

INDEX

A

- AB design, 189
- ABC . . . D . . . design, 189
- Accuracy standards
 - analysis of qualitative information, 129
 - analysis of quantitative information, 128
 - context analysis, 127
 - justified conclusions, 129
 - reliable information, 128
 - valid information, 127–128
- Ackoff, Russell L., 160
- Action recommendations.
See Recommendations
- Adams, C., 142
- ADDIE model, 9, 274, 281
- Adjusting performance, 253–254
- Adler, P. A., 161
- Alliger, G. M., 48
- Altschuld, J. W., 93
- American Evaluation Association (AEA),
120, 122
- Andrei, H., 281
- ANOVA (analysis of variance), 214
- Apking, A. M., 77
- Artifacts
 - data collection using, 192
 - error of the, 245
- Assessment
 - needs, 127–137, 25, 33
 - standard for complete and fair, 126
 - See also* Evaluation
- Association error, 243
- Average performer error, 246

B

- Bache, A. P., 49
- Baldwin, T. T., 53
- Bar graphs, 210, 211*fig*
- Bassi, L. J., 49
- Bates, R., 54, 69
- BCR (benefits-cost ratio), 67
- Beer, S., 275
- Begemann, C., 276
- Behavioral engineering model, 271–272
- Bell curve, 209*fig*
- Belton, V., 275
- Benson, G., 49
- Berk, R. A., 180, 181

- Berrah, L., 272
 - Bias (observation), 163–164
 - Bititci, U. S., 276
 - Blake, B. E., 70
 - Blenkinsop, S. A., 275
 - Blind spot error, 245
 - Bloom, B. S., 180, 181
 - Bloom's taxonomy, 181
 - Borg, W. R., 171
 - Brethower, D. M., 8, 189
 - Brewer, J., 128
 - Brignall, S., 142
 - Brinkerhoff, R., 42, 52, 69, 75, 76, 77
See also SCM (case success model)
- ## C
- Canabali, D. T., 189
 - Carré, A. S., 276
 - Carroll, A., 9
 - Cascio, W. F., 47
 - Center for Instructional Research and
Curriculum Evaluation (University of
Illinois), 228
 - Cheney, S., 49
 - CIPP model
 - applicability in formative/summative
evaluations, 110*r*
 - articulating program core values/solutions,
111–112
 - on context evaluation, 108
 - on input evaluation, 109
 - introduction to, 5, 43, 107–108
 - methods used in, 112
 - PORO application example of, 113–115
 - on process evaluation, 109
 - on product evaluation, 109–111
 - strengths and limitations of, 113
 - See also* Stufflebeam, D.
 - Clark, R., 280, 282
 - Clark, R. E., 280, 282
 - Closed-ended questions, 176–177
 - Coghlan, D., 253
 - Communicating findings
 - developing the report for, 226–235
 - importance of, 221–222
 - recommendations component of, 96,
216*fig*, 222–226
 - Complete and fair assessment standard, 126

Concoran, C., 62
 Confidentiality agreement, 268
 Conflict of interest standard, 126–127
 Construct validity, 183
 Consulting retainer contract, 260
 Consumer-oriented evaluation model, 40, 82
 Content-related validity, 182
 Context analysis standard, 127
 Context evaluation, 108
 Context standards
 analysis of qualitative information, 129
 analysis of quantitative information, 128
 context analysis, 127
 justified conclusions, 129
 reliable information, 128
 valid information, 127–128
 Continual improvement
 adjusting performance for, 253–254
 definition of, 250
 monitoring performance for, 250–253
 role of leadership in, 254–255
 Contracting. *See* Evaluation contract
 Converse, J. M., 175
 Cooperrider, D. L., 6
 Correlation coefficient, 212–213
 Cost-benefit evaluation, 20
 Cost-effectiveness evaluation, 20
 Cost-effectiveness standard, 125
 Cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, 259
 “Course Improvement Through Evaluation”
 (Cronbach), 5
 Cowan, D. A., 272
 Cresswell, A., 62
 Criterion-references tests, 180–182
 Criterion-related validity, 183
 Critical incident technique, 171–172
 Cronbach, L., 4, 5, 43
 Cronbach’s alpha, 126
 Cross, K. F., 142
 Cummings, T. G., 254
 Customer satisfaction, 90–91

D

Da Silveira, G., 277
 Data
 collecting postprogram, 63
 converting to monetary values, 65–66
 defining from performance objectives,
 139, 141
 definition of, 134
 graphical representations of, 210–212*fig*
 hard, 135
 linkages between results and required,
 145*t*–147*t*
 qualitative, 95, 129, 136–137, 171, 196–197
 quantitative, 95, 128–129, 136–137
 relevance, reliability, validity of, 135–137
 scales of measurement for, 137–138*t*
 soft, 136
 See also Evaluation questions; Information;
 Measurable indicators
 Data analysis
 graphical representations used in, 210–212*fig*
 inferential statistics used in, 214–217
 interpretation component of, 217–218
 linking recommendations, findings,
 interpretations and, 234–235
 measures of relationship in, 212–214
 progression to recommendations for action
 from, 216*fig*
 qualitative, 196–197
 quantitative, 199–210*fig*
 selecting tools for, 93–96
 standard for, 128–129
 structured discussion, 197–199
 Data collection
 document-centered methods, 191–192
 error of the instrument, 244
 experimental research, 186–190
 importance of, 159–160
 instrument-centered methods, 172–178
 person-centered direct observation methods,
 161–166
 person-centered indirect observation tech-
 niques, 166–172
 plan flow for, 140*t*
 selecting methods of, 92–93
 standards on, 123–124
 traditional knowledge testing, 179–184
 treatment-centered methods, 184–186
 Data sources
 finding, 152–155
 identifying, 92
 for specific data categories, 154*t*–155*t*
 Davies, J., 20
 Davis, I., 21
 Decision making
 evaluation question decision string for, 29–30
 performance gap reduced through, 272–273
 performance measurement systems (PMSs)
 tool for, 273–277
 performance monitoring role in, 271–273
 Delivery and acceptance, 262
 Delphi technique, 169–170
 Deming, W. E., 94
 Demonstration, 233
 Dennett, D. C., 48
 Descriptive statistics
 described, 200
 measures of central tendency, 201–204

- measures of dispersion (variability), 204–210*fig*
 - “Development of a Plan to Measure Return on Investment of Educational Programs at Providence Hospital” (Blake), 70–73
 - Dick, W., 54
 - Direct observation. *See* Person-centered direct observation methods
 - Discrepancy evaluation model, 5, 41, 83
 - Displacement shift error, 245
 - Dissemination. *See* Communicating findings
 - Division of Blind Services (DBS) case study, 148–151
 - Document-centered methods
 - artifacts and work products, 192
 - extant data review, 191
 - literature review, 192
 - Doucouliagos, C., 68, 69
 - Drucker, P., 24
 - Dumas, J. S., 227
- E**
- Eccles, R. G., 275
 - Eckerson, W., 253
 - Educational Evaluation and Decision Making* (Stufflebeam et al.), 107
 - Efficiency (or process) evaluation, described, 19
 - Eisenhardt, K., 272
 - Employee satisfaction, 91
 - Ends
 - definition of, 25, 32
 - definition of societal, 22
 - evaluation comparison of intentions with, 32–33
 - Environmental Protection Agency, 152
 - “Equivalent of alternate forms” method, 184
 - Errors of logic, 242–243
 - Errors of procedure, 244–246
 - Errors of system mapping, 240–242
 - Estes, F., 282
 - Ethical issues, 262
 - Evaluation
 - benefits of, 24–25
 - brief overview of history of, 4–5
 - communicating findings of, 96, 216*fig*, 221–236
 - definition of, 240
 - ensuring ownership and commitment to, 23–24
 - ensuring stakeholders’ buy-in, 9–10
 - experimental research relationship to, 185–186
 - formative, 15, 17, 18, 110*r*
 - performance improvement role of, 281–282
 - purpose and definition of, 5–8
 - reasons for conducting, 7
 - relationship to other investigative processes, 11–15
 - simulation and gaming used for, 190
 - standards used for, 119–120
 - summative, 15, 17, 18–20, 110*r*
 - terminology related to, 25–26
 - timing of, 15, 17–18
 - See also* Assessment; Meta-evaluation; Performance-based evaluation
 - Evaluation contract
 - consulting retainer, 260
 - controls included in, 260–262
 - cost-plus-fixed-fee, 259
 - ethics and professionalism
 - elements of, 262
 - fixed-price, 258–259
 - overview of, 258
 - time-and-materials, 259–260
 - Evaluation contract controls
 - delivery and acceptance, 262
 - management plan, 261
 - other contract clauses, 261
 - program review, 261–262
 - schedule and work breakdown
 - structure, 262
 - scope of work, 260–261
 - statement of work, 261, 262–268
 - Evaluation errors
 - logic, 242–243
 - procedure, 244–246
 - system mapping, 240–242
 - Evaluation impact standard, 124
 - Evaluation models
 - Brinkerhoff’s SCM (case success evaluation), 42, 75–80
 - conceptualizing fit between situation and, 44–45
 - error of, 244–245
 - Guerra-López’s impact, 42, 81–104
 - historic overview of, 5
 - Kirkpatrick’s four levels, 42, 47–58
 - Patton’s utilization-focused, 42
 - Phillips’s ROI methodology, 42, 61–73
 - Provus’s discrepancy, 5, 41, 83
 - Scriven’s consumer-oriented, 40, 82
 - Scriven’s goal-free, 5, 15, 41, 162
 - selecting, 43
 - self-evaluation framework, 250–253
 - Stake’s responsive/client-centered, 5, 41
 - Stufflebeam’s CIPP, 5, 43, 107–115
 - Tyler’s objective-based, 40
 - Evaluation Network, 120
 - Evaluation questions
 - asking the right, 28–32

- Evaluation questions (*continued*)
 coming from various perspectives and stakeholders, 87–88
 decision string of, 29–30
 evaluation study are driven by, 35
 follow-up, 155–157
 open- and closed-ended, 176–177
 process string of, 29
 societal string of, 29
 system string of, 30
See also Data; Questionnaires/surveys
- Evaluation Research Society, 120
- Evaluators
 AEA principles for, 120, 122
 challenges faced by, 20–22
 competencies of, 11
 contracting with, 257–268
 ethics and professionalism of, 262
 functions of, 13
 as job versus role, 10–11
 observation bias by, 163–164
 recommendation implementation role of, 235–236
See also Meta-evaluators
- Executive briefing, 232–233
- Experimental design
 basis of, 186–187
 examples of typical, 187–188
 variations of time-series, 189
- Experimental research
 designing, 186–188, 189
 problems with classic, 188
 relationship between evaluation and, 185–186
 time-series, 188–190
- Expert error, 242
- Explanation creep error, 245
- Extant data review, 191
- F**
- Face validity, 182–183
- Fair assessment standard, 126
- False conclusion error, 242
- Feasibility standards
 cost-effectiveness, 125
 meeting propriety, 125
 political viability, 124–125
 service orientation, 125–126
- Ferrington, J., 280, 282
- Findings. *See* Communicating findings
- Fitzgerald, L., 142
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., 4, 5, 39, 40, 119, 120
- Fixed-price contract, 258–259
- Focus groups
 conducting, 166–167
 samples used for, 167–168
- Follow-up evaluation questions, 155–157
- Ford, J. K., 53
- Forked path error, 246
- Formative evaluations
 CIPP model applicability to, 110*r*
 described, 15, 17, 18
 timing and issues of, 17
- Foxon, M., 52
- Freedman, M., 21
- G**
- Gage, N. L., 189
- Gall, M. D., 171
- Games, 189–190
- Gharajedaghi, J., 83
- Gilbert, T. F., 8, 49, 92, 271
- Gilbert's behavioral engineering model, 271–272
- Goal-free evaluation model, 5, 15, 41, 82, 162
- Goals
 based on valid organization needs, 33–34
 definition of, 26
 needs assessment to determine, 33
See also Objectives
- Grady, M. W., 275
- Graphical data representations, 210–212*fig*
- GRE (Graduate Record Examination), 183
- Guba, E., 5, 6, 185
- Guerra, I., 13, 50, 86, 91, 92, 93, 135, 138, 148, 170, 257, 262, 281
- Guerra-López, I., 6, 41, 42, 81, 84, 96, 112, 281
See also Impact evaluation process
- H**
- Handbook of Human Performance Technology* (Pershing), 281
- Hard data, 135
- Harless, J., 8, 272
- Henderson, A., 20
- Hofstadter, D. R., 48
- Holton, E., 54
- Howick, S., 275
- Huberman, A. M., 197
- Human Competence: Engineering Worthy Performance* (Gilbert), 8
- Human subject rights standard, 126
- Hunter, A., 128
- I**
- Impact evaluation
 definition of, 19
 impact evaluation process model, 42, 81–104
- Impact evaluation process
 comments on, 96

- elements of the, 83–96
 - illustrated diagram of, 84*fig*
 - introduction to, 42, 81–83
 - strengths and limitations of, 97
 - TVC (Visionary Corporation) application
 - example of, 97–104
 - See also* Guerra-López, I.
 - Impact evaluation process steps
 - 1: identify stakeholders and expectations, 84–86
 - 2: determine key decisions and objectives, 86–91
 - 3: deriving measurable indicators, 91–92
 - 4: identifying data sources, 92
 - 5: selecting data collection methods, 92–93
 - 6: selecting data analysis tools, 93–96
 - 7: communication of results and recommendations, 96
 - Indirect observation. *See* Person-centered indirect observation methods
 - Inferential statistics
 - described, 201
 - parametric and nonparametric, 214–217
 - Information
 - definition of, 134
 - included in written reports, 229–230
 - standards for, 127–129
 - standards for collecting, 123–124
 - See also* Data
 - Input evaluation, 109
 - Instructor-made tests, 179–180
 - Instrument errors, 244
 - Instrument-centered methods
 - choosing the right instrument, 172–174
 - overview of, 172
 - questionnaires and surveys, 174–178
 - International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI), 9, 279
 - Interpretation
 - data analysis, 217–218
 - linking recommendations, findings, data analysis and, 234–235
 - Interval measurement level, 137, 138*r*
 - Interview methods, 170–171
 - Investigative processes
 - common elements of all, 14–15
 - dimensions of, 16*r*
 - evaluation relationship to other, 11–15
 - needs assessment, 12*r*–13*r*, 25
 - IRHTP (Interdisciplinary Rural Health Training Program) evaluation case
 - background information on, 122
 - findings of, 123–129
 - methodology used in, 122–123
 - “Item-objective congruence,” 181
- ## J
- Janak, E. A., 48
 - Johnson, T. R., 49
 - Johnston, R., 142
 - Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 119–120
 - Juran, J., 94
 - Justified conclusions standard, 129
- ## K
- Kaplan, R. S., 142, 276
 - Kaufman, R. A., 13, 21, 22, 25, 55, 82, 88, 90, 92, 93, 94, 109, 112, 135, 138, 139, 170, 254, 257, 262, 280
 - Kaufman’s organizational elements model, 82
 - Keller, J. M., 55
 - Kennerly, M., 142
 - Key Evaluation Checklist, 40
 - King, D., 54
 - Kirkpatrick, D., 42, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53
 - Kirkpatrick’s four levels of evaluation
 - application example of, 56–58
 - comments regarding, 54–55
 - introduction to, 42, 47–49
 - Kurman and Keller’s variation of, 55
 - level 1: reactions, 47, 48*fig*, 49–50
 - level 2: learning, 48*fig*
 - level 3: behavior transfer, 48*fig*, 52–53
 - level 4: results, 48*fig*, 53–54
 - Phillips’s expansion of, 61–62
 - “reactionnaires” forms used in, 174
 - strengths and limitations of, 55–56
 - Knowledge of Health Care Disciplines Questionnaire, 128
 - Kuder-Richardson formula, 184
- ## L
- Lavigne, M., 62
 - Leadership
 - accountability demands by, 282
 - continual improvement and role of, 254–255
 - Levels of result, 25
 - Lick, D., 254
 - Likert scales
 - attitudinal surveys using, 137, 184
 - Kirkpatrick’s level 1 reactions using, 49
 - mean of, 202
 - median of, 203
 - questionnaire items, 136
 - Lincoln, Y., 5
 - Line charts, 210–211*fig*
 - Liston, C., 4
 - Literature review, 192
 - local value error, 241–242

- Logic errors
 of association, 243
 of the expert, 242
 of explanation creep, 243
 false conclusion, 242
 of the quick fix, 243
 wishful thinking, 243
- Lynch, D., 122
 Lynch, R. L., 142
- ## M
- Madaus, G., 40
 Mager, R. F., 139
 Management by walking around, 161
 Management plan, 261
 Market share increase, 90
 Maskell, B., 1424
 Mauris, G., 272
 McKinsey, 21
 McLaughlin, S. D., 49
 McMillan, J. H., 136
 Mean, 201–202
 Means
 definition of, 25, 32
 of evaluation process, 32–33
 Measurable indicators
 CIPP framework of, 114*t*
 commonly used financial, 142–143
 definition of, 141–142
 deriving, 91–92, 141–152
 general categories of commonly used, 143*t*–144*t*
 vocational rehabilitation case study on, 148–151
See also Data
- Measurement
 central tendency, 201–204
 data analysis of relationship, 212–214
 dispersion (variability), 204–210*fig*
 error of, 244
 levels of, 137, 138*t*
 Likert scales, 49, 136, 137, 184, 202, 203
 observation methodology and purpose of, 160–186
 performance, 271–277
 performance improvement role of, 281–282
See also Statistics
- Measures of central tendency
 the mean, 201–202
 the median, 202–203
 the mode, 203–204
- Measures of dispersion (variability)
 the normal curve, 208–210*fig*
 the range, 204–206
 the semi-interquartile range, 206
 the standard deviation (SD), 206–208
- Median, 202–203
 Merit (CIPP model), 108
 Meta-evaluation
 AEA principles for evaluators, 120, 122
 definition of, 118–119
 importance of, 118
 IRHTTP application example on, 122–129
 standards used for, 119–120, 121*t*
See also Evaluation
- Meta-evaluators
 essential qualifications for, 119
See also Evaluators
- Miles, M. B., 197
 Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, 183
 Misattribution error, 241
 Missing player error, 241
 Mode, 203–204
 Mohr, L. B., 139
 Monitoring performance
 continual improvement by, 250–251
 organizational decision making and role of, 271–277
 self-evaluation framework for, 251–253
 Montman, J., 272
 Myers-Briggs test, 183
- National Centre for Vocational Education Research (Australia), 68
- Needs
 definition of, 22, 25
 organization goals/objectives based on valid, 33–34
 using top-down approach to derive valid, 34
- Needs assessment
 definition of, 25
 objectives/goals determined by, 33
 unique perspectives of, 12*t*–13*t*
- Needs assessors, 13
 Neely, A., 142, 275, 276
 Negatively skewed distribution, 210*fig*
 Nevo, D., 44
 Newby, A., 174
 Niven, P. R., 144, 152, 155
 Noe, R. A., 53
 Nominal group technique, 168–169, 170*t*
 Nominal measurement level, 137, 138*t*
 Nondisclosure agreement, 268
 Nonparametric inferential statistics, 214–217
 Nonstructured direct observations, 163
 Norm-referenced tests, 182
 Normal curve, 208–210*fig*
 Norton, D. P., 142, 276
 Nutt, P., 272, 273, 275

O

Objective-based evaluation model, 40

Objectives

based on valid organization needs, 33–34

congruence between test items and, 181

defining required data from

performance, 139, 141

definition of, 26

determining key decision and, 86–91

needs assessment to determine, 33

See also Goals

Observation bias, 163–164

Observation methodology

instrument-centered, 172–178

person-centered direct, 161–166

person-centered indirect observation

techniques, 166–172

reliability and validity of tests, 182–184

rules for, 161

traditional knowledge testing, 179–182

treatment-centered, 184–185

Obtrusive direct observations, 162–163

OMT (outdoor management training) programs

description of, 56–57

evaluation of, 57–58

Open-ended questions, 176, 177

Oral reports/presentations, 232–233

Ordinal measurement level, 137, 138*t*

Organizational elements model, 82

Organizational mission, 34

Organizational vision

definition of, 34

Kaufman's ideal, 112

value-added, 89–90

An Ounce of Analysis Is Worth a Pound of Objectives (Harless), 8, 272

P

Parametric inferential statistics, 214–217

Parker, R. A., 174

Participant observation, 164–166

Patton, M. Q., 5, 42, 75, 123

Patton's utilization-focused evaluation

model, 42

Performance

adjusting, 253–254

definition of, 25

monitoring, 250–253

role of leadership in improving, 254–255

Performance dashboards, 274

Performance gaps, 272–273

Performance improvement

ADDIE model for, 9, 274, 281

a conceptual framework for, 8–9

definition of, 9, 25

evaluation and measurement in, 281–282

future of evaluation, 279–283

ISPI definition of, 279–280

Performance Improvement Journal (PIJ), 281, 282

Performance Improvement Quarterly (PIQ), 281, 282

Performance measurement systems (PMSs)

ADDIE approach adopted for, 274

description of, 273

Gilbert's approach to, 273

issues and challenges of, 275–277

performance dashboards for, 274

Performance pyramid, 142

Performance-based evaluation

overview of, 27–28

principles of, 27–35

See also Evaluation

Performance-based evaluation principles

1: asking the right questions, 28–32

2: evaluation as function of obtained

results, 32–33

3: organizations objectives should be based on valid needs, 33–34

4: derive valid needs using top-down approach, 34

5: every organization should aim for the best, 34–35

6: evaluation questions drive the evaluation study, 35

Pershing, J., 8, 9, 280, 281

Person-centered direct observation methods

acceptance by the group, 165

bias problem of, 163–164

effects of participation, 165–166

obtrusive versus unobtrusive, 162–163

overview of, 161–162

participant, 164–165

structured versus nonstructured, 163

“surplus meaning” problem of, 164

Person-centered indirect

observation methods

critical incident technique, 171–172

Delphi technique, 169–170

focus groups, 166–168

interview methods used for, 170–171

nominal group technique, 168–169, 170*t*

Peters, T. J., 161

Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on

Evaluation, 6, 107

Phillips, J., 42, 61, 62, 63

See also ROI methodology

Pie charts, 212*fig*

Platt, W. A., 92, 135, 138, 170, 257, 262

Political viability standard, 124–125

Popham, W. J., 43

- Population masking error, 246
- PORO (Guidance Program for Job Search)
evaluation case, 113–115
- Positively skewed distribution, 210*fig*
- Postprogram testing, 54*fig*, 96
- Pre-program testing, 54*fig*
- Presser, S., 175
- Problem solving assumptions, 7
- Procedure errors, 244–246
- Process (or efficiency) evaluation, 19, 109
- Product evaluation, 109–111
- Professional ethics, 262
- Program review, 261–262
- Propriety standards
complete and fair assessment, 126
conflict of interest, 126–127
rights of human subjects, 126
service orientation, 125–126
- Provus, M., 5, 41, 83
- Provus's discrepancy evaluation model, 5, 41, 83
- Public forum, 233
- Pyburn, P. J., 275
- ## Q
- Qualitative data
critical incident technique for collecting, 171
data analysis of, 196–197
description of, 95, 136–137
standard on analysis of, 129
- Quantitative data
analysis of, 199–210*fig*
description of, 95, 136–137
standard on analysis of, 128
- Quantitative data analysis
examples of purposes of, 199–200
measures of central tendency, 201–204
measures of dispersion (variability),
204–210*fig*
statistics used in, 209–210*fig*
- Questionnaires/surveys
basic types of items used in, 175–176
as data collection instrument, 174–175
length of, 178
Likert-scale, 137
open- and closed-ended questions used in,
176–177
other types of question formats used in, 177
structure of, 177–178
See also Evaluation questions
- Quick fix error, 243
- ## R
- Range (or spread), 204–206
- Ratio measurement level, 137, 138*t*
- Rea, L. M., 174
- “Reactionnaires,” 174
- Recommendations
communicating findings and, 222–223
considerations for implementing, 225–226
evaluator's possible role in implementing,
235–236
framework for identifying and presenting,
223*t*–224*t*
impact evaluation process on
communicating, 96
linking to interpretations, findings, data
analysis and, 234–235
progression from analyzed data to, 216*fig*
reporting the, 226–235
- Redish, J., 227
- Relationship measures, 212–214
- Relevant data, 135
- Reliability
of data, 135
standard for information, 128
testing, 182–184
- Reliable information standard, 128
- Repeated AB design, 189
- Report development
clarifying stakeholders' responsibilities, 235
evaluator's role after the report, 235–236
format decisions, 228
identifying the key message, 233–234
knowing the audience, 227–233
language elements of, 227–228
linking evaluation components, 234–235
oral reports, 232–233
overview of, 226–227
written reports, 229–232
- Research. *See* Experimental research
- Responsive/client-centered evaluation
model, 5, 41
- Results evaluation, 19
- Reversal/ABA designs, 189
- Richards, L., 197
- Richards, T., 197
- ROI methodology
application example of, 70–73
calculating ROI of program, 67
collecting postprogram data, 63
comments on the, 67–69
converting data to monetary values, 65–66
identifying intangible benefits of program, 67
introduction to, 42, 62–63
isolating effects of training, 64–65
Kirkpatrick's four levels model expanded
by, 61–62
strengths and limitations of, 70
tabulating program costs, 66–67
See also Phillips, J.

- ROI (return on investment)
 calculation for, 67
 concept and applications of, 68
- Rowland, C., 56
- Rowland/Diamond, 56
- Rummler, G. A., 8, 49
- ## S
- Saari, L. M., 49
- Sanders, J. R., 4, 5, 11, 39, 119
- Santos, S., 275, 277
- SAT (Scholastic Assessment Test), 183
- Schedule/work breakdown
 structure, 262
- SCM (success case model)
 application example of, 79–80
 introduction to, 42, 75–77
 process of, 77–78
 strengths and weaknesses of, 78
See also Brinkerhoff, R.
- Scope of work, 260–261
- Scriven, M., 4, 5, 15, 19, 40, 82–83, 95, 118, 119, 162
- Scriven's consumer-oriented evaluation model, 40, 82
- Scriven's goal-free evaluation model, 5, 15, 41, 82, 162
- SD (standard deviation), 206–208
- Self-evaluation framework, 250–253
- Semi-interquartile range (SIQR), 206
- Service orientation standard, 125–126
- Sgro, P., 68, 69
- Shinkfield, A., 39, 40, 41, 42, 107, 118–119, 120
- SimPak Computers evaluation case, 79–80
- Simulations, 189–190
- Sivestro, R., 142
- Skinner, B. F., 280
- Skinner, W., 277
- Slack, N., 277
- Society
 core values and ideals held by, 111–112
 ends in context of, 22
 evaluation questions in context of, 29
- Socrates, 4
- Soft data, 136
- Sputnik*, 5
- Srivastva, S., 6
- Stake, R. E., 5, 41, 75, 119, 139, 241
- Stakeholders
 clarifying responsibilities of, 235
 core values and ideals held by, 111–112
 definition of, 25
 determining key decisions and objectives of, 86–91
 ensuring evaluation buy-in by, 9–10
 evaluation questions coming from, 87–88
 identification of, 84–86, 123
 pre- and postprogram results reported to, 54*fig.*, 96
 test performance comparison reported to, 51*fig.*
- Stake's responsive/client-centered evaluation model, 5, 41
- Standard deviation (SD), 206–208
- Standards
 accuracy, 127–129
 context, 127–129
 development of evaluation, 119–120
 feasibility, 124–125
 listing of program evaluation, 121*t*
 propriety, 125–127
 utility, 123–124
- Standards for Evaluation of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials* (Joint Committee), 120, 122
- Stanley, J. C., 189
- Statement of work
 description of, 261
 sample and example of, 262–268
- Statistics
 descriptive, 200
 inferential, 201, 214–217
 measures of central tendency, 201–204
 measures of dispersion (variability), 204–210*fig.*
See also Measurement
- Structured direct observations, 163
- Structured discussion
 analysis using, 1979
 controls on, 198–199
 imposing structure on emerging issues of, 197–198
 relevance of, 198
- Stufflebeam, D., 5, 6, 18, 19, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 118–119, 120, 185
See also CIPP model
- Summative evaluations
 CIPP model applicability to, 110*t*
 described, 15, 17, 18–20
- “Surplus meaning” problem, 164
- Surveys. *See* Questionnaires/surveys
- Suwignjo, P., 276
- System mapping errors
 error of causal path, 240–241
 error of local value, 241–242
 error of misattribution, 241
 error of the missing player, 241

T

Technos: Quarterly for Education and Technology (2000), 160

Test-retest method, 184

Testing

- critereon-referenced, 180–182
- data collection through, 179–182
- instructor-made for training, 179–180
- norm-referenced, 182
- reliability and validity of, 182–184

Time-and-material contract, 259–260

Time-series studies

- four design variations of, 189
- overview of, 188–189
- simulations and games, 189–190

Treatment-centered methods, 184–186

Turner, T., 276

TVC (Visionary Corporation) evaluation case

- background information on, 97–98
- findings of, 101–104
- methodology used in, 98–99, 101
- relevant performance indicators, 100

Tyler, R., 4, 40, 41

Tyler's objective-based evaluation model, 40

U

Unobtrusive direct observations, 162–163

Usability testing, definition of, 20

Utility standards

- evaluation impact, 124
- feasibility, 124
- information scope and collection, 123–124
- stakeholder identification, 123
- values identification, 124

Utilization-focused evaluation model, 42

Utilization-Focused Evaluation (Patton), 42

V

Valid data, 135

Valid information standard, 127–128

Validity

critereon-referenced test, 180–181

data, 135–137

standard for information, 127–128

testing, 182–184

Value

error of local, 241–242

identification standard for identifying, 124

Value added

definition of, 26

organizational vision on, 89–90

Variability. *See* Measures of dispersion (variability)

Vision

definition of, 34

Kaufman's ideal, 112

value-added, 89–90

Vocational rehabilitation measurable indicators, 148–151

Voss, C., 142

W

Wagner, R., 57

Waterman, R. H., 161

Watkins, R., 86, 88

Webster, W. J., 18, 19, 43

Weiss, C., 5

Western Michigan University's Evaluation Center, 119

Willis, M., 20

Wishful thinking error, 243

Witkin, B. R., 93

Work products, 192

Worley, C. G., 254

Worth, 108

Worthen, B. R., 4, 5, 39, 119

Written reports

information included in, 229–230

outline for formal, 230–231

outline for "quick-and-dirty," 231–232

Z

Zimmerle, D. M., 49