidate portfolios: case study/technology and student teachers, 68, 70–72; description/use, 69

Technology: portfolios and, 69; professional development case study, 75–81; student teachers case study, 65–72

Technology integration, 66–72

Top-down approach, 113–114

Training for program evaluators, 10, 56

Trust: case study/community-based mentor program, 58, 60–63, 62; clients and, 58, 60–63; evaluation matrix and, 19; evaluation objectives and, 16; external evaluation/evaluators and, 12

V

Validity: observer effect and, 127–128; preestablished tools/instruments and, 59

Variables: in program evaluation vs. research, 9–10. *See also* Extraneous variables

Video recording interviews/focus groups, 28–29

W

Whole language approach, 7

Wright, Jennifer/case study, 85–90

