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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Need for Input Evaluation

The pressure for change in education, the evaluation mandate of ESEA, and the current demand for accountability are all descriptors of the present educational environment. Evaluation is a response sensitive to this existing environment. During the past ten years, major break-throughs have been made in educational evaluation; however, there still exists a tremendous need for evaluation methodology for evaluators to use. The following paragraphs briefly review existing evaluation accomplishments and illuminate in greater detail the need for input evaluation.

Advancements in evaluation have been made. The conceptual work of Ralph Tyler provided the initial framework for theorists to use as they tackled the task of developing evaluation theory which could work in field settings where practically all U.S.O.E. evaluation mandated projects existed. Gradually there began to emerge, through the writings of Malcolm M. Provus, Robert E. Stake, and Michael

---


Scriven,4 and Daniel L. Stufflebeam5,6 various propositions and several evaluation models. One comprehensive evaluation model was that developed at the Ohio State Evaluation Center under the direction of Daniel L. Stufflebeam. In the recent publication, Educational Evaluation and Decision Making, by Stufflebeam, et al., evaluation is defined as "...the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives."7 The four types of evaluation which comprise the model and the acronym CIPP are presented below.

...context evaluation serves planning decisions to determine objectives; input evaluation serves structuring decisions to determine project designs; process evaluation serves implementing decisions to control project operations; and product evaluation serves recycling decisions to judge and react to project attainments.

Input evaluation as set forth in the CIPP model was the focus of this study. Whereas context evaluation provides information to determine what should be done, input evaluation provides information to determine which alternative means for achieving a given set of

---


7 ibid., p.40.

8 ibid., p.218.
objectives is best. Input evaluation provides a systematic framework to assist in the translation of objectives into program activities.

An educator may benefit from the use of an input evaluation framework because it provides information about program identification and selection which can be useful in making decisions. In addition, for accountability purposes, educators will be able to support their program decisions with documentation relative to the following questions:

1. Why was this program selected?
2. Does the program effectively use resources of the system?
3. Were alternatives considered?
4. If alternatives were considered, why was this program chosen?
5. How has a similar program worked in other settings?

Thus, input evaluation not only provides a framework for educators to use in decision-making but also provides documentation for accountability purposes.

Stufflebeam, who originally conceptualized input evaluation, describes this type of evaluation as follows:

...information for determining how to utilize resources to meet program goals. This is accomplished by identifying and assessing 1) relevant capabilities of the responsible agency, 2) strategies for achieving program goals, and 3) designs for implementing a selected strategy. This information is essential for structuring specific designs to accomplish program objectives.9

---

9 Ibid., p. 222.
The importance of input evaluation for the identification and assessment of alternative ways of achieving program objectives is reflected in the following comments by Michael Caldwell:

...while most educators are quite willing to accept the inevitability of change, they are not willing to accept "change for the sake of change." Thus, the focus, and in this writer's opinion, a proper one, is upon giving proper direction and substance to change through sound educational planning... Input evaluation refers to the assessment of the inputs which one is able or willing to invest in order to realize certain outputs... Thus, input evaluation may be thought of as a kind of plans assessment.10

The input evaluation framework is needed in education for the following reasons. First, input evaluation centers around identification of alternative means for achieving a given set of objectives. Although the importance of generating alternatives in other fields has long been recognized, educators often consider only one program. Second, input evaluation includes the systematic assessment of alternative means of achieving a given set of objectives in terms of a predetermined set of criteria. Third, most educational program development does not take into consideration the capabilities of the parent system, which often results in program specifications that cannot be fully implemented. Fourth, in input evaluation, designs are developed before implementation resulting in programs which are sufficiently planned and structured so that they can be effectively put into action.

Need for Methodology for Input Evaluation

Methodology for program identification and assessment is relatively nonexistent. Often a person or perhaps a group of people get together and design a program based solely on their past experience and common sense. There is no systematic look at the resources of the agency, nor is any effort made to identify or develop alternative designs or programs, let alone assess the alternative designs in terms of pre-determined criteria. Other areas in planning are beginning to offer some assistance to the area of program generation and assessment. For example, Russell G. Davis proposed the development of manpower targets and programs to achieve these targets for public schools stressing use of statistical methods.11 Other planning models are being adapted from systems theory such as the General Model which "...provides one way of conducting function and systems analyses and for planning and designing programs toward more efficient and effective organizational functioning."12 Another model projected as useful is a problem-solving Planning System which "...as a linear time-space episode model, it facilitates the processes and procedures implicit in problem-solving and planning."13 Most of the techniques

13 Ibid., p. 7.
just described require a background knowledge of systems theory. Another systems analysis framework has been proposed by Nadler and includes a functional analysis during work design. Although Nadler's work has been used in areas outside of education, he is currently developing applications for program identification and assessment procedures for education.14

A framework which could be used specifically for input evaluation is provided by Caldwell in his paper "An Approach to the Assessment of Educational Planning."15 Caldwell outlines development, assessment, and decision point cycles for the movement from objective setting to plan implementation. Although Caldwell provides a list of criteria which are appropriate for each cycle of plans assessment, little information is provided on how alternatives are identified and assessed or how the capabilities of the system would relate to that development.

Another methodology for input evaluation which has been used involves the use of advocate teams. Egon Guba, John Horvat, and Daniel Stufflebeam initially used the advocate team "idea" when working with the Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Although there was not a clearly established definition of advocate teams, the term generally referred to groups of people who were brought

15Caldwell, op cit., pp. 6, 11.
together to develop competing strategies for achieving a given set of objectives. This approach also included an analysis of the competing strategies. Although advocate teams had been used in field situations, methodology for their usage had been a kind of trial and error approach. The idea of advocate teams was generally thought to be useful by those who had been involved with its use and deserving of further development. Further development of the advocate team notion for input evaluation was the focus of this study.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to develop and to evaluate methodology for input evaluation utilizing advocate and design teams. The results of this dissertation can, hopefully, be used by educators who wish to see programs developed and assessed through a systematic, rational process. The need for development work via dissertations is explicated by Dr. William B. Michael, Professor of Education at the University of Southern California, in an address to the American Educational Research Association.

...I would also like to put a plug in for our encouraging work in evaluation, and the CIPP model presented here offers a beautiful opportunity for doctoral dissertation research which would get away from some of the old classical experimental-control group models and allow students to do developmental studies. They are perfectly respectable...16

Objectives

The three major objectives set forth for this study were as follows:

A. Obtain a "state of the art" picture on advocate teams use by conducting four case studies in which advocate teams were utilized and procedures analyzed and by surveying related literature.

B. Develop a technical manual for advocate team use which would include basic conceptualization as well as exemplary operationalized procedures.

C. Evaluate the manual in terms of its conceptual adequacy and practical utility.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The term "advocate teams" was first coined in the Summer of 1968 by Daniel Stufflebeam, Egon Guba, and John Horvat as a result of their consultant work with the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in Austin. Case Study #1 in Chapter III fully illustrates this first use of advocate teams. Briefly, the advocate team notion was created in response to a need for help in the development of alternative programs for migrant students. The consultants wanted to get "objective outsiders" to help in the development of programs for secondary migrant students, however, the time and cost to orient these "objective outsiders" was more than the Lab could afford.

Being concerned with objectivity, the consultants felt that people who were already familiar with the area because of their active involvement in secondary migrant education, would develop programs reflecting the biases that they had developed. Therefore, these persons would come into any program development as advocates of certain solutions to the needs of migrant students.

The consultants finally agreed that they should capitalize on the bias of the people familiar with the area and obtain advocate strategies for programs for the migrant students from a variety of people. By deliberately obtaining biased views, the objectivity
question would then be whether or not the advocate positions selected were representative of the spectrum of possible advocate positions. The consultants felt that this means of program development would be valuable in that one could array the different strategies prepared by the different advocates and look for similarities and differences. In this initial conception of advocate teams, the groups of people were to be specifically selected because they advocated a certain position prior to program development.

**Input Evaluation**

Related literature on prior conceptual work on input evaluation and input evaluation methods provided valuable information for the development of the technical manual on input evaluation using advocate and design teams. The Caldwell article cited previously presented a rather simple flow chart of activities that could be used in input evaluation ranging from a general plan to the selection of the specific plan. This article does not emphasize or concentrate on how alternatives should be developed which is the prime reason for using advocate teams; however, the article does present criteria which could be used at various stages of plan assessment. These criteria were referenced in the technical manual. The book entitled *Educational Evaluation and Decision Making* conceptually describes input evaluation in detail and a comprehensive example was provided for input evaluation under conditions when acceptable alternative strategies were available.
The only other related literature on input evaluation was that found in a series of working papers developed for the Southwest Educational Laboratory during the Summer of 1968 by John Horvat and Egon Guba. Working Paper #1 entitled Input Evaluation Methods speaks directly of input evaluation in terms of identification and assessment. A great deal of the information provided in this first working paper was directed at how an agency could go about identifying or collecting and assessing possible input treatments. Methods for identifying strategies which have already been used included a literature search, site visitations or recall of past general experience or past practice. The authors in this first working paper also recognized the need to develop one or more de novo strategies to resolve a problem under attack. This special distinction was described as follows:

The special case of "input creation" will not utilize input evaluation information in the same way that such information is used when inputs are borrowed or adapted. In the "input creation" or "input de novo development" situation information from the evaluation effort will be used primarily as guidelines in the development process rather than as decision-making tools. The development of "de novo" inputs is a highly creative activity. Most of the assessment questions posed in Phase II of input evaluation must be asked and answered during the process of creative development.

The authors cite three possible ways in which de novo strategies could be developed—brainstorming, consultation with experts and

---

creative original development or problem solving. The authors emphasized the need for creative original development and strongly suggested that the agency put part of its resources into this process. Although they realized that the creation of inputs or strategies would be on an ad hoc basis, they proposed that a small core staff be available to engage in this kind of development.

Additional working papers #2 and #3, entitled Information Decision Matrices and Information Decision Matrices Operations, provided additional input to the development of the technical manual. The synthesis of the case studies revealed little information on actual assessment procedures which could be followed in the assessment of alternative strategies. These working papers set forth various procedural steps such as the identification of criteria, operationalizing the criteria and the identification of interpretation and decision rules. In addition, these papers provided valuable examples on ways of presenting information on assessment procedures such as the Information Decision Matrix and the Information Decision Profile. These examples were used extensively in the technical manual. References to additional related literature can be found throughout the technical manual located in Chapter IV. A large number of documents related to advocate team use are also presented in the case studies in Chapter III.

Advocacy Planning

In the field of city planning, advocacy planning has been in the literature for a number of years. Paul Davidoff in an article titled Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning\(^3\) states that the first time advocacy planning was used was in 1965. Advocacy planning in the city planning field meant that planners, in essence, become advocates of plans they developed with special interest groups. Davidoff states that planning cannot be prescribed from a position of value neutral, for city plans are a person's view of what a society should be. Upon development of his/her plans, the advocacy planner prepares a legal brief in which he cites facts and reasons for decision makers to adopt his plan. The advocacy planner also provides facts and reasons indicating the inferiority of counter plans by pointing out biases. This adversary analysis of counter plans is similar to cross-examination in legal terms. The application of legal procedures to this planning effort is extensive. Upon development of the legal brief, the advocate planner would enter into a political process in which he would be an advocate of his/her plan and an adversary to other plans.

The previous work in urban planning is somewhat similar to the use of advocate teams as defined in this study, in that advocate

teams prepare alternative strategies for achieving a set of objectives, whereas advocate planners prepare alternative city plans. Advocate teams, however, do not enter into an adversary analysis of counter plans or strategies. The alternative strategies developed by advocate teams are assessed but they are not assessed by advocate team members in the adversary manner. The common element between the planning technique and use of advocate teams is that both are involved in the development of strategies or plans. The emphasis upon application of legal procedures is more obvious in urban planning than it is with the use of advocate teams for educational program development.

Advocate/Adversary Evaluation

In 1971 Robert Stake and Craig Gjerde of the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation at the University of Illinois evaluated a seven week institute for the talented in Minnesota. The evaluation report was entitled T-City-1971. This report contained an advocate and adversary evaluation of the institute. The evaluation team which evaluated the institute worked closely with staff of the institute and provided formative evaluation which the institute staff used to change their program. This close association provided a rationale for the use of advocate and adversary summary evaluation. The actual reasons for use of advocate/adversary evaluation were stated as follows:

For the "outsider" this cooperation raises the question of objectivity of the final report. To off-set in part this weakness, this evaluation report features an advocate report and an adversary report, one summarizing the most favorable
arguments in support of the institute and the other summarizing the most damaging criticisms. The reader is left with the responsibility of resolving these conflicting arguments.

The advocate statement was prepared by Robert Stake not to indicate his personal opinion of the institute but as a summary of the positive claims that one might reasonably be made. The adversary statement was prepared by Terry Denny and was not to indicate his personal opinion of T-City but as a summary of the most damaging charges that might be made. In an interview with Stake in May, 1972, reactions to this type of evaluation were discussed. The institute faculty viewed the adversary statement as very negative—they felt that this statement hurt the program and they questioned the professional ethics of the evaluators for including it as the report was to be used to obtain future funding. The Board which financed the program however, did not pay much attention to the adversary statement. Stake’s reactions to this first use of advocate/adversary evaluation was that perhaps a rebuttal would have been useful to include and that the advocate/adversary approach might be more valuable as evaluation provided for institute personnel to improve the institute while it was being implemented (formative evaluation) rather than providing the information only at the end of the institute (summative evaluation). The difference between advocate teams and advocate/adversary evaluation is as follows:

---

1. Advocate teams are used to develop programs. Advocate/adversary evaluation is used to evaluate a program after it has been implemented.

2. Advocate team members are not responsible for analyzing or preparing adversary statements in regard to the strategies other advocate teams have developed. They are used primarily for program identification tasks rather than an assessment task.

In a paper presented at the 1972 American Educational Research Association session in Chicago, Marilyn Kouilsky and Eva Baker presented results for a paper entitled, "An Evaluation of Evaluation Procedures." This paper described a research study in which a group of eighteen student volunteers in a course on social studies methodologies were asked to prepare evaluation papers on the project. Six of the students were assigned randomly to prepare their evaluation reports independently. The remaining volunteers were arbitrarily paired into six groups. Each member of the team was assigned either a positive or a negative viewpoint toward the adoption of the Social Studies Project. Students were told to gather information and to prepare a paper which supported the viewpoint, either positive or negative, to which they had been assigned. Adversary groups were instructed to meet in a session to decide on a position and to incorporate the most valid points from individual papers. Both groups were also provided with guidelines along with a thirty minute orientation. Results of this study were as follows:
Papers produced by the adversary team members whether as individual or conference documents were found to be superior to the independently developed papers. Differences were found to be significant for the comparison beyond the .01 level.5

In the discussion of this report the authors state that they think the adversary position of evaluators would minimize the intellectual detachment in evaluation by increasing ego involvement. Because of this increased ego involvement, the authors proposed that the use of the adversary approach in evaluation would lead to better evaluation, although they indicated that much more investigation is needed in this area. The adversary approach to evaluation as explicated in this research study is very similar to the advocate/adversary evaluation of the Tri-City just mentioned—it is a method for evaluating a project that has already been developed. However, the use of advocate and adversary evaluation which more closely follows legal procedures is a related area to advocate teams in evaluation today.

CHAPTER III

CASE STUDIES

Case Study Methodology

The use of case studies to assist in the development of evaluation methodology seemed appropriate from the initial conception of this study. The major advantage of the case study for complex situations as Blau has pointed out is that it (the case study approach) lends itself to the interlocking of a variety of research procedures\(^1\) e.g., interviews, document review. Additional advantages of case study use are supplied by Guba.

\[\ldots\text{The case study provides sufficient scope to enable all relevant factors to be considered, if not rigorously dealt with. It lends itself to probing, tenative effort. It does not pose as a necessary condition for its application high degrees of control of relevant variables, nor does it presuppose a knowledge of those variables in advance. It can be pushed to great depths in selected areas found to be highly relevant. It can accomodate a variety of perspectives.\ldots}\]

The first question answered was "what cases should be studied?"

Selection criteria used included relevance and feasibility. Relevance

\[\begin{align*}
\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{Peter Blau, The Dynamics of Bureaucracy, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), pp. 4-5.}\\
\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{Egon Guba, The Development and Testing of a Case Study Approach to the Field of Research Knowledge Utilization in Education (Proposal for Research and/or Related Activities Submitted to the U. S. Commissioner of Education, Bureau of Research, April 1, 1967), p.4.}
\end{align*}\]
and feasibility were determined by positive answers to the following questions.\(^3\)

1. Does the potential case study encompass problems and issues in the development and use of the advocate team approach?

2. Are the roles, functions, processes, and behaviors of advocate team usage the central dynamics in the potential case study?

3. Can the potential case study serve as a vehicle for illuminating knowledges and concepts relevant to the development of appropriate methodology for advocate team use based upon the proposed logical framework?

4. Can the data be practically obtained?

To the best of the investigator's knowledge, the four cases selected satisfy the criteria of relevance and feasibility. In addition, the four case studies selected were at the beginning of this study the only major efforts to use advocate teams that have been identified.

The most appropriate methodology for this particular use of case studies resulted in a unique combination of perspectives and techniques. Those perspectives and techniques are presented in the following

\(^3\)Questions adapted from those supplied by Glen L. Immegart, *Guides for the Preparation of Instructional Case Materials in Educational Administration*, (The University Council for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, 1967), pp. 3, 4.
sections and constitute the methodology which was developed and used for the case studies. The description of the case study methodology will include descriptions of the dimensions, the sequence of activities, and other scientific considerations.

**Dimensions:** The case study methodology developed and used can be identified through a description of the following dimensions. Specification of these dimensions prior to conducting the case studies helped set boundaries for the case analysis and collection of data.

A. Substantive content - The case studies provided an historical or retrospective tracing of ideas and events in which advocate teams were used. The content included an intensive look into the particular theme of identification of the methodology used, how it was developed and the participants involved (see case study sections 11B, 111).

B. Time durations - An historically retrospective time line was used. It began when the decision to use the advocate team approach was made and ended when the strategies developed were at the point of being implemented. A section at the beginning of the study summarized relevant antecedent events. A brief section at the end of the study labeled "outcomes" summarized relevant events during

---

implementation (see case study sections II A, C, D, E).

C. Richness of detail - Within the case studies, richness of detail was less for historical events which were not directly related to development of the methodology itself and how it was used. In like manner, processes not directly related to the delineation of the methodology and its use were treated more superficially.

D. Perspective of the narrator - Within this dimension, there were differences within case studies. For two of the cases the investigator played the role of an outside observer, coming on the case after it was completed. For the remaining two case studies, the investigator played a part during the usage and thus may be termed an insider, conducting the case after its use.

E. Style of reporting - The style of reporting selected for the case studies included narrations, summary presentations, and exhibits.

F. Framework - Culbertson, Jacobson, and Reller have listed and described five perspectives that can be used, either singly or in combination, in developing a case. A combination of frameworks was selected as most appropriate for this case study methodology. The framework was historical in that case events were described in a chronological

---

series. The case studies were thematic in that the case was built around the particular theme of advocate team methodology and use. Finally, the case approach included the process framework as it focused upon group and individual interactions in the development and use of advocate teams.

**Sequence:** A systematic sequence of activities is necessary for a scientific endeavor. The investigator found Glenn L. Immeagart's pamphlet entitled *Guides for the Preparation of Instructional Case Materials in Educational Administration* most helpful in setting up a complete sequence of events. A work breakdown schedule and a checklist of activities were developed prior to the initiation of the case studies and used as a guide for each case study (see Appendix A-1 and A-2 for copies). Major activities in sequence were as follows:

A. Review available documents

B. Identify primary data sources

C. Delineate kinds and extent of data needed (prepare interview questionnaire—copy in Appendix A-3)

D. Identify appropriate data collection procedures

E. Schedule meetings

F. Review notes and identify where more information is needed (complete interview form—copy in Appendix A-4)

G. Recycle to B (when appropriate)

---

Immeagart, *Preparation of Instructional Case Materials.*
H. Select content and information for rough draft
I. Check rough draft with framework selected and rewrite
J. Send second draft to two primary actors for validation

Scientific Considerations: Although elements described in the previous sections on methodology indicate elements which could support scientific conditions, special considerations will be given to scientific concerns. Most scientific considerations center around controls of one sort or another. Various procedures used to increase case study validity and reliability were as follows:

1. A variety of sources of data were used.
2. Primary and original sources were used when possible as opposed to (second-hand) data sources.
3. A systematic procedure was developed and used in data collection.
4. A variety of data collection techniques were used.
5. A system for identification and solution of data discrepancies were developed and used (see interview form—Appendix A-4).
6. Primary actors were asked to review the case study when completed (see Appendix B for letter, questionnaire, and results).

The case studies which follow were derived from an analysis of over two hundred and fifty documents and extensive interviews with approximately thirty persons (see Appendix C for names). In addition to those persons interviewed on site in Columbus and telephone inter-
views, trips were made to Bloomington, Indiana; Austin, Texas; and Portland, Oregon as part of the collection of data. The cases are presented in the chronological order of occurrence beginning with the first use of advocate teams.
CASE STUDY #1

ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT
FOR
SECONDARY MIGRANT STUDENTS

I. Introduction

The case study which follows is divided into two major parts. The first part describes the context in which advocate teams were first used. This section also includes antecedent events, an historical account of major activities, and a description of major actors involved. The second part examines in detail the use of advocate teams and other related documents and processes.

II. Case History

A. Description of Context and Antecedent Events

Advocate teams, as defined in this study, were first used to identify solutions (strategies) for problems related to secondary migrant students. The following paragraphs describe the environment and antecedent events which led to the creation and utilization of advocate teams. Following this will be a description of the major roles filled by primary actors and major events.

The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, (SEDL) in Austin, Texas, is one of several national educational laboratories which was
established under legislation of the ESEA Act of 1965. This institution receives some of its funding from the National Center for Educational Research and Development (NCERD) and the rest from other funding sources.

The laboratory has a board which provides policy guidance for its operations. One of the policy statements indicates that the Laboratory may engage in contracts with other institutions and agencies only when the purposes and goals are consistent with those of the Laboratory. This policy, the board felt, would aid the mission thrust of the Laboratory and promote more effective program coordination and resource use. One of the Laboratory's goals as established by its articles of incorporation, is as follows:

...educational and scientific, including, but not restricted to, the following: 1) to identify educational problems, with special consideration of, and emphasis on, those problems of the elementary and secondary education, and particularly those which relate to the culture and economy of the Southwestern United States.7

Since the Southwestern part of the United States does constitute a large proportion of the nation's migrant students, the Laboratory has been very actively involved in a migrant program thrust.

7Progress Report, September 1, 1968 - March 15, 1969, (Submitted to The Texas Education Agency by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, April 15, 1969), p.5.
The Texas Education Agency (TEA) is the State Department level educational institution for the State of Texas. Since 1963, the agency funded migrant programs throughout Texas with Federal funds allocated through ESEA Title I-Migrant. Several studies concerning migrant education in Texas were completed by the Laboratory under contract with the Texas agency.

On February 3, 1968, Dr. J. W. Edgar, Texas Commissioner of Education, submitted a recommendation to the Texas State Board of Education for the establishment of a development center for the improvement of migrant education. The Laboratory was invited by the commissioner to submit a proposal for the establishment of the Texas Migrant Educational Center. Staff at the Laboratory wrote a prospectus and submitted it to the Texas Education Agency on March 29, 1968.

The Laboratory's proposal was accepted. One of the first tasks allocated to the Texas Migrant Educational Development Center, hereafter referred to as TMEDC, was to conduct a comprehensive site visit evaluation of schools where migrant programs were being financed by Texas state money. The evaluation which the Laboratory conducted consisted of a series of site visits to schools which were receiving state aid and to comparable schools which were not receiving financial aid.

As a result of scope of work sections within this specific contract and previous contracts between the Laboratory and TEA, several evaluations were conducted which provided context information (information which
identifies needs, problems, and opportunities). An evaluation report titled, Evaluation of Migrant Education in Texas (June, 1968), revealed that only fourteen percent of the migrant students identified were enrolled in the upper six grades of Texas Public Schools. Other documents with high drop-out rates of migrant students resulted in the specification of work statement number fourteen in the contract for continued operation of the TMEDC, which began operation September 1, 1968. The scope of work was stated as follows: "Conduct a study of educational opportunities available to migrant students at the secondary level and develop a conceptual design or model program for improving secondary education for migrant students."\(^8\)

In January of 1968, Ed Hindsman, Director of the Laboratory at that time, met Daniel Stufflebeam in Florida where he heard a presentation Stufflebeam made entitled, Evaluation as Enlightenment to Decision-Making. At that time, they talked briefly about testing Stufflebeam's theory in the Laboratory. This idea was discussed in length by the Associate Director for Evaluation, Robert Randall, Hindsman, Egon Guba, and Stufflebeam at the February, 1968, American Educational Research Association meeting. Laboratory personnel felt that the ideas proposed by Stufflebeam and Guba were interesting and seemed valuable; a laboratory was needed to test out their ideas; and it was concluded that the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory would be an appropriate location.

\(^8\) Ibid., p.29.
From March through May, 1968, preliminary negotiations were made through correspondence between decision makers at the Laboratory, Stufflebeam and Guba. Stufflebeam and Guba went to the Southwest Regional Lab on several consultant visits during the period and it was their desire to work as a team using the expertise they jointly had to test the theory. Initially, the team was to involve Guba, Stufflebeam, Robert Hammond, and John Horvat; however, due to other commitments, Hammond participated only occasionally. Beginning July 1, 1968, to September 1, 1968, Guba and Horvat were on site full-time at the laboratory. Stufflebeam served as the consultants' consultant during this time. Lab decision makers determined that the Laboratory's TMEDC activities would be appropriate for the consultants to work with while testing their evaluation model. Advocate team use resulted from the consultants' work with the TMEDC section of the Laboratory. Teams were specifically used to develop secondary migrant educational strategies for the TEA.

B. Major Actors

The major actors in this case study can be categorized into six clusters. A brief description of the clusters and major persons follows. The first major cluster of actors could be considered the administrative element of the case study. This included the Director of the Laboratory, Edward Hindsman; the Associate Director for Programs, Rogers Barton; the TMEDC Director, José Cardenas; and the Associate Director for Research and Evaluation, Robert Randall. All the names of the people invol-
The second major cluster of actors was within the **Context and Input Branch of R and D**. The major responsibility of this group included conducting the conferences, developing the Questionnaire, and conducting a literature search which resulted in a document file which came to be known as the monster. In addition, personnel in this cluster had major responsibility for developing documents to be used by the Advocate Teams as well as supervising and providing resources for the teams while they were developing their strategies.

The third major cluster was the **Consultants to the Laboratory**. Consultants included Drs. Guba, Horvat, Sffebleam, and Hammond. These consultants provided help to the TMEDC by creating evaluation awareness and by working with the staff to increase staff evaluation skills. They specifically assisted the Context and Input staff in setting up methodologies and procedures for the conferences and the running of the Advocate Teams.

The fourth cluster of actors was the members of the **Rating and Ranking Teams**. Dr. José Cardenas from the Laboratory, and Mr. Leon Graham from the Texas Educational Agency, were, among others, the people who rated the problems and then assigned priorities to solutions in terms of whether the strategies should be developed for implementation.
The fifth cluster of actors was the Advocate Team members themselves. Advocate Teams were developed to design alternative strategies for looking at specific problem areas that were assigned to them by Laboratory personnel. These team members were provided a wealth of information and any available additional resources to assist them in conducting their task.

The sixth major cluster of actors constituted the Pre-Strategy Team. The Pre-Strategy Team, which was composed of Laboratory personnel and chaired by the Chief of the Context-Input Evaluation Branch, had the job of reviewing the Advocate Team strategies, analyzing all the problems, and coming up with a set of proposed strategies. This group also worked closely with the Laboratory Director, TMEDC Director, and Director of Evaluation and Research in the delineation of strategies which were ultimately sent to TEA for consideration.

C. Historical Account

The following paragraphs provide a historical account of major activities surrounding the development and use of advocate teams.

Beginning July 1, 1968, consultants Guba and Horvat were located at the Laboratory full-time. During this time they developed a series of working papers on context and input evaluation. Titles of papers were 1) Input Evaluation Methods, 2) Information Decision Matrices, 3) Information Decision Matrices Operations, 4) Task 1: Identification of Need and Problem Candidates, 5) Task 2: Identification of Criterion Variables, Interpretation Rules and the Decision Rule, and
6) Task 3: Creation of a Continuous Context Evaluation Mechanism.

In addition to developing the working papers, the consultants met with the TMEDC staff to discuss evaluation concerns and reactions to the working papers. They also developed proposals for a data retrieval system, and conducted a comprehensive retrospective input evaluation based on a questionnaire administered to all Lab program directors.

Beginning in August, the consultants became actively involved in conducting the Harlingen and Austin Conferences, and in designing a model for identifying strategies for secondary migrant students.

In an effort to obtain additional information on contextual questions, such as needs, problems, and opportunities, a conference was held in Harlingen, Texas, August 23 through 25, 1968. Participants of this conference included six groups who were intimately involved with the needs and problems of migrant students. This conference was termed the "Actors" Conference because of their perceived involvement. In addition to the Harlingen Conference, an additional conference was conducted by the Laboratory in Austin on August 25 through 27, 1968. Participants of this conference were mostly professional persons from outside of education. This conference was labeled the "Experts" Conference.

Near the end of August, 1968, the consultants engaged in a series of discussions about the problems brought out at the Austin "Experts" Conference which led to a consideration of next possible steps. It was through those discussions that the concept of Advocate Teams was developed.

Beginning in September, a taxonomy of problems and solutions was
under development which followed the format provided by Guba and Horvat in their evaluation of the "Experts" Conference. Guba and Horvat suggested ten possible problem areas identified by conference participants. These were: 1) non-standard entry-withdrawal patterns, 2) language problems, 3) cultural difference problems, 4) dysfunctional school characteristics (inflexibility, etc.), 5) dysfunctional school personnel characteristics (poor attitude), 6) dysfunctional student characteristics (fatalism, retardation), 7) dysfunctional parent characteristics (misplaced confidence in teachers, etc.), 8) poverty problems, 9) community involvement problems, and 10) problems arising from lack of funds available to the school. The consultants also proposed a tentative first cut at possible solutions identified by conference participation.

In order to provide more data on problem identification, administrators of Texas schools serving migrant populations were asked to provide additional information. The Laboratory designed and pilot-tested a questionnaire to seek the administrators' attitudes and opinions regarding the problems which they felt affected migrant secondary students. This questionnaire was sent to approximately ninety administrators. Questions centered around enrollment and attendance information, motivation and encouragement information, as well as information on general administrative attitudes toward migrant education.

The Laboratory over the years had collected an enormous amount of literature, articles, reports, and other documents relating to mig-
rant education. It was the hope of the Laboratory to categorize this information in some sort of a logical framework so that it could be used by all members of the TMEDC. To this end, beginning in September, 1968, doctoral students from various disciplines at the University of Texas reviewed more than a thousand documents to determine their relevance. This task, which took much staff time, resulted in the creation of what staff members referred to as the "Monster."

The data obtained in the literature search, the problems and solutions identified at the "Actors" and "Experts" Conferences, and the Administrative Questionnaire was organized into ten problem areas which were then presented to a team of administrators for rating. The administrators represented two major institutions involved in migrant education, decision makers from the Texas Education Agency and major decision makers from the Laboratory. These administrators were asked to rate the problem areas with respect to relevancy to secondary education. They also indicated through priority rankings the desirability of implementing potential solutions in migrant secondary education.

Following this activity, Laboratory personnel created three Advocate Teams. Preliminary thinking included having the Advocate Teams look at the data obtained so far, and developing proposals to overcome one of the three problems identified as having top priority by the decision makers. In January, 1969, the Laboratory employed the consultant services of Drs. Stufflebeam, Guba, Hammond, and Horvat to develop guidelines which Advocate Teams would use in the development of their
strategies. Outcomes of this consultant session were used in the orientation session for the Advocate Teams. Specific items included, among others, a list of directions and specifications for development of the Advocate Team reports.

An Advocate Team orientation session was held on January 24 and 25, 1968, to acquaint members of the teams with their tasks. Each team was given a set of criteria to consider in developing their strategy proposals. In addition, each team was given a problem area for which they had to develop possible solutions. The composition of the Advocate Teams included:

1. A senior faculty member from an institution of higher education in Texas who served as the chairman. These persons had been involved with migrant education.

2. A member of the regular Laboratory staff considered to be an "expert" in the area of migrant education.

3. A graduate student from the Laboratory staff who had worked on the review of literature in the creation of the "Monster."

After orientation by the project staff, the Advocate Teams developed three solutions or strategies for their specific problem area. Resources in the form of secretarial help and needed administrative assistance were available to all teams. At the orientation session the teams were charged with producing the strategies and were allocated a specific time frame within which these strategies had to be developed.

After the Advocate Team reports were developed, Laboratory staff members were assigned to a Pre-Strategy Design Team. This team was
charged to synthesize the results of the Advocate Teams, review all
the problems and solutions proposed by the conference participants and
school administrators, and to design and propose additional strategies.

At this time, Laboratory decision makers set up an ad hoc committee
to take the analysis and results presented so far, and provide a set of
proposed strategies to the Texas Educational Agency. These strategies
were not fully designed proposals for actions, but were the basic
framework upon which proposals could be designed. The strategies even­
tually submitted to TEA were grouped into three levels. The first
level included strategies for improving present programs, which essen­
tially involved identification and modification of policy barriers. The
second set of strategies centered around developmental efforts which
would cost more time and effort. The third set of strategies was an
innovative, completely novel, extremely expensive set of strategies.

D. Summary

The table on the following page summarizes the major activities
and actors primarily responsible for those activities.

E. Outcomes

On April 15, 1969, a formal report, "Alternative Strategies for
Migrant Secondary Education", was sent to the Texas Educational Agency.
Within the report all activities surrounding the utilization of the
Advocate Teams were discussed and strategies proposed to the Texas
### TABLE I

**SUMMARY OF MAJOR EVENTS AND PRIMARY ACTORS**

**CASE STUDY #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Events</th>
<th>Primary Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harlingen, Austin Conferences (August, 1968)</td>
<td>Consultants, Context-Input Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Advocate Team Concept (August, 1968)</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Administrator Questionnaire (September-October, 1968)</td>
<td>Context-Input Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Problem and Solution Matrix</td>
<td>Context-Input Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Monster</td>
<td>Context-Input Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings and Rankings of Problems and Solutions (December, 1968)</td>
<td>Rating and Ranking Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Training Materials for Advocate Teams (January, 1969)</td>
<td>Consultants, Context-Input Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate Team Orientation Session (January, 1969)</td>
<td>Context-Input Staff, Advocate Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate Team Sessions</td>
<td>Advocate Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Additional Strategies</td>
<td>Pre-Strategy Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection and Organization of Strategies to be Submitted in Proposal (April 15, 1969)</td>
<td>Pre-Strategy Design Team, Laboratory Decision Makers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational Agency were described. Some ideas and elements of strategies developed by the Advocate Teams were implemented in Laboratory projects and continue to be implemented at the time of this writing. A table tracing the problem areas from their identification in August of 1968 through the Advocate Teams, the Pre-Strategy Team, and program development at the Laboratory up through 1971, is listed in Appendix D-1. In addition, the Director of the TMEDC, José Cardinas, who is now Superintendent of Edgewood School District in San Antonio, is reported to be using ideas developed by the Advocate Teams in his recently awarded Experimental Schools Project.

III. Methodology for the Use of Advocate Teams

An in-depth description of methodology which accompanied the use of Advocate Teams is provided in this section. The following elements will be considered: 1) Harlingen/Austin Conferences (August, 1968), 2) Creation of the Advocate Team Idea (August, 1968), 3) Administrative Questionnaire, 4) Development of Problems and Solutions Taxonomy, 5) Rating and Ranking of Problems and Solutions, 6) Creation of the "Monster," 7) Consultant Session to Develop Advocate Team Training Materials, 8) Advocate Team Orientation Session, 9) Advocate Team Writing Sessions, and 10) Pre-Strategy Design Team Activities.

A. Harlingen/Austin Conferences

These conferences, also known as the "Actors" and "Experts" conferences were designed to assist Laboratory personnel to obtain context and input information to be used by the Laboratory in their devel-
opment of migrant secondary programs within the TMEDC. These con-
ferences were viewed as one of a series of activities which would
provide this information. According to the evaluation of the con-
ferences, the following objectives were to be served:

1. To involve a variety of audiences in providing a pic-
ture of the needs and problems of migrant secondary
students.

2. To determine from each audience and for each problem
identified, judgments regarding the nature of the need
or problem, its probable causes, its consequences if
left untreated, and the nature of available evidence
substantiating the existence of the problem.

3. To determine for each audience and for each problem
identified, judgments regarding action steps which
might be taken to eliminate or ameliorate the problem.

4. To test the conference model as a device for obtaining
context and input perspectives.9

Two different audiences were surveyed through these conferences.
The "Actors" group consisted of those persons who were viewed by
Laboratory personnel as intimately involved with the problems in ques-
tion. Members included representatives from the following groups:
secondary migrant students, parents of secondary migrant students,
teachers of secondary migrant students, administrators of schools
having migrant enrollment, auxiliary personnel, and community service
agency personnel.

Egon Guba and John Horvat, "Preliminary Report on the Harlingen-
Austin Conferences," Evaluation Report Draft, Southwest Educational
Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas, 1968, p.1 (mimeographed).
The second conference was held in Austin, Texas and included the involvement of fifteen "experts" who were thought by Laboratory personnel to hold insights regarding problems of secondary migrant students. The fields represented by these "experts" included cultural anthropology, law, medicine, dentistry, economics, political science, educational psychology, industrial psychology, sociology, demography, linguistics, educational philosophy and fine arts.

The "Problem Inventory Form" developed by Laboratory personnel served as a basic document throughout both conferences. This one-page form contained the following five questions:

1. What is the nature of the problem? Describe it.

2. What are the causes of the problem?

3. What evidence is there that the problem exists? Why is it an important problem?

4. What will be the results if the problem is not treated?

5. What are some ways of handling the problem? (After listing the ways, rank them by writing the number "1" in the space before the most preferred way of handling it, "2" in the space before the next preferred way, etc.)

The Harlingen Conference included a briefing of proposed activities, after which an entire day was spent in group discussions in filling out the form. These forms were filled out by Laboratory staff who acted as chairman-recorders. The conference participants were grouped homogene-

10 bid., Appendix B.
ously, and when necessary, the discussions were conducted in Spanish. Problem forms from each group constituted that group's report. At the Sunday morning session (staff only), the recorders identified commonalities and conflicts between the group reports. This information was provided to conference participants and discussed. Group reports were then refined and submitted as final products.

The Austin Conference also centered around the "Problems Inventory Form". The forms were completed by individual participants rather than through group discussion. Upon completion of the individual work, the experts broke into two groups for discussion. However, both groups had difficulty staying on task. Therefore, the planned schedule could not be maintained. The second day was spent, upon the request of the conference participants, in a short two to three minute reaction to problems by each "expert". This session was tape recorded. The confusion which resulted in this conference was viewed by one Laboratory representative as directly related to the fact that the "experts" came in with preconceived solutions to migrant education and had trouble remaining open and flexible to other "expert's" views.

The Evaluation Report from this conference raised questions and presented comments on various elements of the conference such as group size, sampling, logistics, and caused confusion between problems and solutions, among others. In addition, the evaluators felt that the conference technique used raised certain questions such as the value of using experts who come in with preconceived solutions. The two
conferences, however, provided extensive lists of problems and solutions regarding secondary migrant students.

B. Creation of the Advocate Team Idea

From what can be determined, the idea of advocate teams came about during discussions among the consultants who were employed by the Laboratory during the summer of 1968. Drs. Stufflebeam and Guba both recalled that the idea came up while discussing the concept of objectivity in evaluation. The consultants first of all realized that migrant students' needs and problems really went beyond schools. There were factors such as language, culture, and health which clearly indicated that outside expert assistance was needed. However, they were faced with the practical problems of time, resources, and money needed to orient so-called "objective experts." It was finally agreed that it would indeed be expensive, if not impossible, to summarize data and have an outside "objective expert" assimilate it under existing conditions. And use of experts already familiar with the needs and problems of migrant students raised serious objectivity questions, for, undoubtedly, these experts would be non-objective, would hold specific points of view, and would be unable to consider needs and problems set forth by other experts. (To some extent this happened during the Harlingen Conference.)

However, the consultants realized that they were really forced into having people who were familiar with the situation because there was not enough time or resources to orient outside "objective experts." It was
in this context that the idea occurred to them to capitalize on the non-objectivity of experts familiar with the area. This meant identification of experts with biased points of view who were representative of the spectrum of points of view. Upon obtaining these viewpoints, one could look for similarities and make choices among the differences. Objectivity in this case resulted in the representativeness of the viewpoints solicited. Therefore, the idea of Advocate Teams, a team advocating a position before coming into a situation, was developed.

C. Administrative Questionnaire

Recognizing that the administrators of Texas schools serving migrant populations were an important source of information, Laboratory personnel developed a questionnaire to obtain their perceptions. This questionnaire, "The Administrator Questionnaire: Migrant Education Survey," was designed, piloted, tested, and mailed to ninety administrators throughout Texas. Forty-five questionnaires were sent to schools which offer no special migrant programs, but which enroll at least eighty migrant students (at least five percent of the total enrollment). Eighty-seven of the ninety questionnaires were completed and returned, and all but one was valid.

Attitudes and opinions were obtained regarding three general areas of migrant education:

1. Enrollment and Attendance Information—numbers of migrant students, "drop-out" rates and ages, diplomas earned, late arrival effects and attendance rates.

3. Information on General Administrator Attitudes Toward Migrant Education—compulsory education, "special" migrant programs, and attitude differentials.

D. Development of Problems and Solutions Taxonomy

In the last section of the Evaluation Report on the Austin and Harlingen Conferences, Drs. Guba and Horvat suggested the Laboratory staff develop a problem and solution taxonomy. They also suggested some categories designed to be a first cut at this analysis. Ten problems and sixteen solutions were identified. Analysis of problems and solutions identified by the Austin and Harlingen Conferences were completed by Laboratory staff. In addition, data from the Administrator Questionnaire and the literature search were used to expand the taxonomies. Early in December, 1968, Laboratory personnel met with consultants Guba and Horvat to examine the data available from the conferences, Administrative Questionnaire, and the literature search. Results of this session included a listing of ten problem areas as well as solutions for each problem. This work served as the basic content framework around which ratings and ranking were obtained.

---

E. Rating and Ranking of Problems and Solutions

Using the taxonomy of problems and solutions described in the previous paragraph as a content base, Laboratory personnel developed a rating and ranking form. The purpose of this form was two-fold: first, to obtain estimates of relevancy of the problem areas to migrant secondary education; second, to obtain priority ranking with respect to the desirability of implementing programs based on the solutions within each problem area. Following the instructions, each problem and solution area was presented. The first problem and solution area is presented as an example on the following page.\(^\text{12}\)

This rating of problems and ranking of solutions form was administered to a team of key administrators of TEA and the Laboratory. The three problem areas which received the highest ratings were given to the Advocate Teams, around which they were to develop strategies.

F. Creation of the "Monster"

The "Monster," as it was affectionately called by Laboratory personnel, refers to the comprehensive literature search on migrant needs and problems. The "Monster" was created by eight doctoral students from diverse disciplines at the University of Texas. The eight students reviewed more than one thousand documents which had been gathered from former Laboratory studies and reviews of literature. Of the one thousand, two hundred and fifty were selected as being most relevant, and these were abstracted. This information was cross-

\(^\text{12}\)Ibid., p.127.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF PROBLEM</th>
<th>SAMPLE SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>RATING: RELEVANCE TO SECONDARY ED. (Circle One)</th>
<th>PRIORITY RANK (1 = HIGHEST 10 = LOWEST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Non-standard entry-withdrawal patterns</td>
<td>Enter to and leave early to receive credit. No schooling during migrant work. Standard school year is incompatible with the migratory agricultural year.</td>
<td>Stipends for students. Developing flexible, portable materials. Changing school rules (e.g., allowing partial credit). Establishing branch schools.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indexed according to the following classifications: 1) migrant child (age, sex, self-image, etc.), 2) migrant programs, 3) migrant professional personnel, 4) migrant parents and families, 5) migrant communities, 6) migrant funds, 7) migrant agencies, 8) migrant history, 9) migrant legislation, and 10) migrant labor. In addition, the data were indexed according to the problem areas suggested by the "Actors" and "Experts" Conferences. The "Monster" was intended as a resource by the Advocate Teams in the development of their strategies.

In preparation for Advocate Team use, each migrant element was summarized. During the orientation session, summaries of the migrant elements were introduced. In addition, all three Advocate Teams contained a graduate student who helped develop the "Monster" and was, therefore, familiar with the literature.

G. Consultant Session to Develop Advocate Team Training Materials

A package of materials which consisted, in part, of a tentative agenda and a tentative outline of proposal writing teams, was sent to Drs. Guba, Horvat, Hammond, and Stufflebeam prior to the consultant sessions.

The consultants, during the working sessions on January 16 and 17, 1969, surveyed the progress made by the project staff and assisted in the development of an agenda and outline of the proposals which were to be provided to the Advocate Team members at the orientation session.

The "Outline of Information To Be Included in the Advocacy Statement" specified in detail what content should be included in the Advocate
Team report. In addition, criteria upon which team members were asked to base their proposed solution was also provided.

The directions called for a three part Advocacy Statement. Each of the three parts will be discussed individually. The first part asked for a statement relating to the problem to be served. Within this section a problem was defined as "... a barrier that prevents the fulfillment of some wish or desire, that makes it difficult to serve some need, or that prevents adequate response to some opportunity." For this particular case study, the barrier was provided for each team. All three of the barriers centered around the same need. The wish or desire was defined as "... exposure of migrant youngsters of secondary school age to continuing education, as reflected in the operational indicator of the schools' holding power (low dropout rate)." Each of the three teams was given one of the following barriers: 1) language, 2) disfunctional school personnel characteristics, or 3) disfunctional student characteristics. Using the barrier each team was assigned, Advocate Team members were asked in the outline statements to provide the following information: 1) information description of the barrier, 2) information verifying the existence of the barrier, 3) information relating to the significance of the barrier, and 4) information relating to the nature of the target audience.

---

13 Outline of Information To Be Included in the Advocacy Statement, Item G in packet of information distributed to Advocate Team members, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas, January, 1969, p.1 (mimeographed).

14 Ibid., p.2.
The second section of the Advocacy Statement was to include the objectives. Within the outline statement, examples of the level of specificity for objectives was provided for Advocate Team members to use.

The third section of the outline paper centered around the potential problem solutions. Advocate Team members were instructed to list the potential solution, and to describe and define each solution in terms of the criteria. The criteria identified in the outline for Advocate Team members to use were grouped into three categories: 1) cost-benefit criteria, 2) mediating criteria, and 3) administrative (or agency) criteria. Within the outline, all criteria were described within a paragraph. Specific criteria within each category were as follows:

1. Cost-benefit
   a) Benefits
   b) Cost

2. Mediating Criteria
   a) Innovativeness
   b) Spin-off power
   c) Testability
   d) Practicability
   e) Political viability
   f) Socio-moral viability
   g) Timeliness
   h) Credibility
   i) Recidivism

3. Administrative criteria
   a) Product orientation
   b) Visibility
   c) Exportability
   d) Convenience
e) Importability
f) Legitimacy

H. Advocate Team Orientation Session

On January 24 and 25, an orientation session was held in Austin for members of the three Advocate Teams. The session began with preliminary remarks and background information presented by the Laboratory Director and the Associate Director of Evaluation. A Texas Education Agency representative provided an overview of the State Department's involvement in migrant education, and the Director of the TMEDC described the establishment of the Center briefly.

Evaluation efforts to date (Harlingen and Austin Conferences; Administrative Questionnaire; and the 'Monster' development) were summarized by the Context-Input Branch Chief, Jerry Walker. The rationale for use of advocate teams and description of the three problems to be addressed, as well as the outline to be used by the teams, followed. In addition, the teams were presented with a list of five TMEDC Secondary Education Program constraints to be considered by the Advocate Teams in their solution development. These constraints were as follows:

1. Short Time Period: Solutions proposed must be capable of being implemented within two years or less.

2. Starting Time: Solution strategy must be designed and ready for pilot testing, starting sometime between

---

15 Ibid., pp. 9-15.

3. Increased Holding Power: Ultimate success criterion is the increased holding power of secondary schools for migrant students. The primary goal is neither to reinstate drop-outs nor to employ them. However, a solution might have "spin-off" for these secondary goals.

4. Funding: The constraint on funding is that the amount is unknown. The attractiveness of the proposed solutions will play an important role in determining the funding level. The implications for solution proposals are that they be: 1) attractive and 2) flexible.

5. Product Orientation: The solution strategies must include promise of a developable product, i.e., materials, methodologies, training packets, etc. Research proposals and/or nonoperational ideas are not acceptable.16

Upon completion of these activities, a package of documents was distributed and explained. Documents included the following:

Item A: Agenda
Item B: List of Participants
Item C: Testimony Presented by Dr. Jose A. Cardenas to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights
Item D: Results of Harlingen and Austin Conferences
Item E: Table Listing Administrative Support for Advocate Writing Teams
Item F: List of Problem Barrier Sets by Priority and Results of Rankings and Ratings
Item G: Outline of Information in the Advocacy Statement
Item K: List of Major Constraints
Item L: Criteria for Judging Advocacy Statements: Summary Definitions and Priority Rankings
Item M: Mini-Simulation Worksheet
Item N: List of "Creative" Resource Persons

These documents were reviewed by Advocate Team members for several hours. Thereupon, a detailed explanation of the writing outline was

provided and team members were provided a mini-simulation exercise. The worksheet which was provided contained a list of all the elements asked for in the Advocacy Statement. For part of an afternoon, team members worked on the simulation in which they were to use the barrier assigned to them. An evening session designed to be a follow-up to the simulation exercise was not held because team members experienced extreme difficulty and therefore did not complete the task. The remaining time for the orientation session was spent in administrative items, i.e., resources available, time schedule, payments, etc., and individual team meetings. Personnel running the sessions appeared surprised that more questions regarding the task assignment were not asked.

1. Advocate Team Writing Sessions

The Laboratory did not specify the operational details of when and how Advocate Teams should operate. Therefore, there was no specific time and place designated for Advocate Team writing sessions. Teams were promised payment for five man/days and given a time frame when the strategies had to be in. Resource persons at the Laboratory were identified for them to use. It was the chairman's responsibility to structure his team any way he wished in order to obtain the product. Consequently, a variety of methods of development were used. Some members constructed strategies in marathon sessions, and other worked individually and only came together as a team for a limited period of time. The documents were completed in one to three weeks. During this
time, there were many questions addressed to the Director of the Context-Input Branch who was assigned to facilitate the operations of the Advocate Teams. Much clarification on the actual task was needed, especially in regard to defending the strategy in terms of the criteria. Some of the content in the team report was prepared by resource persons within the Laboratory. Each Advocate Team report submitted contained three solutions to the barrier assigned. The primary purpose of the Advocate Team Report was to propose solution sets or preliminary strategies.

Problems cited by Laboratory staff in using the Advocate Teams were as follows: insufficient task directions, differing abilities of chairmen and team members, too many materials, and too much leeway in how solutions were developed.

J. Pre-Strategy Design Team Activities

Laboratory staff members were assigned a Pre-Strategy Design Team. The purpose of this team was three-fold. First, the team was to synthesize the results of the Advocate Teams; second, it was to review all the problems and solutions proposed by the conference participants and administrators; and finally, the team was to design and propose strategies.

During the orientation session, Advocate Teams were presented a list containing a summary of the criteria and their relative importance as determined by evaluation experts within the Laboratory. Each criterion was listed and given an importance rating on a 1-5 scale.
ranging from "of some importance" to "critical importance." Also provided, was a column consisting of short remarks concerning each criterion and its rating of importance. Members of the Pre-Strategy Design Team did not apply the criteria to the strategies in any systematic manner. Analysis of the Advocate Team strategies was general and relatively unstructured.

In the Pre-Strategy Design Team's analysis of all problems and solutions, a procedure was suggested by the outside consultants. The consultants suggested an analysis of the power and tractability of problems and solutions. Power was defined as "...the degree to which a solution holds a potential for reducing or ameliorating several problems." Whereas tractability was defined as "the degree to which a problem lends itself positively to several solutions." This analysis was not completed except in simulated circumstances. However, concepts underlying this analysis were considered by the Pre-Strategy Design Team along with other subjective judgments. The Pre-Strategy Design Team developed seven strategies, or solutions, which were as follows: 1) Residential Schools, 2) Removing Policy Barriers, 3) Extension Courses, 4) Staff Development, 5) Innovative Migrant Curricula, 6) Goal-Directed Auditing, and 7) Personalized Counseling.

18 Ibid., p. 153.
Upon discussions between key Laboratory Decision Makers and the Pre-Strategy Design Team members, the decision was made to present the following three categories of solutions to the Texas Education Agency in the April 15, 1969, report: 1) strategies that required few structural changes, 2) strategies for program development, and 3) strategies for innovation. Many of the solutions from the Advocate Teams, and all but one of the solutions proposed by the Pre-Strategy Design Team, were posed as strategies. Future design and development of the strategy were to be dependent upon TEA decision-making. Therefore, the proposed strategies were not in the form of fully developed proposals for action.
CASE STUDY #2

PLANNING GRANT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
MODEL TRAINING PROJECT

1. Introduction

The following case study is divided into two major parts. The first part attempts to describe the context of this case study in regard to advocate team use, to identify relevant antecedent events, and to present a retrospective account of major activities and the principle actors involved. The second part examines in detail the activities, documents, and processes involved in input evaluation when advocate teams were used.
II. CASE HISTORY

A. Description of Context and Antecedent Events

Use of the Advocate Team approach occurred in this case study as a result of the awarding of a planning grant to develop a consortium-based Model Training Program for training researchers, developers, diffusers, and evaluators. The following paragraphs delineate federal conditions which led to sending out the Request for Proposals (RFP), a description of an institution which decided to respond to the RFP, and events antecedent to the submission of the proposal and use of Advocate Teams.

Title IV of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 8910) contained authorization for the training of researchers and research-related personnel. The Federal Government began funding research training fellowship programs throughout the country for Master's and Ph.D. level personnel. The primary emphasis of these programs was on the training of research methodologists. Initially, this group was in very short supply; however, as the training programs proceeded through the years, projections were made by David Clark and John Hopkins\(^\text{19}\) which seemed to indicate that critical

---

manpower shortages would occur in areas such as development, diffusion, and evaluation, and that there would be an oversupply of research methodologists if training priorities were not changed. This projection became a reality, and in response to this concern, the Federal Government began development of an RFP for training other educational change personnel early in 1970.

The Federal Government felt there was a need to add programs for training developers, demonstrators, disseminators, and evaluators, and also for retraining experienced personnel. The RFP was issued for a planning grant to develop a Model Training Program for training additional educational support personnel. Proposals were requested to look into fresh approaches for training programs which differed in respect to objectives, content, location, and scope, from other training programs available at that time. The training program was also to involve a consortium of agencies in the training function. Thus, the request was for an emphasis not only on a content area other than research, but also on a different means of training. The U. S. Office of Education, Research Training Branch, sent out RFP No. 70-12, "Proposal to Design New Patterns for Training Research, Development, Demonstration/Dissemination, and Evaluation Personnel in Education," which called for a planning grant for up to six months. Of those selected for the planning grant, a certain number would be supported through implementation on a three-year development of the designs.
In response to a demand for improved evaluation theory and practice, the Evaluation Center was established in 1965. Since its beginning, the Director has been Daniel L. Stufflebeam. The Center is an agency of The Ohio State University College of Education, and at the time of this case study, is within the Faculty of Educational Development. This faculty offers a Ph.D. program with a specialization in evaluation. Additional training efforts such as a simulation exercise and the offering of training institutes were also products of this activity. Therefore, there was a logical interest in this particular RFP.

In addition, Stufflebeam, Director of the Evaluation Center, served as a member of the Office of Education Commissioner's Advisory Panel on Evaluation and became aware early in 1970 that the above described RFP's for a planning grant were to be sent to interested institutions. The consortium-based Model Training Program was but one of several RFP's to be sent out. Knowing of these opportunities, Stufflebeam went to the Faculty of Educational Development and indicated that these opportunities were coming up. As a result of this communication, a committee of six people was appointed and charged with writing proposals in response to the RFP's. At this time, in the Spring of 1970, the Ohio State campus became the scene of riots. Many of the campus offices were closed down and often professors could not get materials from their offices. Within these constraints, two people, however, did agree to write proposals. Stufflebeam agreed to write a
proposal for the Model Training Program and another Educational Development Faculty member agreed to write a proposal for Materials Development. However, in the confusion with the riots and other department activities, the consortium-based Model Training Program was the only proposal which was submitted.

Although the original Planning Grant Proposal did talk about input evaluation, no mention was made of the use of advocate teams for the input evaluation at this time. However, Stufflebeam was aware of the advocate team idea because he, Egon Guba, and John Horvat while engaged in joint consultative work at The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in 1968 and 1969 had conceived the idea when working with the Laboratory in Texas. As a result of this consultant experience, the Advocate Team notion for use in input evaluation was "born."

B. Major Actors

The following section attempts to identify and describe major actors.

Use of the Advocate Team approach in this particular case study involved the use of a variety of people serving in a variety of roles. The major actors within this case study can be grouped into six categories. The first group of actors can be clustered around the role of Administrators of the Planning Grant. These people were Stufflebeam in the role of Project Supervisor and Darrell K. Root in the role of Project Director.
Duties of these administrators included development of the consortium and participation on the Decision-Making Team and Convergence Team. In addition, the administrators provided conceptual leadership for the Context and Input Evaluation Teams.

The second category of actors comprised the Decision-Making Team. The Decision-Making Team consisted of representatives from each of the consortium agencies. These agencies were partially reimbursed for the work their representative performed in the project. This team was charged with finalizing the objectives of the three-year training program, participating in the development of alternative strategies for which one would be chosen, and attending decision-making meetings. The Decision-Making Team met three times during the Planning Grant, once in July, once in late September, and again in November, 1970. At the time of the Planning Grant, Dr. Jack Taylor, Superintendent of Saginaw Public Schools, assumed chairmanship of the twelve person Decision-Making Team.

The Context Evaluation Team, the third major group of actors, was headed by Walter Marks. The function of this team was to design and implement a context evaluation which would identify needs, problems, and opportunities relating to the training of RDD&E personnel in education. Based on the context evaluation, a series of objectives were formulated.

The Input Evaluation Team, the fourth major group of actors, was headed also by Walter Marks. The function of this team was to design
an input evaluation, conduct advocate teams that would generate alternative strategies, assess the strategies, and to enlist the help of a Convergence Team to operationalize the strategy.

The fifth cluster of actors constituted members of the Advocate Team. Two teams were selected to develop alternative strategies for achieving the MTP objectives. Roald F. Campbell and Francis S. Chase served as Chairmen of the Advocate Teams.

Assistance in operationalization of the strategies was provided by the sixth major group of actors, the Convergence Team. This team, chaired by Stufflebeam, reviewed the Input Evaluation Team's evaluation of the strategies, chose a strategy, and attempted to fill in the gaps and other areas of weaknesses. (See Appendix D-2 for complete listing of actors within categories).

C. Historical Account

A summary of major events follow in chronological order of occurrence. Upon acceptance of the Planning Grant, which began June 19, 1970, a series of activities were undertaken by the administration and staff of the project. After personnel appointments had been made, the administrators of the project spent most of June and all of July in trying to firm up the composition of the consortium. During this time, the administration also set forth specifications for the context evaluation which was to result in a series of objectives for the Model Training Program. On July 22, 1970, a joint meeting of the project staff and the Decision-Making Team took place. One purpose of that
The meeting was to begin developing objectives for the three-year training program utilizing the Delphi Technique. The meeting was also used to work with the Decision-Making Team in strengthening the proposal based on the comments provided by the U. S. Office of Education.

The rest of July, and all of August, was spent in conducting a context evaluation. The context evaluation consisted of a review of literature in which over 100 articles were abstracted; interviews were conducted with key people outside and inside of the consortium; one round of the Delphi Technique which began at the July 22 meeting was completed; case studies of individual agencies were written; interviews with key administration personnel at Ohio State were held; and a survey of regional labs and R&D centers was conducted. It was during the month of August that the Project Supervisor, and the Director of the Context Evaluation started thinking about procedures and specifications for the input evaluation. At this time it was decided to use advocate teams, utilizing in some way the ideas established by their use at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Within this time, decisions to utilize the Convergence Team idea were also made. The Director of the Context Evaluation was unsure why this procedure of function was termed the Convergence Team. The Project Supervisor cited two reasons for use of convergence team. First, there was a need to converge the ideas about evaluation and innovation processes. Second, there would be a need to operationalize the strategies and
this procedure would seem to be the answer to these needs. The term "Convergence Team" may have resulted from exposure to the convergence technique currently being utilized in educational research.

On September 23, 1970, another joint meeting of the staff and the Decision-Making Team occurred. At this meeting an update on the consortium membership was made by the Executive Officer. The Director of the Context Evaluation described the methodology used in the Context Evaluation, and how the data were analyzed and synthesized so that it resulted in a statement of needs, problems, and opportunities. Next, the Project Supervisor reported on his Working Paper on Objectives. In preparation for this consortium meeting, the Project Supervisor synthesized a Working Paper on Objectives which he derived from the Context Evaluation and other documents. In this synthesis of objectives activity, the Project Supervisor was serving as a representative of the Decision-Making Team. The report proposed that evaluation be selected as the main objective of the training program. The report outlined recommendations as to what an evaluation unit should be, and what kind of people ought to be trained. The report on objectives also recommended that diffusion be selected as the second priority training area. Since the consortium did not have any particular exper-

tise in this area, it was proposed by the Project Supervisor, and accepted, that Ronald Havelock from the University of Michigan, a known authority in this area, be asked to develop a working paper on a consultant basis for objectives in the field of diffusion. These two areas were selected as they were perceived as the greatest manpower need. Upon presentation of his paper, the Consortium Decision-Making Team reacted to it and accepted the report in principle.

At this meeting, the design for the input evaluation was presented to the Decision-Making Team. Within this design, there was a brief introduction in which the functions of the Input Evaluation Team were delineated along with the objectives for the input evaluation. Following the introduction, a description of the Advocate and Convergence Teams was provided to the Decision-Making Team. Also at this September meeting, a series of criteria was presented to the Decision-Making Team, and they were asked to look over this list of criteria to see if there were other criteria which should be used in assessing the strategies which would be generated by the Advocate Teams.

An Orientation Session was held for members of the Advocate Teams on Monday, September 28, 1970. At this time, the Advocate Teams were briefed on their role. They were also given instructions for writing their advocate reports. A summary of the Context Evaluation was reported on by the Director of the Context Evaluation. Preliminary documents were sent out in advance of this meeting. These documents included the Context Evaluation, the original RFP, the Planning Grant Proposal, and the Working Paper on Objectives. The major documents used at the
orientation session were those prepared by the Input Evaluation Team. These documents consisted of the Charge to the Advocate Teams, a suggested format for their program development, a list of criteria upon which the strategies would be assessed, and miscellaneous housekeeping items.

The first Advocate Team met October 9-13, 1970. This team met at a motel near OSU and used the resources of technical writers, a secretary, and a resource person provided by the Input Evaluation Team. The second Advocate Team met on October 19-22, 1970. This Advocate Team followed the same process as the first Advocate Team, only the location was a conference room at the Evaluation Center. Drafts of the strategies from Advocate Team I and II were sent out to Advocate Team members for their final approval.

Upon completion of the strategy development, the Input Evaluation Team assessed the strategies in terms of the criteria. They also assessed the strategies in terms of the degree to which the Advocate Teams had developed items which were called for by the format statement. In addition, Advocate Teams I and II were asked to refer to criteria at the end of their strategy in a section in which they stated how they felt their strategy responded to the criteria. Based upon the analysis of the strategies, the Input Evaluation staff made recommendations to the Convergence Team, which served as an agent for the Decision-Making Team.

The Convergence Team met for three days (November 2-4, 1970) to review the input evaluation results and to formulate operational designs. The function of the Convergence Team was to select one of the two
strategies which were reviewed and assessed, refine the strategy, and then operationally define the scope of work. Following the work of the Convergence Team, the entire project staff worked to refine various aspects of the proposal which were not considered by Advocate or Convergence Teams. A preliminary draft of the proposal to submit as the Model Training Program Proposal was presented at the Consortium Decision-Making Meeting on November 23 and 24, 1970. Based upon input from this team, the project staff made minor revisions and submitted a final proposal to the U. S. Office of Education on December 18, 1970.

D. **Summary**

The primary groups of actors and major events are presented in Table 3 on the following page.

E. **Outcomes**

Having submitted the proposal within the time allocated, the Ohio State proposal was one of twelve evaluated by a procedure outlined by personnel with the National Center for Educational Research. At the end of February, 1971, the Evaluation Center Director, Daniel L. Stufflebeam, was informed that this proposal was one of three accepted for funding beginning the end of February, 1971, and continuing for three years. At the date of this writing, the Model Training Program is in its second year of funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Events</th>
<th>Primary Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Awarding of 6 month Planning Grant (June 19, 1970)</td>
<td>Project Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Writing of Position Paper on Objectives Based on the Context Evaluation</td>
<td>Project Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Advocate Team Writing Sessions (October 9, 13, 19-22)</td>
<td>Advocate Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assessment of Strategies (October 25 - November 1)</td>
<td>Input Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Convergence Team Session (November 2 - 4)</td>
<td>Project Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convergence Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Submittal of Proposal (December 18, 1970)</td>
<td>Project Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific names are presented in Appendix D-2.
III. METHODOLOGY FOR INPUT EVALUATION

Methodology for input evaluation within which advocate teams were used in this particular case study can best be illustrated by examining the following eleven components in depth: A) the original input evaluation design, B) selection of Advocate Team members, C) the identification and weight assignment of criteria, D) the Charge to the Advocate Teams, E) the format for Advocate Team strategies, F) the Orientation Session for Advocate Team members, G) the Advocate Team sessions, H) the assessment and analysis of the strategies, I) the selection of Convergence Team members and their charge, J) the Convergence Team Session, and K) activities preceding proposal submission.

A. The Original Input Evaluation Design

The original design for the input evaluation submitted to the Decision-Making Team on September 23, 1970 consisted of four sections. The first section set forth the framework surrounding the upcoming activities which included the role of the Input Evaluation Team and how strategies were to be identified. The second section consisted of the general objectives which were as follows:

1. To plan, develop, and produce a highly innovative creative strategy by which to train persons in RDD&E.

2. To utilize in an integrative manner the synthesis of the context report in the development of training strategies.

3. To develop strategies that are within the criteria
established by the Input Evaluation Team and the Decision Making Team.

4. To expand the knowledge base of the Context Report through individual experience and expertise in order to develop creative innovative strategies.

5. To produce sufficiently sophisticated strategies that can be adopted and utilized with a minimum of refinement.  

The mechanics and operational functions of the Advocate Teams and the Convergence Team comprised the third section. The final section of the design centered on the relationship, role, and tasks of the Input Evaluation Team. This section set forth the role of the Input staff to the Advocate and Convergence Teams as "management/decision makers" at the operations-functioning level. In other words, the function of the staff was to facilitate and assist in any way in the production of the strategies. In addition, the input staff was to identify criteria for selection of team members, develop charge and format statements, as well as identify criteria and assess the produced strategies.

B. Selection of Advocate Team Members

The following criteria were generated to assist in the selection of Advocate Team members who were to create alternative strategies for

---

for a Model Training Program.

1. Credibility with peers (academic)
2. Evidence of innovative thinking
3. Task orientation
4. Ability to conceptualize broadly (interdisciplinary)
5. Recognition of the roles of Research, Development, Diffusion, Evaluation, Social Analyst and Management
6. Commitment to the needs of Research, Development, Diffusion, Evaluation, Social Analyst and Management
7. Knowledge of the literature in respective fields
8. Ability to relate and articulate the needs of Research, Development, Diffusion, Evaluation, Social Analyst, and Management from own perceptual base
9. Availability
10. Representative from evaluation
11. Representative from innovation process

The number of team members was five. The team chairmen were selected upon demonstrated administrative ability to move groups and reach closure rather than having each chairman advocate different positions prior to program development. Other team members were selected for their expertise in areas of research, evaluation and knowledge utilization. Initially, the Advocate Teams were to include a doctoral student familiar with the literature. However, in reality,

22 Ibid., p. 84.
the graduate student did not serve as a member of the team but instead provided guidance on directions and administrative assistance.

C. The Identification and Assignment of Weights to Criteria

The Input Evaluation Team collected and presented to the Decision-Making Team, on September 23, 1970, a tentative list of criteria, and the Decision-Making Team members were given an opportunity to expand the criteria list.

The Input Evaluation Team felt the criteria would be more valuable if some form of a weight was assigned to each criterion. Therefore, members of the Decision-Making Committee rated the criteria via a questionnaire in two different ways. The first rating was to determine which criteria were "important" and which were "unimportant" or irrelevant to strategies for the Model Training Program. It was determined ahead of time that any criterion which was rated as "unimportant" by a majority of the members of the Decision-Making Committee would be deleted from the list. No criterion received a majority of "unimportant" ratings. Consequently, all thirty criteria were included. Each criterion rated as "important" was rated again on the five point scale presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of some importance</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>of critical importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ratings of the important criteria were put within a forced-choice rectangular distribution; i.e., the same, or approximately the same number of criteria had ratings of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The ratings of the criteria were tabulated. Median scores were calculated and were used as a weight estimate.

Several problems occurred in the rating process. First, some members of the Decision-Making team expressed concern over the generalness of the criteria. In addition, another decision maker indicated that administrative criteria would end up with greater weights than the curriculum criteria, for administrators were the ones who rated the criteria. It was the intention of the Input Evaluation Team in assignment of weights, to provide a general framework in the development of a program strategy. Expertise and experience of members on the Advocate Teams regarding criteria were incorporated into that strategy. In addition, each Advocate Team was asked to relate their strategy to the criteria at the conclusion of their development.

D. The Charge to the Advocate Teams

The Charge to the Advocate Teams was developed by the Input Evaluation Team. The original RFP and the Working Paper on Objectives served as the major reference documents. The first section of the Charge consisted of the major goal. Within this section, documentation was provided which established evaluation as a top priority area for the training program with a secondary emphasis on diffusion. The document
then provided to the Advocate Teams five objectives which were as follows:

1. To plan, develop, and produce a highly innovative creative strategy by which to train persons in evaluation, primarily, but with secondary emphasis on diffusion.

2. To utilize in an integrative manner the synthesis of the Context Report in the development of training strategies.

3. To develop strategies that are within the criteria established by the Input Evaluation Team and the Decision-Making Team.

4. To expand the knowledge base of the Context Report through individual experience and expertise in order to develop creative innovative strategies.

5. To produce sufficiently sophisticated strategies that can be adopted and utilized with a minimum of refinement.23

E. The Format for Advocate Team Strategies

A format that could be used as a guide for the Advocate Teams was generated by the Input Evaluation Team. A systems approach developed by Nadler served as the major resource document.24 Major categories included: program mission, roles to be served, characteristics of the program at all levels, program elements, installation of trainee roles within agencies and environment. Reference documents which related to each of the major elements were noted on the format statement. In addition, the Input Evaluation Team asked each Advocate Team to relate their strategy to the criteria which they were given.

23 Ibid., pp. 98,99.
F. The Orientation Session for Advocate Team Members

An Advocate Team orientation session was held on September 28, 1970, for one half day. This meeting was structured by the Input Evaluation Team to primarily provide the Advocate Teams with an overview of the project, the Context Evaluation, the Objectives, and their Charge. All of the documents except the Charge were distributed to the Advocate Team members prior to this session. Following the presentations, questions generated by team members were answered. Questions centered around whether there were priorities assigned to the format and criteria while some persons expressed concerns that the task as outlined was too comprehensive. Team members also had questions about resources available. Several members of the Advocate Teams were unable to attend this session because of prior commitments; however, if this was the case, someone from the Input Evaluation Team spoke to them prior to the actual writing session.

G. The Advocate Team Sessions

The first Advocate Team met on October 9-13, 1970. The location was Stouffer's University Inn in Columbus, Ohio. The entire team met together until the middle of the second day. Until that time, team members spent time getting acquainted with each others educational philosophy and particular background and training. Discussions also centered around individual interpretations of the Charge to the Advocate
Team. Some members of the team felt this was due to the fact that no one had a clear idea of what was to be the final product. Transition to small group working sessions at the middle of the second day went smoothly for by that time individuals had a good idea of whom they could best work with. Team members seemed concerned about their lack of productivity during this time period. At the middle of the second day, two team members broke off from the main group and developed a Content-Roles Matrix which served as a conceptual framework upon which their strategy was developed while other members worked in small groups. The Team continued for the remaining time to work in small groups, bring back products to the large group for discussion, and then again break into small groups. This group made use of index cards, the chalkboard and large rolls of brown paper during their development effort. The first Advocate Team started with several members of the Input Evaluation Team on site to answer questions concerning their output. After the first morning, the bulk of the Input Evaluation Team representatives efforts were spent in supervising secretarial help, providing needed materials, and transferring information from documents onto a master chart. Advocate Team I referred to the Charge quite often. The format statement, however, seemed to be less useful in that some members felt it was more confusing than helpful. Therefore, this team did not follow the format extensively. On several occasions the other documents, i.e., the Context Report and the Objective Paper were consulted. Some members expressed the value of having abstracts of documents.
In the application of the criteria, the entire team discussed their strategy in terms of each criterion. Some team members felt that the number could have been smaller, i.e., using only the most important ones. There were also questions about utilizing criteria in evaluating the strategies. One team member felt the application of the criteria was valuable for organizing and summarizing thinking.

Advocate Team II met on October 19–22, 1970, at the Evaluation Center. This team operated in a slightly different fashion than the first team. The entire four days were spent in large group discussions of the task. Although the chairman suggested breaking off into small groups on several occasions, this request was rejected by other team members. The chalkboard was the only aid used by this team. The Charge to the Advocate Team was referred to often, but the format was not used at all. Team members required approximately the same amount of time to get acquainted with each other as the first team. This too caused anxiety on the part of the team members in that they did not feel they were being productive. Discussions were often more individual than group oriented. One member of this team brought in a typed statement which he had worked on the previous night; however, this was the only development that took place outside of the large group. The chairman dictated a summary statement at the conclusion of the last day which attempted to synthesize the discussions of the previous days. He also spoke for the group in relation to how their strategy responded to the criteria.
Members of both teams felt that five team members were appropriate for the task. When asked about the setting, most preferred a location away from regular working conditions. The background of the team members seemed to be conducive to good working; however, it was pointed out by one team member that members on one advocate team seemed to have had more professional experience than members on the other advocate team.

The role of the technical writers at the sessions and during their write-up of the first draft is outlined next. Two technical writers were used at each Advocate session. The writers really did not know each other until they started to work together, so prior to that time they met to talk and interact person-to-person. Neither writer attended the orientation sessions, however, the Director of the Input Evaluation Team did talk with them before the beginning of the writing sessions.

Both writers decided to take notes for the first Advocate Team session during the first half of the first day. At noon they compared notes and found that they were almost identical and decided that it would be more beneficial if only one was in the room at a time. They did this and traded off each half day. At the end of each day the Advocate Teams were given a summary of the content. This was done to build credibility in the accuracy of the content, to give Advocate Teams content feedback of what they did, to show how much time the team spent on a topic, and to give technical writers feedback on how well they were
doing their job because the content was either accurate or inaccurate and the Advocate Team members could respond accordingly. The writers could see no major differences in working with Advocate Team I and working with Advocate Team II. Sometimes they were asked twice a day for a summary. In addition, the writers questioned the group by saying, "Is this what you meant? Is this where you are going? The writers were careful not to add content to the teams' reports.

After each Advocate Team met, the technical writers synthesized the results. The final synthesis of the report was not the sum of the parts, for sections that were written on a daily basis were often changed. The final synthesis really occurred after the conference. Each of the writers of the synthesis report took all their notes and cut them up into like categories for all of the days. Then they scattered them on the floor and put them into categories. General categories gave them general content topics. Some categories were big and some were small. They then took some of the smaller ones and put them under the bigger headings. After this, they selected what sections would be appropriate for each technical writer according to their background. They then discussed the sections together prior to writing, decided if they needed charts, etc., and then went off on their own. They read their notes, and began typing. The content was the same but arranged differently from the notes. They felt it was more of an inductive process for it takes a person who internalizes material to synthesize. After they had written the report they edited
each other's sections for clarity but not content. The editing process was viewed as important because it attempted to eliminate the jargon in the strategies. The whole process of synthesis took from six to eight hours; one hour to get ready, one hour to put the content into categories, then four or five hours alone writing, and then one hour editing each other's work.

After the rough drafts were developed, they were sent to Advocate Team members for comments. Very few substantive changes were made after this first draft.

H. Assessment and Analysis of the Strategies

The Input Evaluation Staff applied the weighted criteria to Strategy I and Strategy II using the following procedures. First, the Input Evaluation Staff constructed a four point evidence rating scale shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>little evidence</td>
<td>some evidence</td>
<td>ample evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, evidence ratings for each criterion were made independently by two members of the Input Evaluation Staff for both Strategy I and Strategy II. Discrepancies of the independent evidence ratings occurred for seven of the thirty criteria. However, the degree of discrepancy was never more than one point. Third, the evidence rating for each criterion was multiplied by the assigned weight. The plan was to select the strategy with the highest sum of evidence rating
times the weight. For this particular study, the results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Evidence X Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Strategy = Strategy II

Following the selection of Advocate Team II’s Strategy, the Input Evaluation Team used the criteria and the format provided both teams as a basis for analyzing both strategies. This method was employed to establish areas of strengths, weaknesses, and omissions in each strategy. Based upon the results of the application of the criteria and format to each strategy, recommendations were made to the Convergence Team regarding additions to the accepted strategy of Advocate Team II. The same 1-4 evidence scale applied to the criteria was also applied to the format in establishment of the areas of strengths, weaknesses, and omissions in both strategies. An example for one element of the format is presented on the following page.

The criteria ratings were also analyzed. The Input Evaluation Team found commonality between weaknesses in areas of the format and in certain criteria. Neither of the strategies were rated as showing no evidence (rating of 1.0) for any criterion. Areas of weakness

250p Cit., Stufflebeam, p. 216.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Advocate Team I Rating</th>
<th>Advocate Team II Rating</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Statement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1. Use a foundation Strategy II's Mission Statement (p. 5-6); modify by adding strengths in area of diffusion and role specifications from Strategy I. (p. 3-5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Demand-Supply and demand function</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within criteria were defined by the Input Evaluation Team as those criteria which received a rating of 2.0 (little evidence) for both strategies. The team then developed a table which showed the four criteria which received a 2.0 rating for both Strategy I and II, and made recommendations.

All of the assessment and analysis described in the previous paragraphs were presented to the Convergence Team along with what the Input Evaluation Team had termed in a synthesis of Strategies I and II. Within this synthesis section, specific recommendations were made to the Convergence Team. In addition to these recommendations, a number of questions were generated by the Input Evaluation Staff, which they suggested might serve as a conceptual guide for the Convergence Team. The questions surrounded the two areas of greatest weakness within the strategies.

1. The Selection of Convergence Team Members and Their Charge

Criteria for selection of Convergence Team members, which served as a representative of the Decision-Making Team, included whether or not a person would be involved in the implementation of the design. Therefore, four of the five members selected were to have responsibility for implementation of the design. In addition to anticipated involvement, these four persons served as specialists in one of the following areas: evaluation, innovation process (diffusion), graduate education, planning, or program management. The remaining team member was selected for expertise in consortium development, a major element of the proposal.
Since cooperative relationships were being developed with the University of Michigan, which has demonstrated expertise in diffusion or innovation process, the Convergence Team membership included a representative from Michigan to operationalize their involvement.

The Convergence Team was given the following Charge by its chairman, Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Project Supervisor:

1. Select one of the two strategies which were reviewed and assessed in the Input Evaluation Report.
2. Refine the selected strategy.
3. Operationally define the scope of work over four funding periods for the refined strategy. (Include coverage of program development, training, materials development, administration, evaluation, and diffusion).
4. Develop recommendations regarding the governance, the working relationships, and the financial relationships within the consortium.

J. The Convergence Team Session

The Convergence Team, consisting of six members, met for three days on November 2-4, 1970. The majority of the first day was spent in a large group. At this time, the Director of the Input Evaluation Team presented a summary of the strategies developed by the Advocate Teams, as well as, results from the assessment of the strategies. The synthesis of the two strategies was also presented. The rest of the time spent in large groups consisted of the Innovation Process Specialist

explaining his views on how training for this content area should come about. Toward the end of the first day, smaller groups were formed. The rest of the Convergence Team time was spent in small groups. Content concerns of the small groups included 1) consortium development and other administration of the project, 2) innovation process, 3) training content, and 4) development of a training model with work breakdown structures for the selected strategy. Members of the Convergence Team did not attend any prior orientation sessions; however, they received copies of the two strategies prior to the first session.

The outputs from the Convergence Team were rather disappointing to the project staff. It was anticipated that the Convergence Team would operationalize the chosen strategy. This, however, did not occur. However, much specific help was received on consortium development. Reasons cited for this lack of anticipated output included, 1) personality clash between members of the team, 2) no orientation session providing "incubation" period before the actual writing session, 3) confusion over the task itself, and 4) confusion over the diffusion, secondary training thrust, and what it meant. Members thought of themselves as consultants rather than actual writers of strategies.

K. Activities Preceding Proposal Submission

Following the Convergence Team sessions, the entire project staff
met and discussed an outline of topics prepared by the Project Supervisor which would be needed for the eventual submission of the proposal. The outline was developed using the original RFP and guidelines which were prepared by USOE. Staff members were assigned writing responsibility for sections of the outline. Each staff member used the relevant information generated by the Advocate and Convergence Teams, and filled in any gaps using individual expertise and inter-staff consultation. The products of the staff's written assignment were integrated and submitted to the Decision-Making Team for approval on November 23 and 24, 1970. Upon approval of the Decision-Making Team, the proposal was submitted to Washington to meet the December 18, 1970 deadline.
CASE STUDY #3

DESIGN OF A PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
FOR
THE DIVISION OF MANPOWER AND INSTITUTIONS

1. Introduction

The case study which follows is presented in two major parts. The first part describes the context in which the advocate teams were used as well as identify relevant antecedent events. This part also contains an historical account of major activities and the major actors involved. The second part examines in detail the use of advocate teams and other related documents and processes.
II. CASE HISTORY

A. Description of Context and Antecedent Events

Use of the Advocate Team approach occurred in this case study as a result of the awarding of a contract to design an assessment system for the Division of Manpower and Institutions (now referred to as DRDR—The Division of Research and Development Resources), a subsystem of the National Center for Research and Development within the United States Office of Education. The following paragraphs describe this federal agency and conditions which led up to the awarding of the grant. In addition, a description of the institution which was awarded the contract will be presented along with important antecedent events.

The Cooperative Research Act of 1963, authorized and allocated funds for the development of university-based Research and Development Centers. Several years later Regional Educational Laboratories were authorized by ESEA Title IV (an amendment to the Cooperative Research Act). By 1967 there were thirty labs and centers throughout the country. However, from 1967 through the time of this study in 1971, two research centers and nine labs were closed in part as a result of low funding. In 1971, the United States Office of Education, through the Division of Manpower and Institutions (DMI), supported twenty-seven educational R & D institutions with an annual budget of approximately thirty-four million dollars.

Early in 1971, shifts in administrative personnel resulted in a new director for the National Center for Educational Research and
Development (NCERD), within which the Division of Manpower and Institutions existed. One of the first problems the Associate Commissioner, Harry Silberman, faced was answering politicians' and special reference groups' questions regarding earlier decisions that had resulted in the withdrawal of funds from several educational laboratories. The basic concern centered around evaluation procedures and the criteria used for evaluating these institutions. The director found himself inadequately prepared to answer certain questions posed to him, for the earlier evaluations lacked much in the areas of objectivity and credibility. In addition, personal colleagues of the director, who had been involved in previous evaluations, expressed great concern over site visit procedures, the most common form of evaluation used. Therefore, one of the first acts of the director was to set priorities on the development of an evaluation system which the Division of Manpower and Institutions could use to assess the nation's R & D institutions. To this end, W. Ray Rackley was transferred into the DMI office and given the charge to develop an evaluation system. Another priority item identified was the development of a support policy prescribing the conditions under which financial support would be allocated to R and D institutions and programs.

Upon analysis of the evaluation theory and consultation with other personnel within NCERD, Rackley began to formulate ideas concerning the evaluation system. He began by attempting to identify problems of the present DMI evaluations by interviewing major decision makers within
NCERD, personnel from the labs and centers, and people who had previously participated on numerous site visits. Following that activity, a position paper was developed, revised, and presented to the director of DMI, also a new appointment.

On March 25, 1971, Rackley and Mrs. Sarah Gideonse, a Program Monitor met with Daniel L. Stufflebeam and Henry M. Brickell at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, Oregon. Also included in the meeting was the Director of the Laboratory, Lawrence Fish, and the Director of Evaluation and Research, John Seger. Discussions centered around the new evaluation system for DMI. The participants agreed generally that the work plan of the Evaluation Team should include five phases over the next six months. Specific activities described included, 1) conducting a context evaluation of the existing system for evaluating Labs and Centers, 2) writing up the description and specifications for the DMI system, 3) designing and assessing alternative evaluation systems, 4) employing a Convergence Team to design the final system, and 5) implementing the new system. The Advocate Team approach was suggested for the designing of alternative evaluation systems.

The Program Review Team, of which Rackley was the leader, decided that outside experts would be needed to assist in the development work. A work statement, needed before contracts could be awarded, was developed. Rackley then discussed the possibility of the contract with Stufflebeam and other decision makers involved in the development of the system. Stufflebeam's notion of Advocate Teams and his personal and
professional relationships with the country’s outstanding evaluators provided a unique opportunity to achieve widespread participation of leaders in evaluation.

Stufflebeam’s interest in the contract stemmed from many areas. First, of all, he was Director of the Evaluation Center at The Ohio State University, and this contract was consistent with one of the Center’s goals, the development of materials and mechanisms for the implementation of evaluation. Second, Stufflebeam had previously been involved with setting up evaluation systems in other divisions of the Office of Education. Third, Stufflebeam had been a member of numerous site visit teams sent out to evaluate the labs and centers.

All of the above described events led up to the awarding of a contract to the Evaluation Center entitled, "Design of a Planning and Assessment System For the Division of Manpower and Institutions".

B. Major Actors

The use of the Advocate Team notion in this particular case study involved the participation of a variety of people serving in a variety of roles. The major actors within this case study can be grouped into five categories or role functions. The first cluster of actors constituted the major decision makers within NCERD. This category included the Directors of NCERD and DMI as well as their Administrative Assistants. Responsibilities of this group of actors included, 1) setting priorities in the development of the evaluation system, 2) development of a support policy paper, 3) providing assistance in contract
specification and implementation, 4) working with an expert panel in the evaluation of strategies, and 5) selecting one strategy for implementation (primarily chosen by the Associate Commissioner).

The second class of major actors comprised the DMI Program Review Team. The major actor was the Leader of the Review Team. However, personnel who served in roles of Program Monitors offered major assistance. Activities of this group included, 1) developing background information to be used by the Advocate Teams, 2) serving as resource persons during the orientation and Advocate Team writing sessions, and 3) acting as Program Monitor for the contract with The Ohio State University. In addition, the team collected evaluations on the strategies developed and conducted the expert panel session.

The third cluster of people involved in this case study consisted of The Ohio State University Contract Project Personnel. The supervisor for the Project provided conceptual leadership for Project activities and served as chairman of one Advocate Team. The Project Director had major administrative responsibility for, 1) selecting Advocate Team members, 2) running the orientation session, 3) providing administrative assistance during the actual Advocate Team writing sessions, and 4) preparing the final report to be submitted to the Office of Education.

The fourth group of actors served as members of the Advocate Teams. Each team consisted of a chairman, three team members, and two consultants. The consultants were representatives of the labs and centers.
The team members were chosen because they appeared to hold differing philosophical and theoretical positions on evaluation.

The final group of actors served on the Invited Judges Panel. This panel of four was selected to provide assistance to key decision makers in NCERD in making decisions regarding the two strategies developed by the Advocate Teams. A complete list of names for each of the clusters just described is located in Appendix D-3.

C. Historical Account

The following is a summary in chronological order of major events. On June 18, 1971, The Ohio State University Research Foundation submitted to the U.S. Office of Education a proposal initiated by Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Director of the Evaluation Center at Ohio State. The proposal was entitled, "Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions (DMI).__

The proposal, which was to span a period of six and one-half months (June 15 to December 30, 1971), contained six objectives. Procedures for achieving these objectives were elaborated in a series of twenty-seven steps; however, the funding for the initial proposal, which was to be followed by a continuation proposal, was requested only in terms of the first nine steps.

These steps were altered following a meeting of Ohio State personnel with the NCERD key decision makers when it was revealed that the six and one-half month time schedule for completing all twenty-seven
steps would not result in an evaluation system that could be implemented in time to service important decisions of NCERD.

To meet NCERD decision needs, and provide timely information, the time schedule and tasks were compressed into a two-month sequence. A brief description of the revised scope of work for this grant of two months (June 28 - August 28, 1971) follows. It was decided that the DMI staff would prepare the background study, and Ohio State was responsible for the submission of alternative evaluation plans by September 1, 1970.

The majority of Project personnel time during the first part of July, 1971, was spent on the recruitment of Advocate Team members, and consultants from the labs and centers. Also during this time the Project Director worked closely with the USOE Project Monitor in developing specifications for the orientation session. Consequently, the DMI staff prepared a package of documents which was designed to provide the needed background information for Advocate Team members.

On July 24, 1971, an orientation session was held in Washington D. C. for all team members and consultants. The purpose of this meeting was to provide background data and answer any questions team members or consultants had regarding their task. The Project Director compiled questions that Advocate Team members wished to have answered at the session and forwarded them to relevant persons within NCERD. Before this session, Advocate Team members were also asked to identify documents needed to assist them in their task of developing evaluation strategies.
A compilation of documents which constituted the background study effort was given to each Advocate Team member. Documents provided were classified as follows: 1) lab and center background, 2) recent and current reporting guidelines, 3) sample documents furnished to DMI by labs and centers, 4) documents relating to the contract for the design of the new evaluation system, 5) a sample of information on product evaluation, and 6) a sample of information used to guide site visit teams.

The orientation session itself began with the presentation by Harry Silberman, Associate Commissioner, in which the Charge to the Advocate Team was described. This was followed by a discussion of the "Support Policy" paper dated June 3, 1971, with Charles Frye answering questions that were posed concerning it. The remainder of the morning, and the first part of the afternoon, was spent in discussion of questions generated by the Advocate Team members. Questions were addressed to USOE personnel who attended the session and served as resource persons. During the latter half of the afternoon, each Advocate Team met separately to discuss individual concerns and talk with Office of Education resource persons. All team members and consultants were able to attend this session except one, who was oriented individually by the Project Director.

In August, 1971, transcripts of the orientation session were sent to Advocate Team members and their consultants prior to their writing sessions. Team members also received a sample of site visit reports.
The Advocate Team chaired by Stufflebeam met August 5-9 in Phoenix, Arizona. The Advocate Team chaired by Michael Scriven met for its writing session on August 18-21 in Santa Barbara, California. The teams were offered the services of a technical writer or stenographer, and provided any needed equipment, i.e., typewriters, dictating machines, xerox facilities, at the site of their meeting. Each team chairman was also allocated an amount of money to be spent following the writing session for editorial work or additional consulting time. Both the Project Manager and USOE Project Monitor attended both sessions. The Project Monitor brought additional documents, i.e., reports from all of the institutions, for Advocate Team members to use.

On September 1, 1971, copies of both the Advocate Team reports, as well as a report which provided an administrative summary of activities, was submitted to the U. S. Office of Education. The Program Monitor for the project then circulated the strategies developed and asked for critiques. Written responses were summarized and a meeting with the chairman of each Advocate Team was scheduled.

On September 27, 1971, NCERD personnel and the invited judges (Expert Panel) met with the chairman of each advocate team for a morning session. In the afternoon the invited judges met with the decision makers and continued their discussions on the worth and merit
of both of the strategies. On the following day the Associate Commissioner called a staff meeting where he announced the selection of the strategy developed by the team chaired by Michael Scriven.

D. Summary

The major activities and primary clusters of actors described in this section are summarized in Table 5 on the following page.

E. Outcomes

The following months were spent in activities relating to the operationalization of the Scriven strategy. At the time of this writing, August, 1972, the master panel and specialists panel are concluding their work assessing R & D institutions to determine which institutions and programs will continue to be funded in the newly legislated National Institute of Education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Events</th>
<th>Primary Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Submittal of proposal for OSU contract (June 18, 1971)</td>
<td>1. Daniel L. Stufflebeam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Revision of scope of work activities in contract</td>
<td>2. OSU Project Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCERD Decision Makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Background study</td>
<td>3. Program Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selection of Advocate Team members</td>
<td>4. OSU Project Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Orientation Session (July 24, 1971)</td>
<td>5. OSU Project Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Actual writing sessions</td>
<td>6. Advocate Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USOE Program Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluation of strategies</td>
<td>7. Program Review Team and Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Session with invited judges</td>
<td>8. Invited Judges Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCERD Decision Makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DMI Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman of each Advocate team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. METHODOLOGY FOR THE USE OF THE ADVOCATE TEAMS

An in-depth description of the methodology which accompanied the use of Advocate Teams is provided in this section. The following elements will be considered: 1) the original proposal and the revised scope of work, 2) the Support Policy Paper, 3) selection of the Advocate Team members, 4) the background study, 5) the charge to the Advocate Teams, 6) the orientation session, 7) the actual writing sessions, 8) the evaluation process and reporting format, and 9) the meeting with the invited judges.

A. The Original Proposal

The Original Proposal submitted to the Office of Education began with a Background Information section. Within this section, the maturity model—a crucial element of the Support Policy was summarized. Ten decision-clusters required for implementing the support policy were presented. The second section, Problems and Objectives, stated that in order for DMI decision makers to make responsible decisions, they must have a planning, management, and assessment system. The objectives are listed below:

1. Completing a background study that would lay out the characteristics, needs, and opportunities of the new planning, management, and assessment system of the Division of Manpower and Institutions.

2. Preparing detailed specifications for the design of the new system.

3. Designing two alternative planning and assessment systems, complete with detailed specifications for all needed instrumentation.
4. Selecting or synthesizing the final system.

5. Completing pilot instrumentation according to the specifications.

6. Orienting DMI staff to the new system.²⁷

In summary, the Project would provide a comprehensive background study, two alternative systems, and a synthesis of the alternatives. Although the proposal described a six-month series of activities, the actual budget was requested for only the first phase of the proposal activities, which would end upon completion of orienting the Advocate Team members. The third section of the report contained the task areas, task groups and products. These items were discussed briefly in narrative form and were visually displayed on a single-page chart. The vertical dimension of the chart contained a time frame divided into five phases spanning six and one-half months. The horizontal dimension contained the major task groups, e.g., USOE decision makers, Advocate Teams. Within each of the cells, specific products which would be developed were identified for each time frame.

In an effort to build in credibility and acceptance of the new system, several functions were added to that function served by the Advocate Team. For example, the role of synthesizer among the decision makers was planned. This team was to include one person

²⁷Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions, (Proposal submitted to The Office of Education by The Ohio State University Research Foundation, June 18, 1971) p. 4.
from the U. S. Office of Education who would be making decisions about implementing the system, an outside person who was highly knowledgeable of DMI, and also a statesman in the area. This team was to provide specifications for the work of the background study, the generation of the alternate strategies, and the converging of the strategies.

Following the use of the Advocate Team, the proposal specified the convening of a Convergence Team. The purpose of this team was to operationalize a selected strategy or converge elements from both strategies. Membership on this committee was to include personnel who would eventually be responsible for implementing the system. The final element of the proposal provided consultative help to the present DMI evaluation system while the new one was being developed.

On June 18, 1971, the Project Supervisor and Project Director for the Ohio State contract went to Washington to finalize negotiations with NCERD personnel and USOE Budget Officers. At this time, a meeting was held with the Associate Commissioner of NCERD, and the proposal just described was discussed. The Associate Commissioner was very concerned about the six and one-half month time frame. He indicated to the group that the planning efforts for the National Institute of Education were continuing and there was a possibility of NIE starting in September. He also indicated that if the system was not developed by September 1, 1971, the Office of Management and the Budget Group might determine the evaluation procedures. In an effort to comply with
these concerns, and to develop an evaluation system sensitive to the demands placed by the uncertainty of the establishment of NIE, a revised scope of work was developed between the Ohio State representatives and NCERD decision makers. In a letter sent to the USOE Contract Monitor and Budget Officials, the conditions of the revised scope of work were explicated as presented below:

Essentially, the scope of work for the two months from June 28 to August 28, will incorporate certain activities from the original proposal submitted with the six and one-half month time frame. A brief description of activities involved is provided below.

1. Members of DMI will prepare the background study to be used by the Advocate Teams.

2. Ohio State will recruit and orient two Advocate Teams. The orientation session will last three days. After an intervening period of time, the two teams will reconvene for a writing session of five days.

3. The two evaluation strategies developed by the Advocate Teams will be presented to the Office of Education by September 1, 1971.

It is understood that the amount of money for Phase I (2 months) $24,440, will remain the same. It is also understood that any follow-up grants will take into consideration activities which have been completed during the first phase.

B. The Support Policy Paper

DMI staff and specifically the Director, had been engaged during the past months in the development of a DMI support policy. A draft of this document dated June 3, 1971, was distributed and used explicitly in

the development of the new evaluation system. The paper contained
as its primary objective:

To develop or have developed in time to support FY '73 funding
decisions, an institutional support policy and associated evaluation
procedures which meet the following criteria.

1. Provides for the starting of needed new programs
to respond to current educational problems.

2. Makes it possible to start and build new institutions
when such a course of action appears prudent in view
of new program requirements.

3. Allows a greater degree of control over USOE resources
while at the same time recognizing the autonomy of the
R & D institutions.

4. Provides programs with target completion dates from
which planning for reallocating scarce resources to
meet needs of other growing programs can proceed.

5. Provides stability for multi-year blocks of time that:
    recognizes that institutional capability must be
    built over time...permits and encourages long-range
    planning and program management...accepts the
    risk inherent in research and development.

6. Provides a period of supervised growth for new
institutions during which time they develop the
focus that will guide their future R & D endeavors.

7. Delineates a mechanism whereby the institution can
broaden its base of support by soliciting funds
from other federal and non-federal sources.

8. Provides better balance in the R & D effort in:
. major educational problem areas...the several functional areas, i.e., research, development, field testing, and implementation, representation of major geographic areas.29

Another major element of this paper was the institutional maturity model. This concept meant that DMI would provide institutional support only for R & D institutions not categorized as mature. Mature institutions would be entirely dependent upon allocation of funds through program proposals submitted. Ten clusters of decisions to be made by DMI decision makers were extracted from the Support paper and presented to the advocate teams for their work in the evaluation system development:

Pre-Institutional Phase

(1) Should given requests for planning grants for new institutions be funded?

(2) Should given proposals to start new institutions be funded.

Phase I (new institutions)

(3) At the end of this phase, is the basic program plan of a given institution satisfactory?

Phase II (developing institutions)

(4) At the end of this phase, is the capability of the institution to manage its basic program plan satisfactory?

Phase III (mature institutions)

(5) Should given developmental grant proposals (for new program plans) be funded?

(6) Should the U.S. Office of Education commit itself to support given proposed new program plans?

(7) Are significant milestones in the program plans being reached? On time? With satisfactory quality?

(8) Do current circumstances of the programs or institution require redirection or changes in U.S. Office of Education support?

(9) Did the program reach its objectives? (Answers to this question, of course, have significance beyond the information needs of DMI, e.g., OPE, NCEC, and others.)

(10) With given funds each year, how should the program be adjusted? Stretched? Compressed?

C. Selection of Advocate Team Members

One of the benefits of the use of advocate teams according to USOE decision makers was the involvement of evaluators representing different philosophies. In addition to differing philosophies, decision makers wanted evaluators who were national leaders in the field, for credibility purposes. Team members selected satisfied both of these criteria. The chairmen of the advocate teams were Daniel L. Stufflebeam and Michael Scriven. Both of these men had made substantial contributions to the field of evaluation theory, and both held differing philosophies of evaluation theory and practice. The team members selected for each team had also made substantial contributions to the area of evaluation. In fact, the composition of the teams constituted without question a number of the top evaluators in the country.

30Stufflebeam, Design of an Assessment System, pp. 1,2.
As the convergence team notion was not to be utilized as planned, DMI felt it desirable to have the labs' and centers' interests represented in some way. Therefore, it was decided to have a representative from the labs and centers serve as consultants for each team. Consultants for each team were selected by the team chairmen from a list developed by DMI personnel.

D. The Background Study

Using the limited resources currently available within DMI, the background study was conducted. This study consisted of the identification of relevant documents designed to provide insights for the advocate teams in the development of their strategies. This list included documents suggested by the advocate team members themselves. These documents were compiled and distributed at the orientation session. Actual documents provided to advocate team members included the following items:

1. Lab and Center Background:


2. Recent and Current Reporting Guidelines and PGIS Information:

a) Centers:


b) Laboratories:


c) National Program on Early Childhood Education:


d) Centers and Laboratories:


e) PGIS:


3. Documents furnished to DMI by the centers and laboratories in response to the guidelines of paragraph 2 (above):

The most recent Basis Program Plan, Contractor's Request for Continued Funding, or Program Plan and Budget Request from each of the institutions sponsored by DMI.
4. Papers relating to the contract for the design of a new planning and assessment system for DMI:


5. Selection of information on product evaluation

6. Selection of information used to guide site visit teams.\(^1\)

In addition to the documents, the orientation session was viewed as another means of providing background information.

E. The Charge to the Advocate Team

This two page Charge document was developed through discussion between the Ohio State Project Director and the USOE Program Monitor. A suggested format was also prepared; however, key administrators felt that the format should be the prerogative of the team members so a format statement was not provided. The Charge began with a set of givens which included the criteria for the support policy and associated evaluation procedures (see page 103), and the statement of the ten decision clusters (see page 104). Within that framework advocate team members were asked to:

Design an assessment system which will enable DMI leaders to make responsible decisions in regard to the institutions and programs which they support.

\(^1\)Diane L. Reinhard, Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions, (Final Report, Grant No. OEG-71-4558, The Ohio State University Evaluation Center, August, 1971), pp. 4-6.
Design an assessment system which will specify all steps and procedures leading up to each of the ten decisions, including:

1. A statement of the criteria to be used in making the decisions
2. A description of the assessment information needed to make the specified decisions
3. A statement of how the information will be obtained, processed, interpreted and used by DMI decision makers
4. A statement of who will participate in the assessment activities, including the responsibilities and qualifications needed for each position
5. Outlines or specifications of instruments to be used.
6. A statement of the conceptual, procedural, and organizational unity or integration of the ten types of reviews or decisions
7. A projected budget
8. Recommendations for installing the system, including completion of instruments, training of staff, etc.

The report submitted by each team will include, further, a narrative walk-through of how each of the ten reviews is to be conducted.\(^{32}\)

F. The Orientation Session

On July 24, 1971, an orientation session was held in Washington, D.C. for all advocate team members and the consultants assigned to work with each team. Participants were provided a folder which included the agenda, list of participants, list of documents available, and the Charge to the advocate teams. Resource personnel from the

\(^{32}\)Ray Rackley and Diane L. Reinhard, Charge to the Advocate Teams, Design of a Planning and Assessment System for the Division of Manpower and Institutions, The Ohio State University Evaluation Center, July 9, 1971 (mimeographed).
U.S. Office of Education who attended the session included the Associate Commissioner of NCERD, the DMI Director, Deputy Director, Chief of Program Operation Branch, four program specialists, the Product Diffusion Officer, the leader of the Reports and Analysis Team, leader of the Program Review Team, Program Planners for NIE, and an outside consultant familiar with R & D centers and laboratories.

Following introductions, the Associate Commissioner presented the Charge to the Advocate Team. Next, the Director of DMI addressed questions raised by the Advocate Team members about the Institutional Support Policy Paper which team members had received prior to the orientation session. Major concerns of the participants included whether or not the Support Policy Paper around which the evaluation system was to be designed could be changed by the advocate team members if they had basic concerns about some of the content.

The Director of DMI indicated that although he would welcome comments and criticisms of the Support Paper, the evaluation system developed should reflect the policies set forth. Another major area of concern and/or confusion, centered around whether the system to be developed would be for DMI or NIE. The Associate Commissioner indicated that the evaluation system should be designed for DMI; however, if the system worked upon implementation, the process would probably be incorporated throughout NIE, if and when legislation was passed. Other concerns included members of one advocate team questioning the appropriateness of the teams in generating the criteria, as they felt that was the responsibility of the USOE
decision makers. The decision makers however, indicated that the
teams should definitely identify criteria for they wanted the advocate
team to provide their insights.

All members of the advocate teams requested copies of the documents
which were prepared to provide background information. In addition,
copies of the "green notebooks" were provided. Contents of these
notebooks included summaries of lab and center programs as well as
evaluations prepared through site visits. It was data of this nature
which provided information resulting in the decisions to remove
funding from institutions. Profiles of the programs and evaluation
of labs which were refused additional funding were included in these
notebooks. Advocate team members requested samples of site visit
reports during the orientation session. Following the orientation
session, sample copies of a site visit report with the identifying
information deleted, were sent to advocate team members.

Members of each advocate team ate lunch together and at that
time developed a list of other questions that they wanted to address
to the resource personnel attending. They also indicated which
resource people they wanted to talk with during the individual
advocate team sessions held in the late afternoon. The first part
of the afternoon was spent in answering questions posed by the
advocate team members. Later in the afternoon the teams' members
met in their individual teams with the various resource persons
requested.
The first advocate team to meet was that chaired by Stufflebeam. This group met in Phoenix, Arizona, on August 5-9. The report of this team became known as the "desert team report" because of the location of the writing session. Prior to this session, the chairman developed an agenda for the first morning, a comprehensive outline of what the final report might look like, team member assignment to sections, a suggested procedure for group conceptualization, and a tentative schedule of the week's activities. Upon discussion of the outlines, it was decided to discard the proposed agenda and develop a new one. This was the topic for most of the first day. The first major task completed by this team was the identification of over 300 criteria for evaluating labs and centers. The remaining four days and nights were spent in cycles of individual writing sessions, followed by entire group discussion of drafts. The majority of one team member's time was spent in the development of guidelines for institutions to use in submitting proposals, and guidelines for judges to use in rating the received proposals. A draft of the final report, which included several revisions, was completed by the last day.

The second advocate team chaired by Scriven met in Santa Barbara on August 18-21. Consequently, the report became known as the "beach team report." All members of the "beach team" arrived at the first evening session with a document prepared prior to the session. These documents were distributed to all other team members. The
team worked in a large group session the evening of the first day, and all of the second day. The remaining time was spent in cycles of individual or small group writing sessions, followed by large group discussion sessions. The chairman took all of the information generated during the writing sessions and went home where he developed the advocate team report in the form in which it was sent to the Ohio State Project Director for eventual submission to USOE.

Both the OSU Project Manager, and the USOE Project Monitor attended both sessions. The Project Monitor brought additional documents, i.e., reports from all of the institutions for advocate team members to utilize if they wished. However, there was limited use made of the documents. Since the idea of utilizing advocate teams was for the purpose of obtaining two different strategies, special care was taken by these persons not to have the proceedings of the first advocate team influence or contaminate in any way the proceedings of the second session.

H. The Evaluation Process and Reporting Format

Upon receipt of the two advocate team reports, the Director of the Program Review Team sent copies out to be critiqued. Copies were sent to all lab and center directors, approximately ten NIE planners, ten DMI and other NCERD staff, and several other qualified persons. The letters asked for opinions of the strengths, weaknesses, and omissions of each strategy. Approximately thirty written responses were made, of which about fifteen were from lab and center directors.
This data was used in the development of a document prepared by DMI and used when the invited judges were called in. This document contained four major parts. The first part contained parallel summaries of the alternative evaluation designs for the following items: overview, locus of power, general evaluation procedures, ranking of programs and institutions, and reliability. The second part of the document contained critical questions to be answered in the selection of the design such as who should serve on the panels. Each question was followed by a summary of how each team answered each question. The third section contained questions raised by outside critics and actual quotations from critics. The final section was titled, "Immediate Next Steps." Alternative strategies were, choose one, or the other, or converge. After each alternative, a quote from a critic was presented which recommended each alternative. Other recommendations from critics about next steps included a consideration of time constraints, bringing in other people, as well as refining the criteria.

1. Invited Judges Session

On September 27, 1971, a panel of four judges was assembled to critique and judge the two evaluation designs. Judges were selected from a list prepared by NCERD decision makers. The judges were sent copies of the strategies prior to this session. The chairman of each advocate team met with the judges and with NCERD personnel during the morning session in order to discuss and answer questions about
their respective designs. This session was an open session and a number of USOE persons attended.

The morning session resulted in discussions about evaluation in general. A good deal of time was spent on the political nature of NCERD's evaluation. Several questions about the strategies were asked of the chairmen of the advocate teams. In the afternoon, the Associate Commissioner for NCERD, the Director of DMI, the invited judges, and several others, met to select the preferred design and to lay out future activities. Suggestions provided by the judges included implementation from the two reports the suggestions which would lead to modest, incremental changes or adopting parts of both plans. Other comments from judges included the feeling that the "desert team" plan placed too much faith in psychometrics, and the composition of teams. An analysis of the notes taken at this meeting seemed to reveal a slight preference of the judges for the "beach team" strategy. However, most of the comments from the judges seemed to indicate a preference for combining the two systems. On September 28, 1971, the Associate Commissioner met with DMI to discuss the two evaluation plans. At this time, the Associate Commissioner announced that the "beach team" strategy would be adopted.
CASE STUDY #4
A REPLANNING STUDY OF THE ILLINOIS PLAN FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT FOR GIFTED CHILDREN

I INTRODUCTION

The following case study is divided into two major parts. The first part contains five sections which are as follows: A) Description of the Context and Relevant Antecedents, B) Identification of Primary Actors, C) an Historical Account, D) Summary, and E) Outcomes. The second part examines in detail the activities, documents, and processes surrounding the use of advocate teams within this case study.

II CASE HISTORY

A. Description of Context and Antecedent Events

Utilization of the advocate team approach occurred in this case study as a result of a contract awarded to the Educational Administration Faculty from the Illinois State Department of Education. The following paragraphs delineate Illinois State Department conditions which led to sending out the request for proposals, a description of the Ohio State University Administration Faculty which submitted a proposal, and other relevant antecedents which led to the use of advocate teams.

Throughout the years, many state departments of education have taken on the responsibility of generating state-wide plans regarding
the gifted child in the state. The State of Illinois has been actively involved in the development of state-wide plans for many years. Between the years 1959 and 1963, a special commission was established by the General Assembly of the State of Illinois to study the needs of gifted children. The results of this study were presented to various reference groups within the State of Illinois at a Governor's Conference in 1962. Based on the reaction of the conference participants, Senate Bill 749 was developed and passed in both Houses by unanimous vote. This bill went into effect on August 5, 1963, and money was allocated specifically for program development designed for gifted children throughout the State of Illinois. Between 1963-64, all parts of the plan were initiated and additional support was generated.

During the years 1968-71, the State of Illinois supported evaluations of the Gifted Program. These evaluations were conducted by two institutions, 1) the Cooperative Educational Research Laboratory Incorporated, and 2) CIRCE, the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Development at the University of Illinois. Products from these evaluations included thirteen written evaluation reports. These reports provided an impetus for change within the Illinois Gifted Program. Perhaps the largest of these changes was the shift from demonstration centers to area service centers. In the Fall of 1971, Illinois State Department personnel decided to seek a major replanning effort because of cultural changes occurring since the original planning for the Gifted Program, and the evaluative feedback.
Persons involved with an Educational Administration Project entitled the National Program for Educational Leadership, working with the Illinois State Department, suggested that the Gifted Program personnel contact the Educational Administration Faculty for assistance in this planning effort. In addition to the Ohio State Administration Faculty, requests for proposals were sent to other major institutions including, for example, the Batelle Institute and the University of Washington Field Service Unit. The proposal submitted by The Ohio State University was accepted.

The Field Services Unit of the Educational Administration Faculty has a history of more than fifty years of service to public schools and other public agencies. Staff within this unit were formerly a part of the Bureau of Educational Research and Services at The Ohio State University. When in 1968 the College reorganized into faculties, this unit joined the Educational Administration Faculty. This replanning effort became a project within the Faculty of Educational Administration when granted. Since members of the Educational Administration Faculty had engaged in comprehensive planning in various studies, it was a natural move on the part of this faculty to submit a proposal to engage in comprehensive planning at the state level.

The proposed director of the project, working with the chairman of the Educational Administration Department, developed a proposal to submit to the Illinois State Department. This proposal indicated that advocate teams would be used to develop strategic state plans
for the Gifted Program in Illinois. The idea of using advocate
teams came from previous experience with them in the development
of a Model Training Program for evaluators conducted by the Ohio
State University Evaluation Center. Using this information, project
proposal writers adapted the idea of advocate teams for their particular
needs. In addition, they used the technical writer who had worked
with the Evaluation Center to provide needed assistance.

B. Major Actors

It is perhaps useful at the onset to emphasize that this case
study used advocate teams twice. The first use of them resulted
in the identification of clusters of local Gifted Program options
which were part of the context data. The second use of advocate
teams resulted in the State Strategic Plans. With this clarification
in mind, major actors will be discussed. Actual names of persons
within each cluster are provided in Appendix D-4.

There were five major groups which constituted the major actors
in this study. The first group was referred to as the Base Team
and was composed of four persons who had primary responsibility
for conducting this study. The Project Director provided the primary
conceptual assistance for the planning and implementation of this
study and was on site full-time at The Ohio State University. An
advanced level research associate assisted the Director in the
planning and implementation activities. This research associate
was assigned half-time to the Project from December through May,
and full-time for June and July. In addition to these people, two
part-time people were used in various aspects of the study and served as Associate Directors. One person was located at the State University of New York in Albany, and had been actively involved in gifted programs within the State of New York. This person took major responsibility for the identification of program options within the study. He gave leadership to those activities and wrote the working paper which synthesized program options developed by the first set of advocate teams. The other person had been closely associated with the Illinois Gifted Program, and was presently at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. He took primary responsibility for the suboptimization phase, i.e., the use of advocate teams to develop strategic state plans.

The second major group of actors constituted those persons who worked on the first use of advocate teams to develop clusters of local program options for the gifted. Three teams with five members engaged in discussions designed to obtain a picture of possible gifted programs that could exist at a local level that a state plan would have to take into consideration. This group of people included specialists in the area of gifted education as well as curriculum generalists.

Persons involved in the second use of advocate teams constituted the third group. These teams were selected and oriented to develop strategic State Plans for the Illinois gifted. Their involvement included reviewing working papers developed by the Base Team and outside consultants, and developing potential strategic plans. The chairman of each team had responsibility for attending an orientation
session the night before the regular session, and writing a plan based on the notes provided by the technical writers. In addition, the chairmen sent out rough drafts to their team members and rewrote the plan based on members' comments.

The fourth major cluster of actors constituted various advisory committees for the project. These advisory committees provided assistance at designated times throughout the Project, and included three separate committees. The first was a State Level Advisory Committee; the second was a Field Advisory Committee, and the third was an Illinois State Department Advisory Committee. Involvement of the committees in three rounds of the Delphi Technique provided inputs in the development of goals.

The fifth major cluster of actors constituted the technical writers. Technical writers were trained using taped exercises, and worked with both uses of advocate teams. Two technical writers were assigned to each advocate team for each use. The names of members in each of these major clusters of actors can be located in Appendix D-4.

In addition, an evaluator worked with the staff throughout the Project. This person had full access to all information concerning the Project. Weekly, or even more frequent, the evaluator met with staff members. He described his role in the Final Report as follows:
In one sense, the evaluator's role was advisory; in another, the role was evaluative in that data were collected from various reports and focused conversations with Project staff members. Questions were asked of, and by, the evaluator, and alternatives proposed by both the decision makers and the evaluator. This permitted decisions to be arrived at from critically informed and synthesized points of view. Questions were raised regarding information-gathering techniques, planning strategies, and appropriate resources available for a given problem area.

The evaluator played a more formal role in the evaluation of the dissemination materials. Instruments were developed and implemented on a field test basis to assess the degree to which the materials communicated. Technical difficulties however, resulted in less than ideal evaluation conditions.

C. Historical Account

The time frame for this study was eight months beginning December 1, and ending approximately August 31. Originally, the Project was to begin November 1, but various approval procedures at the State Department of Illinois made it impossible to start at this time. The Project activities can be grouped into five major areas which are as follows: 1) the context data analysis, 2) the development of goals and objectives, 3) the potential program options development, 4) the strategic plans development, and 5) the development of dissemination materials.

The major activities in the first month, December 1 to January 1, included a comprehensive planning of the entire study which resulted in an extensive PERT chart for the Illinois Gifted Project. This chart showed activities and events throughout the Project. Although many of these activities took place simultaneously, activities month by month can be described with the recognition that there was overlap. From January 1 to February 1, a major part of the context analysis was completed. This analysis included the development of a series of working papers on various topics related to the Illinois Gifted Program, i.e., an evaluation of the evaluations, Illinois support system's description, and previous related research. (See section III for more specific information.) Also within this month's time frame, advocate team members who were to develop potential clusters of program options were selected, logistics for actual writing sessions were undertaken, and initial work was done toward establishing goals and objectives.

During the month of February other activities were engaged in. For example, toward the end of February, the goals and objectives were being reviewed by the various advisory committees. Also during this time the training of technical writers for use with the advocate teams was completed, documents were distributed to the first set of advocate teams, and clusters of program options were developed.

The month of March and April resulted in a final summary paper of the context evaluation data which was submitted to the Strategic Plan Advocate Teams (the second use). The final report on goals and
objectives was also completed during this time. On Sunday, March 25, 1972, the chairman for the Strategic Plan Advocate Teams met before their writing sessions held on Monday, and concluded on Wednesday, March 29. By April 24, the chairman of each of the three advocate teams was to have a final copy of his state plan submitted to the Project Director. Prior to this time, the chairmen wrote a rough draft and submitted it to their team members for comments; received the comments back; and rewrote the plan based on that input.

In summary, the historical account can be seen in terms of five elements. Context data analysis is the first element, and the majority of the time spent in this activity was completed by February 1, 1972. This included the writing of numerous working papers. Within the period from February 1 to April 1, several activities were in operation. The first was the actual development of goals and objectives, and review by committees through use of the Delphi Technique. The second major activity was the development of program options for the Gifted Program. Within the time frame April 1 to June 1, the major elements included the scheduling and running of advocate teams to develop strategic state plans, and the rewriting of the strategic plans by the Base Team. The time frame from June 1 to August 31 was spent in development of the final report. From the onset of the study, dissemination materials development as specified in the proposal was implemented. These dissemination materials were to be used to provide information to decision makers in Illinois about
how various reference groups viewed the three strategic plans. The data obtained were to be considered in the state strategic plan selection synthesis. A large part of these dissemination materials development activities occurred between June 1 and August 31.

D. Summary

The major activities and actors are summarized in Table 6.

E. Outcomes

Early in September, 1972, the Director of the Gifted Program met the personnel from the Illinois State Department. At that time he presented the final reports. Currently, the State Department is reviewing the documents and planning for implementation of the dissemination procedures.
### TABLE 6

**SUMMARY OF MAJOR EVENTS AND PRIMARY ACTORS**

**CASE STUDY #4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Events</th>
<th>Primary Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context Evaluation Analysis</td>
<td>Consultants, Base Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(March 1, 1972)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of advocate team sessions to develop potential program options</td>
<td>Advocate Team 1, Base Team, Technical Writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(March, 1972)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of final goals and objectives (March 15, 1972)</td>
<td>Advisory Groups, Base Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of final report on strategic plans (April, 1972)</td>
<td>Advocate Team II, Base Team, Technical Writers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of strategic plans rewrite (June 1, 1972)</td>
<td>Base Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of final report (August 31, 1972)</td>
<td>Base Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of final set of dissemination materials (August 31, 1972)</td>
<td>Consultants, Base Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III METHODOLOGY SURROUNDING USE OF ADVOCATE TEAMS

An in-depth description of the methodology which accompanied the use of advocate teams is provided in this section. The following elements will be considered: A) Planning for the Project, B) Context Data Analysis, C) Development of Goals and Objectives, D) Selection of Advocate Team Members, E) Development of Program Options, F) Development of State Strategic Plans, G) Base Team's Analysis of State Plans, H) Dissemination Activities, and I) Final Report Preparation.

A. Planning for the Project

The Illinois Gifted Program was conducted by using a comprehensive educational planning model which is shown in Figure 1. As the figure indicates, the staff developed a planning process strategy at the beginning which resulted in a plan for planning. Also, as we follow the figure around we see the establishing of goals for the system and the development of the data information system. The establishing of the goals and the development of the data information system was completed by the Ohio State Project staff. The first use of advocate teams to develop local program options was one of the activities with the data information systems. The context data derived from the information system and the goals were used to suboptimize the means of goal achievement, which essentially meant developing alternative plans for achieving a set of goals. It was within the suboptimizing aspect of the Project that the second use of advocate
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teams occurred. These advocate teams developed strategic state plans which the Base Team used in developing alternative plans for the Illinois Gifted Program. Synthesizing the plan alternatives and all other functions in this educational planning model were not to be completed by the Ohio State Project. The only responsibility for this Project had in the synthesizing of the plan alternatives was the development of dissemination information which the Illinois State Department could use to disseminate information about the alternatives.

The planning for planning aspect of the Project included the development of a comprehensive PERT chart. The PERT chart was color coded to indicate five major activities of the Project: 1) Context Data Analysis, 2) Goals and Objective Statements, 3) Potential Program Options Development, 4) Strategic Plans Development, and 5) Development of Dissemination Materials. Each of these major activities was further delineated and component sheets developed for each of the boxes. The actual amount of time that it took to develop this chart was extensive. However, the PERT chart very effectively outlined end products and what was needed to be accomplished before an end product could be achieved. For each box on the PERT chart a Component Planning and Control Sheet was developed. This sheet essentially identified the component, component number, and indicated the start date and the end date. This sheet also contained a description of personnel and resources assigned to complete this particular activity. At various times throughout the study, components were
delineated further because additional information made greater specificity possible.

B. Context Data Analysis

The data information system was developed to provide context data for the strategic plans development. According to the final report the data for the context evaluation included:

...not only hard data coming from actual operations, but also softer opinion type data gathered from both subsystems and coordinate systems. Also included are plans and research findings of the various agencies having an impact on the system for which planning is being undertaken.35

A major aspect of the context data was the development of thirteen position papers which were eventually distributed to the Strategic Plans Development Advocate Teams. These thirteen papers will be described briefly as follows:

1. A Review of the Working Papers. Within this paper all of the working papers which will subsequently be described were put together in a concise review.

2. A Summary of the Evaluations of the Illinois Gifted Program. The thirteen major evaluations of the Illinois Gifted Program were summarized. Discussions centered around the quality of the local program, description of classes for the gifted, and discussions of demonstration centers and training programs.

3. The Illinois Gifted Program Evaluations—Interpreted by an Evaluator. This working paper examines the thirteen reports

and attempts to answer eight questions concerning the quality of the report. Some of the questions answered are, "Do the studies follow an evaluation design?" "Who were the subjects of the studies?" and "Do the studies influence the direction of the Project?"

4. **Review of Research on the Gifted.** This working paper provides the summative review of the literature on the gifted. It covers, among others, the general characteristics of the gifted, motivation of the gifted, as well as various other programs.

5. **A Survey of State Strategic Plans for the Education of the Gifted.** This paper surveys the entire United States, and discusses gifted programs in relation to availability of leadership staff, specific state legislation, and state funding patterns.

6. **Local Program Options Potentially Useful for the Gifted.** This working paper discusses the content of the curriculum as well as the teaching methods normally used with the gifted. This report was a result of a brainstorming session held prior to the first advocate team session.

7. **An Analysis of the Social and Organizational Context of the Illinois Gifted Program and an Analysis of OSPI.** This paper examines the social, political, and economic context within which the Gifted Program operates. It includes, among other things, information about target populations, teacher
characteristics, and school finance trends.

8. **Cost Benefit Analysis PPBS, and State Programs for the Gifted.** This paper examines cost benefit analysis as well as other similar budget systems in terms of how they could contribute to the Gifted Program's effectiveness.

9. **Concept of Change.** This paper illuminates change theory and related concepts of change. Within this paper there exists a description of four components of the change process as well as examples of various change models of Havelock and Chin.

10. **A Report of the Public Forums.** This report contains the proceedings of a series of meetings held in January, 1972, designed to solicit opinions from all persons regarding the Illinois Plan for Educating the Gifted.

11. **Goals of the Illinois Gifted Program.** This working paper includes a statement of the goals that were developed through the use of the Delphi Technique.

12. **Program Options and Support Systems for Gifted Youth in Illinois.** This working paper is the summary of the first use of advocate teams in which clusters of local program options were identified.

13. **Context Data Implications for State Plans.** This final working paper is an analysis of all the context data papers just described, and it is divided into six sections: Program Objectives, General School Characteristics and Trends, Teacher and School District Characteristics, Characteristics of the State Educational Agency, and State Local Linkages.
All of these position papers were either developed by members of the Base Team or by special consultants to the Project. In summary, it can be seen that the context data included a variety of information on a wide range of topics. The papers included looking at the previous evaluation reports and going to related research and other state plans. The papers also addressed the applicability of various content areas such as change theory and cost benefit analysis to the strategic plan development. The context evaluation provided information which served as a framework so that the advocate teams could develop realistic state plans.

C. Development of Goals and Objectives

A series of activities engaged in by the Base Team resulted in the formulation of goals. Utilizing a modified Delphi Technique, a number of individuals completed a questionnaire relating to the goals and objectives for the State. The first questionnaire contained a tentative list of goals and was sent to the State and Field Advisory Committees, the Gifted Program Staff, and the directors of the area service centers. This initial set of goals was influenced by priority goals previously established for the 1970's and produced by the Office of the State Department of Public Instruction. It represented input from about two thousand people.

Three rounds of the Delphi Technique were employed. In the first round respondents were asked to rate the initial set of goals in order of importance on a 1 - 5 point scale and to add any other goals which they thought should be considered. Responses to this first round
resulted in the suggestion of twenty additional goals. To make the list manageable, the Base Team modified several of the original goal statements and added others.

The second round of the Delphi Technique involved asking each individual from each of the reference groups cited previously to rate the goals on the same five point scale, not being influenced by their initial rating, but looking at each goal in its relationship to how the total group had as a whole rated it. If the respondent's rating was above or below the group's rating he was asked to give reasons which might convince others for his rating.

In the third round of the Delphi Technique, the individuals were again asked to rate the goals. Information provided to the group for this round included for each goal: the majority opinions, a measure of disagreement, and reasons given for the minority opinion. Following the third round of the Delphi, results were reviewed by the Field and State Advisory Committees, and final agreement was reached on a set of goals.

D. Selection of Advocate Team Members

As explained previously, there were two sets of advocate teams used within this study. The first set of advocate teams was convened to advocate clusters of local program options for the gifted. The second set of advocate teams was convened to develop potential alternative strategic plans. Selection of both advocate teams followed essentially the same process.
Underlying the selection process, a number of things were of concern to the Base Team. First of all, they wanted different kinds of people with different points of view; second, they wanted a wide geographic distribution in team members; third, they were interested in some person who had been related to the Illinois Gifted Program; fourth, they wanted to get people with national reputations in order to give the development work status; fifth, they wanted to use some Ohio State personnel so as to reduce financial costs of travel and per diem; sixth, they wanted people who would be creative in their development; and seventh, they wanted some people who had been associated directly with the Gifted Program. With these criteria somewhat loosely in mind, the Project Director began to develop a list of approximately one hundred and fifty to two hundred persons from recommendations people made from the very beginning of the project. The Director of the project then divided the list into two groups: those persons who would be better for developing clusters of local program options and those persons who would be better for developing state strategic plans. Using these two hundred names, the Director had ten or twelve persons rate each of the nominated persons in terms of whether or not the rater thought the recommended person would make a substantial contribution to the project. From this rating procedure, the Base Team developed two top priority lists; one for each use of advocate teams. The selection process began with the chairmen and then proceeded to members of both advocate teams. Starting with the people on the top of both
lists, if a person could not allocate the longer time for advocate team work, he was asked if he could participate in the shorter time duration (one day) for a brainstorming session.

E. Development of Program Options

Working paper six cited previously is really a summary of what happened during the brainstorming session held prior to the first use of advocate teams. Persons used for this purpose included outstanding educators and curriculum generalists, as well as specialists in the Illinois Gifted Program. The strategy for these sessions and the brainstorming framework set up to guide this meeting was as follows:

"Four criteria must be met to have a good brainstorming session: 1) discussion is limited to clarification of ideas generated, and there should be no criticism or judgment made concerning the quality of an idea generated; 2) creative and divergent ideas are sought, the wilder the better; 3) emphasis is upon generation of ideas, the more the better; 4) combinations or corollary ideas are appropriate but not as substitutes for original ideas."

The variety of local program options identified by the brainstorming group was used by the first set of advocate teams. Specifications for this first use of advocate teams were not as great as those developed from the second use of advocate teams. The intent of having this advocate team session identify clusters of local programs was made in order to provide information to the second set of advocate teams in the development of their strategic state plans. It was felt that an effective state plan must be flexible enough to allow for diversity at the local level, and that

36 ibid., p.24.
engaging in a brainstorming to get an array of different program options provided information of this nature. There seemed to be confusion about the task by members of the first set of advocate teams. The Base Team felt the output from the first set of advocate teams was less than the output from the second set. However, the Base Team felt that the first use of advocate teams was beneficial in that they had an opportunity to try out the advocate team notion, and learn through their experiences and evaluation of the process.

F. Development of State Strategic Plans

Three advocate teams were selected and convened to develop alternative State Strategic Plans. Various elements within the development of strategies follows:

1. Distribution of Documents: A series of documents were provided to the advocate team members and the chairman of each team. These documents are discussed in section IIIB.

   This set of documents as viewed by two of the chairmen interviewed, included some highly relevant items; while other documents were viewed as unimportant. In addition to these documents, a series of PERT chart component sheets were included which essentially described in greater detail the specific responsibilities of the advocate team members in the idea generation session, the completion of a rough draft, and the preparation of a final report. These documents were given out approximately a week and a half before the team convened. Advocate team members were encouraged to read in particular eight of the documents prior to the sessions.
2. The Orientation Session: Each advocate team chairman was requested to attend an Orientation Session the night preceding the beginning of the actual writing sessions. At this time, the documents were surveyed, administrative concerns regarding logistical information were transmitted, and opening remarks were made regarding the task.

3. The Task Specification Document: The opening statement to advocate teams consisted of five parts, and was provided in oral and written form. The first part was an introduction which indicated what was expected of the advocate teams, i.e., that they would devise a state plan for program development for gifted children for the State of Illinois. This introduction also indicated that there were two other advocate teams meeting in Columbus, and that the Base Team was going to use the advocate strategies developed in their recommendations to the State of Illinois. The second section dealt with the recording of expenses including the distribution of expense sheets. The third item dealt with the description of the task in which some short background information, and a description of where this advocate team development existed within the entire PERT chart, was provided. The PERT chart was discussed briefly at this time. The key task specifications within this opening remark statement were:

"We expect that your plan will include a number of elements all linked together by some overall rationale. Each element should include three things: first, the specification of the objective to be achieved by the element; second, a description of the resources--financial, human, time, and other--needed to reach the objective; and third, a plan of operation
whereby the resources would be utilized. We are asking you to devise a state plan for program development for the gifted in Illinois with the initial expectation of funding in the range of four to eight million. We want to know the overall design of your plan and we want to know for each of its elements the objective to be attained, the resources required, and the plan of operations whereby the resources can be brought to bear upon the objectives.37

The other part of the third section of the opening statement discusses the five things that together constitute the development of a plan; the selecting of persons representing a variety of experiences; providing of chairmen; providing a wealth of background material; and providing the facilities, and a pair of technical writers. The opening statement also indicated the different locations for teams to facilitate each team working independently. In addition to the use of technical writers, the Base Team indicated that they would be available on all three days, and the teams should call them if they had any questions. The fourth section related to the schedule. This section basically indicated when technical writers would mail copies of the proceedings to the chairmen, and when advocate team chairmen were required to return the final report to the Project Director. The fifth section of the opening remarks constituted a question and answer period on the task.

4. Advocate Team Sessions: The actual sessions were held in three hotels close to the University. There were three

37"Opening Statement to Advocate Team for State Strategic Plan Development", (refers to unpublished document, PERT Component #625) prepared by The Ohio State University Gifted Project staff, 1972, pp. 2,3.
teams with five members. Each of the teams was provided two technical writers, as well as a secretary. In general, the teams began their sessions by reviewing the task assignment as specified in the opening remarks, and reviewing the documents. After that they began group discussions which generally resulted in an outline of the plan. Some of the advocate teams remained in large group sessions for the entire three days while others met in large group sessions and then went off in small groups to write individually, bringing their products back for large group reactions.

5. Preparation of the Report: Each team chairman was given approximately three weeks to develop a tentative draft of the strategic plan; send it out to team members for critique; and then revise the draft into a final report. The deadline for the report was April 24, 1972. Although preliminary letters to chairmen indicated their responsibility to write the report based on the proceedings provided by the technical writers, several chairmen felt that the technical writers, under ideal conditions, should have taken on more responsibility in the generation of the report.

G. Base Team's Analysis of State Plans

As was previously indicated, the Base Team was on call during the three days that the Advocate Teams met. During these three days it was decided that the Base Team would develop another strategic plan as there was a sufficient amount of time for all
of them to work together. In actuality, therefore, there were four advocate teams; however, three of the four were described in the previous section. The fourth strategic plan was developed by the Base Team and one other Administrative Faculty member while the other advocate teams were meeting. This team also had five members and knew the background data extensively. The graduate student on the Base Team had trained the technical writers so he served in the function of technical writer as well as a member of this advocate team. Because the team was "on call", it was not really a full team at all times; however, members of this team had developed ideas during the project implementation.

The initial agreement called for three equally viable plans submitted to the State Department. They did not want to have one plan that was outstanding, and several others that were "strawmen". The second constraint that the State Department put upon the project was that the cost of the plans be somewhere between four and eight million dollars per plan. With these two constraints in mind, the Base Team merged four strategic plans into three plans that were equally viable. The team also merged aspects of one plan with another so that each plan was viable. It was not necessary to merge the plans on financial grounds. In actuality, the Base Team served as a Convergence Team, but instead of converging the elements into one plan, they converged the elements into three plans. It had been established with the Illinois State Department prior to this time that if by circumstances the three teams came
up with the same plan, it probably must be a good one and they would diverge the plan in terms of money. By that it meant that they would develop one plan which would cost four million, another plan at six million, and the final plan at eight million. However, this did not happen. The Base Team ended up with three basically different plans that were not essentially different in terms of financial output.

During early discussions with Illinois State decision makers, it was suggested by one of their staff that the output of the advocate teams be structured so that one plan would be very similar to the existing plan; one plan would have major changes from the existing state plan; and the third plan ought to abandon the existing plan entirely. This was not thought valuable by other Illinois staff members or by the Base Team in that they did not want to constrain the strategy development. However, of the three state plans developed, one turned out to be very similar to the state plan, one had major changes, and one had basically abandoned the present state plan.

The work of the Base Team also included setting up the three strategic plans in terms of a specific common format which included the following elements: 1) introductory comments, 2) target population, 3) funds for local programs, 4) service centers, 5) personnel development, 6) research development and experimentation, 7) evaluation and accountability, 8) citizen involvement, 9) state leadership, 10) budget, and 11) transition. In addition to putting the plans

---

into similar format, and converging sections of the plans, an intro­duction to the discussion of the plans was developed and included the identification of four basic problem areas in state-wide planning for the gifted.

H. Dissemination Activities

It was decided very early in the project that the project staff would not be responsible for undertaking the synthesizing of the plan alternatives. This activity was to be undertaken by the OSPI staff. However, the Ohio State project staff which developed the competing strategic state plans was under contract to develop specific dissemination activities which would permit widespread participation from various educators and reference groups throughout the state. These dissemination materials were to be used in order to collect data from a large number of audiences regarding their perceptions of the three strategic plans submitted. The materials included:

"...mass media announcements of the town meetings—newspaper articles, radio, tape, and TV clips for public service announcements, a twenty-minute color film depicting the need for gifted education, and the three alternative plans, popularized digest booklet of the content similar to that of the film, guides for small group discussions, and a questionnaire for participants to provide input into the synthesizing stage of the planning process."

I. Final Report Preparation

Following the development of the strategies and the dissemination materials, a final report was developed by the Base Team. The final

\[\text{ibid., p. 30.}\]
report was put into two volumes. The first volume contained an introduction to the project, and included such things as the need for state-wide programs for the gifted. It also talked about what comprehensive educational planning is, and overviewed the planning efforts and the activities engaged in throughout the project. The second major part of this first volume provided discussion of the plans. It included basic problems to be addressed and an outline of the existing plan. It then provided three alternative plans and a section in which plans were contrasted. Part Three of this first volume had an overview of the dissemination activities which were designed to provide input to decision makers for synthesizing the plan alternatives.

The second volume included appendix materials divided into two parts. The first part consisted of the working papers generated as part of the information system; the second part described in detail the dissemination materials including the mass media package, the basic information package, the town meeting package, the town meeting management package, opinionnaires to collect input data for synthesis of the plans, and a questionnaire to be used in assessing the basic information package.
ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDIES

The four case studies on advocate team use which were presented provide a "state of the art" picture of previous advocate team use. Analyses of these cases provided valuable information as to content to be included in the technical manual. The chart in Appendix D-5 briefly describes each case study in terms of purpose, actors, and case study activities in relation to evaluation functions.

Looking across case studies in terms of general characteristics, several things are observable. First, two uses of advocate teams were sponsored at the state level, two at the federal level. Second, all advocate teams were used to create strategies for an area in which acceptable alternatives were not available. Third, the programs created by advocate teams in these case studies were to be implemented in a variety of settings; a research and development laboratory, a university, a state department and within a federal agency.

When roles across the case studies were analyzed several things were noticeable.

1. All cases had a group or team of people directly responsible for selecting, orienting, and running advocate teams.

2. All cases involved the system decision-makers in some fashion. Degree of involvement, however, varied.
3. All cases had a group of people assess the strategies through some procedure although the procedures used varied greatly. In all cases, assessment results were provided to system decision makers. Actual decisions on selection of strategies or convergence of strategies were made by these decision-makers.

4. All cases used advocate teams. One case used advocate teams twice for two different purposes. Only one case study (#3) selected team members because they advocated different positions prior to program development. Knowledge of this information had a direct impact on how advocate teams were defined in the technical manual.

Roles unique to specific case studies included the use of outside consultants in case study #1. These consultants provided the major conceptual work to this first use of advocate teams. In case study #2, a convergence team was used for the first time. This group was convened to bring together contents from two disciplines and to converge and operationalize selected sections from the advocate team reports. Case study #4 used a project evaluator who provided input into project activities as the project progressed.

The purpose of this study was to design a technical manual for input evaluation using advocate and design teams. Therefore, analysis of the case studies in terms of how activities within case studies related to input evaluation functions was critical. The three functions of input evaluation are identifying and assessing system capabilities, alternative strategies and alternative designs.
1. The degree to which advocate teams in the case studies followed an input evaluation framework varied. Case study #2 contained almost all of the functions within input evaluation, whereas case studies #3 and #4 contained only a few elements (identification of capabilities and identification of alternative strategies). A possible reason for this variation is that a major actor in case study #2 had previously developed the major conceptual framework for input evaluation. In addition, case study #2 consisted of a planning grant which lends itself to the framework of input evaluation. It should also be noted that for case study #3, more of the functions of input evaluation were proposed. However, time constraints resulted in the remotion of certain activities related to the other functions.

2. The majority of information obtained on advocate team use in all cases centered around the identification responsibilities of advocate teams. Some information on assessing strategies was obtained through case study #1 and #2. Little information on system capabilities was identified in any of the cases studied. The design function of input evaluation was only present in case study #2. This design function was incorporated into case study #2 for several reasons. First, major actors within this case study realized that the strategies produced by the advocate teams would not contain the
detail needed for the proposal to be submitted to U.S.O.E. Second, the decision to incorporate different specialty training areas (evaluation and diffusion) came rather late in the process and this design phase provided an opportunity to integrate the two training specialities into a coherent proposal.

The information obtained on the identification aspect of advocate team use through the case studies can be further delineated into a series of generalizations across case studies which were taken into consideration in development of the technical manual.

1. Selection of advocate team members was viewed as an extremely important process as it directly affects the output from the teams.

2. Use of documents presented problems—generally there were too many used and often the documents were not viewed as relevant by team members.

3. Holding an Orientation Session was viewed as a useful way to orient team members. However, orientation sessions should provide added information to advocate team members and allow time for questions and answers.

4. Length of advocate team sessions cited as appropriate ranged from three to five days.

5. Location of writing sessions should be where interruptions are not possible. Some but not all persons interviewed preferred a motel location to an office location.
6. Use of administrative personnel assistance during actual writing sessions will increase the effectiveness of the team.

7. Developers of specifications for advocate team use were concerned about the degree of specification—they wanted creative responses and yet they were concerned that the strategies would not be useful if no structure was provided.

8. All advocate teams felt free to deviate from the specifications if they could establish a rationale for the deviation and often they did.

9. The number of people on a team cited as appropriate ranged from three to six.

In addition to generalizations across case studies, strengths and weaknesses within each individual case study provided additional information for manual development. The strengths of the individual case studies were often included in the manual. For example, one of the strengths cited for case study #4 is the development of dissemination materials through which many reference groups in Illinois could provide evaluative input on the three plans developed by advocate teams. Descriptions of these activities were presented in the manual as a possible assessment procedure.

The weaknesses cited within cases were also used in that processes were included which would hopefully prevent the occurrence of the weakness in other uses of advocate teams. For example, in several
case studies, a large amount of information pertinent to the task assigned to advocate teams was not used. In order to provide this needed information to advocate teams without placing unrealistic reading expectations on team members, the role of input evaluation resource person was created. This person would work with advocate teams and retrieve and summarize needed information upon request. A large number of ideas as well as actual content for the manual was derived from the case study analysis of strengths and weaknesses.

Some of these strengths and weaknesses for each of the case studies identified throughout the analysis are as follows:

Case Study #1

Strengths:

1. Advocate team idea was used for the first time.

2. A complete, detailed list of criteria were identified and used in preparation of reports.

3. An analysis of strategies in terms of power and tractability was suggested by the consultants.

4. The comprehensive literature search was available for use by advocate team members.

Weaknesses:

1. The comprehensive literature search was not used by the teams.

2. No questions were asked at Orientation Session; however, many questions were generated about the nature of the task during actual writing session.
3. Having teams structure their own meeting times resulted in confusion.

4. Reports greatly differing in quality were received.

5. Criteria were not applied to strategies in a systematic fashion. No other systematic analysis of strategies was used.

Case Study #2

Strengths:

1. A formal decision-making team operated in this case study.

2. Criteria were identified and weights were established prior to strategy development.

3. Application of criteria to strategies was completed.

4. The convergence team idea was used for the first time.

5. Technical writers worked out very well—few corrections in rough draft by team members.

Weaknesses:

1. Rating of criteria—some felt that list of criteria was too general—others felt that the weights for administrative criteria would be higher because only administrators were asked to rate the criteria.

2. Confusion over task responsibilities on convergence team.

3. Format provided to advocate team members was confusing and therefore rejected.
Case Study #3

Strengths:

1. A large number of well known evaluators were used on advocate teams. Advocate team chairmen were selected because they represented differing views about evaluation.

2. A panel of invited judges was used to help NCERD decision-makers select between the strategies.

3. NCERD decision-makers were actively involved throughout project. Proposal for original scope of work suggested for the first time use of Synthesis Team (a subset of the decision-makers of the system). However, because the scope of work was revised, the Synthesis Team idea was not used.

4. Orientation Session viewed as extremely valuable to advocate team members.

Weaknesses:

1. An extensive list of documents was given to advocate team members. Little use was made of resource material brought to actual writing session.

2. No clear identification of criteria prior to strategy development.

3. Selection of strategy which had to be operationalized before it could be used (no formal design stage implemented).
Case Study #4

Strengths:

1. Extensive prior planning of project through PERT network.
2. Development of series of working papers designed to orient advocate team members.
3. Development of dissemination materials through which many reference groups throughout Illinois could provide input about the three alternative state strategic plans.
4. Use of advisory groups throughout project.
5. Use of an evaluator throughout project.

Weaknesses:

1. The first use of advocate teams for which little direction was given resulted in confusion. The staff was disappointed about the output from this group.
2. Confusion about the role of technical writer by chairmen of advocate teams.
3. Criteria upon which plans were to be assessed were not identified prior to program development.
4. The four strategies were not assessed according to some systematic procedure other than the subjective opinions of the Base Team.

The two analyses just presented—generalizations across case studies, and strengths and weaknesses within case studies, provided much assistance to the investigator in the development of the
technical manual. The case studies were also analyzed for another purpose, i.e., identification of areas where additional literature was needed. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 7 below. This analysis resulted in the identification and use of other literature.

**TABLE 7**

NEED ANALYSIS FOR OTHER LITERATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Information derived from case studies sufficient for technical manual</th>
<th>Information derived from case studies insufficient—need additional literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Definition of input evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Definition of advocate teams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Definition of design team</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Necessary conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Role of system decision maker</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Role of input evaluation team</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role of advocate teams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Role of design teams</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Role of technical writers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The problem with criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Identification of system capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>Information derived from case studies sufficient for technical manual</td>
<td>Information derived from case studies insufficient—need additional literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>Assessment of system capabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>Identification of alternative strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Selection of advocate teams</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Use of documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Development of specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Orienting team members</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-The actual writing session</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <strong>Assessment of alternative strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Criteria identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Weighting of criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Identification of interpretation and decision rules</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Actual assessment procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <strong>Identification of design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. <strong>Assessment of design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

THE TECHNICAL MANUAL

Introduction

The technical manual which is presented in this chapter was developed upon completion of the analysis of case studies, and completion of the review of literature. The three major activities involved in the manual development were as follows: selection of a logical framework; identification of key elements to include within the manual; and writing and rewriting. Each of these are described briefly.

A number of possible frameworks were surveyed for possible use in development of the manual. These included the framework which Guba and Stufflebeam used to describe an evaluation unit (capability, procedural adequacy and credibility and acceptance). Another possible framework surveyed was that provided by Gerald Nadler in his systems work. Both of these frameworks were rejected as the investigator felt that the framework elements would need to be explicated and use of these frameworks may confuse the readers.

---


Therefore, the investigator chose to use the rather simple framework of roles and functions. The roles and functions framework seemed to fit into the content of the manual without extensive orientation of terms to the potential user.

Key elements within the framework were derived from the case study analysis, related literature, and past experience of the investigator in use of advocate teams. Table 8 which follows provides summary information on various manual elements in terms of where the majority of content or ideas were obtained.

Following Table 8 is the manual which was revised four times from the original draft based upon the critiques of students and staff at the Evaluation Center. Revisions included shortening the manual (original draft was 110 pages), clarifying content and including more information on assessment procedures. The manual is in the form in which it was sent out for evaluation.
TABLE 8  
SUMMARY OF ELEMENTS BY SOURCES OF INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Definition of input evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Definition of advocate teams</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Definition of design teams</td>
<td>2, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Necessary conditions</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Role of System Decision Makers</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Role of Input Evaluation Team</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role of Advocate Teams</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Role of Design Teams</td>
<td>2, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Role of Technical Writers</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The problem of criteria</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Identification and assessment of capabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--need for this information</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--procedural steps</td>
<td>1, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Identification of alternative strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--selection of Advocate Teams</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--use of documents</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--development of specifications</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--orienting the teams</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--the actual writing session</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Assessment of alternative strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--criteria identification</td>
<td>1, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--weighting of criteria</td>
<td>1, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--identification of interpretation and decision rules</td>
<td>1, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--actual assessment procedures</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Identification of design</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Assessment of design</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Code:  
1 - Case Study #1  
2 - Case Study #2  
3 - Case Study #3  
4 - Case Study #4  
5 - Related Literature  
6 - Professional Judgment of Investigator
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The methodology set forth in this manual was derived from an analysis of four previous uses of advocate teams. In addition to the four case studies, the author relied heavily on the previous conceptual work of the P.D.K. Study Commission on Evaluation (Stufflebeam, et al., Educational Evaluation and Decision-Making, 1971).

A series of working papers by Egon G. Guba and John Horvat (Working Papers 1-6, Southwest Educational Laboratory, 1968) provided a framework and examples for the assessment activities described in the manual. And, in addition, other related literature was used.

This manual is divided into three major parts, each of which answers specific questions. The first part answers the questions, "What is input evaluation; what are advocate and design teams; and what are the prior conditions necessary for the use of input evaluation using advocate and design teams?"

The second part answers the question, "What do I need in order to use input evaluation employing advocate and design teams?" Specific needs are discussed in terms of five roles.

The third major part answers the question, "What functions are involved?" and includes a section on criteria, a flowchart, and a series of overall guidelines and procedural steps for each of the three functions of input evaluation.
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Educators are faced with making decisions which relate to variations of actual and intended means and ends. Intended ends, i.e., planning decisions, relate to the determination of objectives and answer the question, "What should be achieved?" Another group of decisions, structuring decisions, relate to the intended means and answer the question, "How are we going to do it?" To make decisions about intended means the following questions need to be answered.

1. What are the objectives?
2. What are alternative ways to achieve the objectives?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the alternatives in relation to resources available?!

Frameworks for educators to use as they move from objective setting to program implementation are limited. Systems analysis and other planning techniques provide a framework to guide the decision process, and often include an analysis of known alternatives. Unfortunately, there is often no conceptual guide for the identification of intended means for accomplishing a set of objectives. A typical approach used in such an absence is that a person or perhaps a group design a program based solely on their past experience and common sense. A major limitation of this process is that there is no systematic study of the resources of the agency and inadequate or no effort is made to identify or develop alternative designs for programs. And rarely are alternative designs assessed in terms of pre-determined criteria.

---

A. Definitions

Input evaluation as defined by Stufflebeam, et al. (1971), provides a decision framework for educators to use. Input evaluation is generally viewed as providing information for decision-making relative to the utilization of resources in meeting a given set of program goals. Input evaluation serves three functions: 1) identifying and assessing relevant capabilities of the responsible agency, 2) identifying and assessing strategies for achieving program goals, and 3) identifying and assessing designs for implementing a selected strategy. Input evaluation, by nature, is ad hoc and is used to identify and assess known alternative strategies, or is used to develop and assess new strategies if existing alternative strategies are unacceptable or nonexistent.

Advocate teams are groups of people specifically selected and oriented to develop alternative strategies for achieving a set of given objectives. Advocate teams are used to "create" new strategies when alternative strategies are nonexistent or when existing strategies are not acceptable to the decision makers. Although advocate team use is based on an input evaluation framework in which alternative strategies are generated and assessed, the process essentially serves a developmental role within the input evaluation framework. The term "advocate," however, needs further explanation. A criterion for selection of membership for teams may be that team members hold a certain philosophy or "advocate" a particular position before they

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2}ibid., pp. 222-223.}\]
engage in strategy development. For example, in the development of an elementary school program, one team may consist of experts who advocate behavior modification, while a competing team may be composed of British Infant School advocates. However, selection of members of a team may be based on other criteria such as administrative ability to move a group, or certain content area expertise. Teams selected utilizing these criteria may not come in with advocate positions, however, they end up as advocates of a particular strategy which their team develops. Therefore, the term "advocate team" is related to two slightly different approaches for the creation of alternative strategies based upon criteria for selection of team members. The first approach includes the involvement of persons who represent differing philosophies and theories and who advocate certain positions prior to strategy development. The second approach brings together a team which develops a strategy and upon completion, advocates its use for achieving a set of objectives. This topic is dealt with in greater detail in section III C of this manual.

A design team is used to operationalize a selected strategy or converge and operationalize sections from several strategies. Advocate teams develop strategies, design teams produce operationalized procedures. An important distinction to be made at this point, perhaps, is the difference between a strategy and a design. The second function of input evaluation results in decisions regarding strategy selections, while the third function ends with decisions regarding designs. Strategy, in this particular case, refers to an
unrefined design—a framework or skeleton of program development. Designs, on the other hand, are specific procedures developed to operationalize each element of the framework as well as fill in gaps in the strategies.

B. Necessary Conditions

Although the use of advocate and design teams for input evaluation is a relatively new and exciting idea, to say that its use is appropriate or possible for all program development would be misleading. The following will set forth conditions where advocate team use in input evaluation would be appropriate. Necessary conditions for use of input evaluation using advocate and design teams can be discussed in terms of two types of conditions, organizational and financial.

1. Organizational Conditions

Are there known acceptable alternative strategies for achieving your set of objectives? If the answer to this question is yes, one may not need to use an advocate team. Instead, one may wish to use an input evaluation process to assess the alternatives, since sufficient information exists on acceptable alternatives, why generate more? The generation of strategies for a designated set of program objectives is expensive. One may find it more cost effective to use available resources in assessing the known acceptable strategies. Advocate teams are best used to create strategies after a search for available alternatives has failed.
Are you sure that the objectives you have set forth are relevant and based on a needs analysis? Objectives are a necessary prior condition for advocate team use. One should be relatively sure that objectives are based on empirical data prior to the generation of strategies designed to achieve them since, in large part, input evaluation and advocate teams develop and assess responses to objectives rather than develop the objectives. An unclear or inappropriate set of objectives used by advocate teams in their creation of alternative strategies may result in programs unrelated to the needs of a system's clients. It is important to recognize however, that input evaluation can lead to clarification of objectives.

Will the strategies developed result in a large change in an area where there is little information? If the answer to this question is "yes," advocate teams use within input evaluation may be appropriate.

The amount of evaluation needed for decision-making increases as the degree of attempted change increases and the amount of information known about the proposed change decreases. Stufflebeam, et al., describes change as follows:

Specifically, potential change should be classified in terms of two conditions. Does society view the variables to be altered as important? And, does society view the magnitude of the proposed changes as trivial or important? If no important variables are involved, the change is small. If important variables are involved but manipulated in unimportant ways, the change is also small. However, if important variables are manipulated in important ways, the change is large. The reader should note that under the above rules, the classification of change is not based upon the magnitude of change per se but upon the perceptions of society about the change.3

3 Ibid., pp. 49-105.
For example, use of advocate teams in the middle 60's to update the traditional math curriculum may not have been an appropriate application. Although math may be viewed as an important variable, the manipulation depends on extent, cost, etc., and would probably be relatively unimportant. However, advocate teams could have been used at that time to completely revise the math curriculum by introducing a "modern math" program. Completely restructuring the math curriculum in this fashion could be termed a large change which would necessitate in-service training for teachers, administrators and parents.

Is there a close working relationship between the evaluator and decision maker? If the answer to this question is "no," there will be severe complications in using the advocate team approach within input evaluation, even if all other conditions are favorable. The reason for this is an assumption underlying input evaluation, that there is a close working relationship between the evaluator and the decision makers. Procedural steps in the methodology call for an active involvement and interaction of evaluators and decision makers.

In summary, organizational elements conducive to the use of advocate teams in input evaluation is one in which the following conditions exist:

1. There is a need to create new strategies for achieving program objectives because known alternative strategies are nonexistent or not acceptable.
2. Objectives around which strategies are to be developed reflect the needs and problems of the system.

3. The program to be developed constitutes a large change in an area where there is relatively little information available.

4. There is a close working relationship between the evaluator and the decision maker.

Another condition, of course, is the availability of actual methodology to use while conducting an input evaluation which uses advocate teams. Hopefully, this manual will help provide the information necessary to satisfy that condition.

2. Financial Conditions

If organizational conditions are met, then the potential user of input evaluation employing advocate and design teams must determine if it is financially possible. In order to provide an idea of the cost for conducting this type of evaluation activity, a sample budget is provided along with suggestions for reducing the budget if necessary.

A budget for conducting input evaluations will vary depending on scope, time, number of teams used, and other factors. The following hypothetical budget is provided as an illustration of costs for an input evaluation which involves two advocate teams and one design team over a six month period.
**TABLE 9**

**BUDGET BREAKDOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Elements</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Input Evaluator, Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(full-time for 6 months) $15,000/yr</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Input Evaluation Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 month salary $12,000) $1,000/month</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Input Evaluation Resource Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 month salary $12,000) $1,000/month</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Technical Writer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 month salary $12,000) $1,000/month</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Synthesizer (external)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($150/day - 20 days)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Advocate Team Members (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($150/day - 8 days)</td>
<td>14,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Design Team Members (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($150/day - 8 days)</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 month salary $6,156 = $513/month)</td>
<td>3,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total - Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td>$49,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employee Services and Benefits</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18 trips by advocate and design teams and 6 trips by synthesizer - $200/trip)</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Office supplies, reproduction, communications, etc.</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Per Diem (300 days - $30/day)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Conference facilities</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Three reports - $200/report</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total - Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td>$13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Required</strong></td>
<td>$62,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the budget breakdown indicates, a substantial amount of funds are allocated for personnel salaries and consultant fees for the advocate and design teams. A less expensive version of the above budget would be to eliminate some salaries and consultant fees. This could be accomplished by the following.

1. Combine the role of input evaluation specialist and input evaluation resource person, or have the director of the input evaluation assume the responsibilities of the specialist and resource person. It should be emphasized, however, that combining roles means that the responsibilities would have to be combined which may result in less depth in completion of the activities. Whether the roles can in fact be combined would be dependent upon the scope of each specific project.

2. Use in-house personnel presently on salary to serve as half of the total advocate and design team members, or use all in-house personnel with the exception of the chairmen.

3. Eliminate the role of the synthesizer (external) to the system.

Use of advocate and design teams within input evaluation is expensive in terms of funds, personnel, and time. The use of advocate and design teams, however, can be well worth the costs, for if programs are developed unsystematically or in crises, the probability is great that the program will not be innovative; will not effectively use the resources of the system; will not be derived through consideration and assessment of alternative program strategies; and will not result in a design which can be fully implemented.

C. Overview of the Manual

The manual is organized around a framework based on the inter-
actions between five roles and three functions that are central to the input evaluation process. Table 10 displays a three by five matrix with the vertical dimension containing the five roles and the horizontal dimensions listing the three functions. The Roman numeral and letter code within the cells and dimensions refer to sections of the manual.

As the matrix indicates, the roles include: decision makers, input evaluation team, advocate teams, design teams, and technical writers. Sections IIA - IIE describe in greater detail what each role is, the purpose of having each role and specific responsibilities.

The function dimension is described in section IIIB through the presentation of a systems model flowchart. This chart was developed to show the flow of input evaluation activities. Major decision points and where the use of advocate and design teams occur within the functions are indicated in the flowchart.

The first row of cells contain a reference to section III C in the manual. This section identifies and discusses overall guidelines and procedural steps in the first function of input evaluation, i.e., identifying and assessing relevant capabilities of the responsible agency. Section IIIA, also referenced in the first two cells of the matrix, contains a definition of criteria, a list of common errors inherent in the identification of criteria, and provides examples of criteria. Section IIIA was placed within the first two cells of all three functions because of input evaluation. And since identification of criteria results from
TABLE 10
MANUAL FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Evaluation</th>
<th>Decision-Makers IIA</th>
<th>Input Evaluation Team IIB</th>
<th>Advocate Teams IIC</th>
<th>Design Teams IID</th>
<th>Technical Writers IIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Identifying and assessing relevant capabilities of the responsible agency</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>IIC</td>
<td>IIC</td>
<td>IIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Identifying and assessing strategies for achieving program goals</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>IID</td>
<td>IID</td>
<td>IID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Identifying and assessing designs for implementing a selected strategy</td>
<td>IIC</td>
<td>IIE</td>
<td>IIE</td>
<td>IIE</td>
<td>IIE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interaction between the decision makers and evaluators, the references were placed in only the first two cells of each row, for advocate teams, design teams, and technical writers are not greatly concerned with identification of criteria.

The second row of cells is referenced to section III D, which describes the function of identifying and assessing alternative strategies. Specific procedural steps are placed under the general categories of identification and assessment. Within the identification category the following elements are described: selection of team members, selection and distribution of documents, development of specifications for the team, the orientation session and the actual writing sessions. Within the assessment category other elements are discussed, such as the identification and operationalization of criteria, weighting of criteria, use of interpretation and decision rules, and development of information and decision matrices.

The third row of cells contains references to section III E in the manual. This section contains procedural steps for the last function of input evaluation which relates to the identification and assessing of designs for implementation. This section is also divided into two categories, identification procedures and assessment procedures.

Table 16, (Section III F), illustrates the overall advocate team framework, and summarizes the activities as described in the manual for each cell.
II ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Implementation of input evaluation using advocate teams requires the involvement of a number of persons. The following paragraphs describe the types of persons to be involved, why their involvement is necessary, and their specific responsibilities. There are five major groups of people involved: decision makers, and a subset of that group which is a synthesis team; the input evaluation team, composed of the director, an input evaluation specialist, and an input evaluation resource person; advocate teams; design teams, which focus on either operationalization or convergence; and technical writers.

A. System Decision Makers

A group of key decision makers from the system will be heavily involved. This group will be composed of key persons who will 1) make decisions about adoption and implementation, 2) be responsible for implementation of the program when designed (if this is known), and 3) have knowledge about the system capabilities and ability to project the new program's relationship to internal subsystems as well as external. These persons insure the relevance of program development by setting forth the objectives and specifications for the input evaluation. Their work with the Input Evaluation Team includes activities that are termed "interface" by Stufflebeam et al. which includes defining the system and decisions, as well as evaluating policies and assumptions. They will also determine
reporting practices and will serve as data sources in the collection of data by the input evaluator. Specific responsibilities for this group of persons are as follows:

1. Clarify objectives and specify requirements to be met by the input evaluation.

2. Assist in the identification of capabilities of the system projected as related to the program to be developed.

3. Assist in the identification of constraints of the system projected as related to the program to be developed.

4. Serve as data sources for those identified capabilities and constraints.

5. Help in the specification of the output to be obtained through the involvement of the advocate team.

6. Assist in the identification and rating of criteria by which strategies produced are to be assessed.

7. Assist in the specification of the output to be obtained through the design team.

8. Assist in implementation procedures of the program design.

Since the number of decision makers involved in these activities will probably be numerous, a subset of the decision maker category will be formed to serve as a synthesis team. Composition of this team will include several major decision makers from within the system and, for credibility and needed broader scope, one or more persons of high professional caliber from outside the system should be included. This is particularly necessary since there will undoubtedly be many decision makers involved with different amounts of time available. This sub-group will analyze and synthesize
the information provided by the input evaluation team, and this provides a formal communication mechanism. The synthesis will result in written and verbal reports at designated times throughout the input evaluation. Specific responsibilities of this sub-group of decision makers will include:

1. Preparation of a report which contains general specifications for the input evaluation.

2. Preparation of a report containing capabilities and constraints of the system within which the program design to be developed would ultimately be placed.

3. Preparation of a report containing capabilities and constraints of the system within which the program design to be developed would ultimately be placed.

4. Preparation of a report which contains criteria and their weight assignment for assessing the strategies developed by the advocate teams.

5. Preparation of a report which contains specifications for the design team output.

6. Preparation of a report containing implementation activities for selected design.

Readers who wish to know more about the specific responsibilities of the decision makers and evaluator within input evaluation are encouraged to read the dissertation entitled, *Educational Evaluation Training Needs of Superintendents of Schools*.4

8. Input Evaluation Team

Although the actual number of persons on an input evaluation team may vary, and one person may serve in more than one role,

---

depending on the scope of the project. There can be identified three necessary roles which have specific responsibilities. These roles are as follows: director, input evaluator specialist, and input evaluation resource person. The director of the team will supervise the work of his team, and be the principle person engaging in interface activities with the decision makers and the synthesis team. Specific responsibilities of the director include:

1. Providing conceptual leadership in the development of the input evaluation design.
2. Allocating work responsibilities to the specialist and resource person.
3. Providing needed information for report generation by the synthesis team.
4. Developing and conducting an orientation session for advocate and design teams.
5. Facilitating the selection and conduction of advocate teams and design teams through efficient management procedures.
6. Providing conceptual assistance to the specialist and resource person in their responsibilities.

The input evaluation specialist will be primarily concerned with the obtaining of information. This person will provide the technical expertise needed to implement an evaluation using advocate teams. Specific responsibilities of the input evaluation specialist include:

1. Designing instruments and collecting information on the system's capabilities and constraints.
2. Operationalization of criteria that have been identified for assessing the strategies.
3. Development of a procedure whereby criteria are assigned weights or priority.


5. Assessment of strategies developed by the advocate teams.

6. Development of a procedure and necessary instrumentation for the assessment of the design team output.

7. Assessment of the design.

The third role within the input evaluation team is that of the input evaluation resource person. This person will provide the necessary resource link between the input team and those people serving on the advocate and design teams. He, in essence, is a human computer which both the advocate and design team can turn to for data during their actual writing sessions. The value of this person's responsibilities increases as the degree of prior familiarity with the system and proposed program development of the advocate and design team members decrease. Specific responsibilities for the resource person are as follows:

1. Analysis and summary of relevant documents.

2. Familiarization with relevant literature.

3. Compilation of a list of documents or other resources which teams may request which includes actual documents and answers to questions formulated by the team members themselves.

4. Development of an effective retrieval system of resource information.

5. Development and running of a simulation exercise at the orientation session designed to demonstrate how the resource person is to be used and what the nature of the resources are.

6. Obtaining resource information needed by teams during session if requested.
7. Assisting in the data collection activities of the specialist.

C. Advocate Team Members

Depending on the number of teams to be used, a certain number of people will serve as either chairmen or members of advocate teams. The primary purpose of this group is to develop competing strategies designed to accomplish a specific set of predetermined objectives. The chairman of each team will provide leadership and allocate tasks as well as coordinate the efforts which will eventually result in their strategy. Specific responsibilities of the advocate teams are as follows:

1. Become familiar with their task by studying documents.
2. Attend and participate in an advocate team orientation session.
3. Communicate with resource person regarding other information needed.
4. Attend writing sessions and actively participate in the strategy development.
5. Review, critique, and edit rough draft of strategy upon completion.

D. Design Team

After the alternative strategies have been developed and assessed, another group of people will be involved as a design team. The functions of this team will differ depending upon the results of the evaluation provided by the input evaluation team and the decisions made by the synthesis team. If the synthesis team feels that the evaluations clearly indicate a choice of one strategy over
the others, an Operationalization Design team will be formed. If, however, none of the strategies are clearly superior, but all contain some good elements, the decision makers may request the formation of a Convergence Operationalization Design team. The first responsibility of the convergence team would be to take those elements from each strategy viewed as valuable and put them together to form a third composite strategy. From that point on the responsibilities of both the operationalization and convergence design teams are the same i.e.:

1. To study documents provided by input evaluation team.
2. To attend and participate in a Design Team Orientation Session.
3. To operationalize the objectives and develop a procedural design for implementing the program.
4. To develop an evaluation design which would be implemented with the program, including identification of potential barriers.
5. To develop a specific budget.

E. Technical Writers

Technical writers are needed to provide support during the actual writing sessions for all teams. These writers are employed in order to optimize the amount of time spent in creative development in the team sessions. In addition, use of technical writers provides the chairmen the unique opportunity to provide conceptual leadership and synthesis to the team's development because he does not have to take copious notes during the sessions. Specific
responsibilities of the technical writers include:

1. Becoming familiar with the content area and tasks assigned to teams.
2. Attending training sessions if held.
3. Attending the orientation session and agreeing on his or her role with the team members.
4. Developing and implementing a procedure of information return to the members while in session.
5. Writing a rough draft of the strategies.
6. Writing and editing the final product based on reactions of team members on rough draft.

III FUNCTIONS RELATING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF INPUT EVALUATION USING ADVOCATE AND DESIGN TEAMS

This section of the manual consists of five parts. The first part contains a discussion of the problem of criteria. A separate section seemed in order since criteria will be used throughout the input evaluation. The second part contains a systems model flowchart which provides an overview of the basic procedural steps. The third, fourth, and fifth parts describe guidelines and procedural steps for the first, second, and third functions of input evaluation.

A. The Problem of Criteria

A separate part on criteria in general is appropriate for the following reasons: 1) The nature of criteria is often misinterpreted or unclear, and 2) the importance of criteria within input evaluation is paramount. The purpose of this section is to present
a definition of criteria, and to present an exemplar classification scheme of criteria.

Webster defines a criterion as "a standard, rule, or test by which a judgment of something can be formed." In this particular case, the "something" is the strategies and design produced by the advocate and design teams. The criterion problem is one of devising the "test of preferredness." The problem of criteria would not exist if the test of preferredness were a relatively simple criterion such as length. If length were operationalized to mean the number of pages, then selection of an advocate team strategy would depend entirely upon length. However, to use criterion of length as the only test of what is preferred is not reasonable. In order for decision makers to make the best choices about resources and programs, they need to know the range of alternative programs available, and they need to identify reasonable criteria to apply to the alternatives in order to make a judgment. A criterion may thus be defined as "the test of preferredness which will serve as the basis for choosing among multiple alternatives."

The problem in identification and selection of criteria exists because in most educational situations, what is preferred involves multiple criteria, which are often not explicitly stated. For criteria, if not already obvious, are often directly related to values. The P.D.K. Study Committee on Evaluation relates criteria
to values in the following way:

We may look upon criteria as being yardsticks for values. Values themselves are pre-defined status of certain variables that occur in our real and ideal worlds. In any frame of reference, a variable (object, thought, precept, function, process, what have you) will have a specific ideal form. This ideal form is the value. The criterion for the value states a means of measuring the variables to see whether it matches the ideal form.6

The authors go on to identify four kinds of values which affect identification and selection of criteria: Institutional values, values external to the institution, subsystem maintenance values, and personal values. Table 11 contains a hypothetical public school example of how value statements can be converted into criteria.

Another problem which is inherent in the criteria problem is related to the system's concept of suboptimization.7 Because it is almost impossible to analyze a total system, analysis is made only on a part of a system. Such is the case when advocate and decision teams are used in input evaluation, for the program developed by these teams will fit into a larger system. Although developing and assessing a subsystem results in great specificity, difficulties arise relating to selection of criteria because selection of criteria for the subsystem may be inconsistent with criteria


7The suboptimization concern was identified from McKlean, op. cit., pp. 82-84. Adoption of ideas to input evaluation was completed by the author of this manual. Readers who would like to study problems of criteria are directed to this source as well as R. N. McKlean, Efficiency in Government Through Systems Analysis, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967), pp. 25-50.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Value (Example)</th>
<th>Possible Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institution value: &quot;We (the Board of Education) want to know if the program makes a difference or doesn't--Accountability is the name of the game!&quot;</td>
<td>1. Testability: the degree to which the proposed program is amenable to testing for potential effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Values external to the system: &quot;We (the parents) are sick of schools experimenting with our kids.&quot;</td>
<td>2. Sociomoral visibility: the degree to which the proposed program is in congruence with the target community mores and standards of morals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subsystem maintenance value: &quot;We (the teachers) just can't take on any more--we're too busy now!&quot;</td>
<td>3. Compatibility: the degree to which the proposed program relates to and supports other programs already implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal value: &quot;I (the superintendent) will make this system the &quot;Cherry Creek* of the East if it is the last thing I do!&quot;</td>
<td>4. Innovativeness: the degree to which the proposed program is novel and different.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This refers to the Cherry Creek school system in Colorado, which is known for its innovative practices.
generated for the entire system. For example, suppose that an educational lab used advocate teams to develop competing strategies designed to prevent high drop-out rates for secondary migrant students. Further suppose that criteria such as cost benefits, sociomoral viability, and practicality were among the criteria used which resulted in the selection of a strategy of reimbursement to migrant students for remaining in school. Although this strategy may be the most cost-effective and practical solution for preventing drop-outs of migrant students, it is inconsistent with the criteria of the larger system since the lab is a development lab and its mission is to engage in development activities which result in tangible products such as curriculum materials. Therefore, the criteria for assessing the subsystem, the migrant drop-out strategy, must be consistent with the criteria of the larger system, the lab mission and product orientation.

Although selection of criteria is a most difficult task, the prospect of selecting "good" criteria can be increased by awareness of potential errors in criteria selection. Major errors are presented below:\textsuperscript{8}

1. The best for the least error. Within this type of error criteria are selected to maximize gains and minimize losses. The following statement provides an example: The best education for all children at minimum cost. To establish this as criteria is unrealistic and impossible; for the best education has many facets, some of which we are probably not aware of and minimal may be zero. Here the criteria of best education and minimal cost are assumed as independent while in actuality they are related; however, not necessarily in a causal fashion.

\textsuperscript{8}Quade, \textit{Analysis for Military Decisions}. 
2. Ignoring effects on other operation errors. Within this category of errors are the selection of criteria which does not take into consideration other operations; for example, selection of a modern math program designed to take three full hours a day without taking into consideration how this amount of time spent per day would influence reading program achievements.

3. Ignoring the time dimension error. This category of errors, forgetting the time dimension in the selection of criteria, is common in research and development activities. Selection of criteria to assess proposals for research and development activities often do not include the feasibility of completing the tasks proposed within the funding period or they fail to consider the amount of time needed before products are available.

4. Applying the same criteria to all the programs. Unfortunately, it is impossible to apply the same criteria to all program development. For example, using criteria generated as tests of what is preferred in evaluations, such as internal validity and external validity, would most likely be inappropriate for assessing curriculum programs relating to secondary migrant students. In a like manner, selection of a criterion such as "does the program encompass sound principles of learning" would be inappropriate as a criterion for evaluation.

The content aspect of a criterion is largely dependent upon what the criterion is a test of preferredness for. The example given in the previous paragraph demonstrates this. In other words, there is no such thing as a "good" criterion in itself...criterion is "good" or appropriate only in terms of its relevance to a specific purpose.

The exemplar classification scheme and related criteria which follows is but one of many available. These particular criteria were developed to assess alternative migrant secondary educational programs to be developed by the Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory in Austin, Texas.\(^9\)

1. Cost-benefit criteria
   a. Benefits (including direct and indirect benefits and indirect negative side-effects)
   b. Costs (including money, personnel, and time)

2. Mediating criteria
   a. Innovativeness
   b. Spin-off power
   c. Testability
   d. Practicability
   e. Political viability
   f. Socio-moral viability
   g. Timeliness
   h. Credibility
   i. Recidivism

3. Agency criteria
   a. Product orientation
   b. Visibility
   c. Exportability
   d. Convenience
   e. Compatibility
   f. Legitimacy

\(^9\)Refers to section of "Outline of Information to be included in the Advocacy Statement" prepared by Consultants to the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, (Austin, Texas, unpublished, no author).
Other classification schemas for criteria which have been developed to serve specific purposes are listed next. Readers should refer to the footnotes for the source.

1. Criteria developed to assess State Library long range evaluation and planning activities.  
2. Criteria for evaluating R & D Labs and Centers, Institutions, and Programs.  
3. Criteria developed for an 'acceptable' evaluation.  
4. Criteria to use in educational plan assessment.  
5. Criteria to be used with various elements of the Planned Change Model of Clark and Guba.  

---


15 These references cite sources of objectives, however, criteria statement could be derived from the objective statement. Benjamin S. Bloom, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1956).

The importance of identification of criteria for each specific use is a time consuming and difficult task. However, the implementation of input evaluation is not complete until acceptable criteria are established.

B. The Systems Model Flowchart

The flowchart, Table 12, is designed to show the movement of one function of input evaluation to another. Within each major function, delineating, obtaining, and providing activities, and the major decision points, are graphically shown. The chart also indicates where advocate and design teams are used.

Specific geometric symbols are used to distinguish between the activities and decision points and the numbers (1.0-2.0-3.0) indicate movement from one major function to another.

As the Table indicates, activities 1.0-1.3 are the first major function of input evaluation; identifying and assessing relevant capabilities of the responsible system. Activities within the second function, identifying and assessing alternative strategies for achieving program goals, are identified by 2.0-2.7 and activities 3.0-3.8 are the third function of input evaluation, which is the identification and assessment of a design.

Activities 1.0, 1.3, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, 3.0, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, all relate to delineation activities. Among these activities is the orienting of the advocate and design teams.

Obtaining activities 1.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.4, and 3.6, include actual development of strategies and design during the writing sessions. Therefore, advocate and design teams are used primarily during obtaining activities.
TABLE 12
SYSTEMS MODEL FLOWCHART

- Determine relevant capabilities of the system
- Assess capabilities
- Prepare written report on capabilities for decision makers
- Information provided complete
  - Yes: Prepare specifications for strategy development
    - Identify criteria to be used to assess strategies
      - Orient advocate team to task
      - Conduct advocate team writing session
      - Assess strategies
      - Prepare evaluation report on strategy assessment
        - Evaluation report provided complete
          - Yes: One strategy is selected
            - Yes: Develop specifications for operationalization
              - Design development
            - No: Develop specifications for operationalization
              - Team development
              - Identify criteria for assessing design
                - Orient design team to task
                - Conduct design team writing session
                - Assess design
                - Prepare evaluation report on assessment of design
                  - Evaluation report on design complete
                    - Yes: Make implementation decisions
- Decision Point

Input Evaluation
- Function 1 (1.0 - 1.3) Identify and assess relevant capabilities of the responsible agency
- Function 2 (2.0 - 2.7) Identify and assess alternative strategies for achieving program goals
- Function 3 (3.0 - 3.8) Identify and assess designs for implementing a selected strategy
The three major decision points, 1.3, 2.6, 2.7, 3.7) are go or no-go conditions. In decision point 2.7, for example, suppose that there was a no-go decision made by the decision makers because the strategy assessment did not include information about certain criteria unidentified until now. Recycling of activities to 2.2 or 2.5, then, may be appropriate.

Several cautions should be noted regarding interpretation of Table 12. The decision points are not to be thought of as the only decision points possible during implementation of input evaluation; they should be considered primarily as major decision points which link one function of input evaluation to another. Further, the activities presented can be broken down into many other sub-activities, some of which are discussed in the following sections.

C. Identifying and Assessing Relevant Capabilities

As stated previously, the purpose of input evaluation is to "provide information for determining how to utilize resources to meet program goals." In order for this purpose to be served, one must engage in activities designed to identify and assess relevant capabilities of the system, alternative strategies for achieving program objectives, and designs for implementation of the strategy. This section will deal directly with the first function of input evaluation, identifying and assessing relevant capabilities of the system and will describe in greater detail flowchart numbers (1.0-1.3). The following two sections will deal with the remaining two functions.
First, the beginning of these activities must be preceded by the setting of goals and objectives designed to respond to some perceived need within the system. Such goals and objectives will help set boundaries throughout the input evaluation for 1) the information obtained about the capabilities, 2) the strategies developed by the advocate teams, and 3) the design preceded by the operationalization team. And second, the capabilities of the system refer only to the capabilities relevant to the goals and objectives.

At first glance this first function of input evaluation, identifying and assessing relevant capabilities of the system, may not appear important or related to the other functions. However, it is relevant in that it provides information about resources that are available within the system. This knowledge is taken into consideration in the development of the strategies and designs. Therefore, the probability of the designs effectively using the system's resources is increased. In addition to effectively utilizing resources, knowledge of capabilities by advocate and design teams should result in a design that can be implemented. Strategy and design activities often operate in a vacuum without taking into consideration the capabilities of the system into which the program will be placed. Implementation can result in great confusion when the design is incongruent with the capabilities of the system. In summary, identifying and assessing relevant capabilities is a necessary condition for the development of a design which can be implemented, and which effectively utilizes the systems' resources.
The following paragraphs 1) describe more fully what is meant by capabilities, 2) provide general guidelines in conducting this activity, 3) provide an illustration with exemplar questions to be answered, and 4) provide possible methodological approaches.

The capability of a system is derived from an analysis of the systems' resources related to the objectives for the program to be developed. Capability can be thought of in terms of what the system has and what it does not have. "What it does not have" may be converted into a statement of constraints. Procedural steps for identification and assessment of capabilities should keep the following guidelines in mind:

1. Capabilities should relate to the set of objectives of the program to be developed. This means that there must be a logical link between the capabilities and the objectives.

2. The capabilities should be identified and assessed through some systematic procedure. A design for activities within this function should be developed. This will increase the probability that the information will be complete and available when needed.

   a. Utilization of a system's framework may provide help in setting the boundaries around capability information collection. For example, Gerald Nadler suggests the following elements of a system: function, inputs, outputs, sequence, environment, physical catalysts, and human agents.17

   b. In the designing of activities to achieve information about a system's capabilities, keep in mind the purpose. Try to put yourself in the shoes of the advocate and design team members—what would they need to know, or what might they ask about the system's capabilities?

17 Gerald Nadler, Work Design: A Systems Concept, (Madison, Wisconsin, Richard D. Irwin, Inc.)
3. Anticipate how the data on capabilities can be put into a storage and retrieval system for advocate and design teams to use during their writing sessions.

4. Do not use tunnel vision in the study of the system's capabilities. For example, if a program within a school system is being developed, look to institutions outside the schools, such as neighboring universities, for resources which might be available.

As an illustration of the kinds of information needed, the following situation is posed. Assume that a school system wishes to revise their elementary (K-3) school program so that it would be more responsive to the educational needs of migrant students. Advocate and design teams are employed to separate the program, specify procedures for administration, and describe staff development. The following list of evaluative questions is a sample of many that relate to relevant system capabilities:

1. What is the present level of teacher's training in working with migrant students?

2. How much money is available for the entire program?

3. What instructional materials are available which might be used with migrant students?

4. What are the physical characteristics of the buildings in which the program will be held?

5. Does the neighboring universities offer course work on the educational needs of migrant students?

6. Is released time available for in-service training?

7. Are there mechanisms in operation for communication of the program to the community?

8. Are there legal conditions in the teacher's contract which would affect in-service training?
9. At what times are the school buildings open? Can this be changed if necessary?

10. Will paraprofessional (teacher aides) be available for use in these rooms?

11. What does the literature cite as pressing educational needs for migrant students?

12. What are unique characteristics of migrant students within district (attendance, parents' education, etc.)?

13. How many bilingual teachers exist within the system?

Several means of data collection to identify relevant capabilities can be used. The first is a brainstorming session. Using the migrant education example above, the groups would include administrators, teachers, and parents. In addition, insights might be provided by school librarians, clergy, secretaries, janitors, and bus drivers. The lead-in for the brainstorming session may simply be, "What resources can you think of which respond to the educational needs of migrant students?" and "What don't we have that may constrain migrant education program?" Another source of capability identification might stem from a review of literature related to the theoretical bases of various alternatives in elementary education and how they would respond to migrant education. For example, an analysis of Lillian Weber's book, *The English Infant School and Informal Education* and its applicability to needs of migrant students may be useful.18

---

With these leads, the input evaluation team could construct an inventory of the relevant capabilities. This may be accomplished by completing a form for every capability identified as relevant. A suggested form completed using the migrant education setting described previously is presented in Table 13.

In the upper right hand corner the capability identification source appears. This refers to the source of the nomination, a book, teacher, etc. The total document number refers to the total report of results, an abstract of which is given in item 4 of the form. Item 1 is simply a description of the capability, while 2 asks for a reason why the capability is relevant, i.e., how does it relate to the program to be developed? Item 3 describes how the capability was assessed in abstract form, and item 4 describes the results of the assessment. Item 5 is included as an example of how one might begin early to set up a storage and retrieval system for the input evaluation resource person to administer during the actual writing sessions. A rather simplistic design would be to identify categories, and then to file 3 x 5 cards containing the capability description and abstract of the results. Information to be put on the 3 x 5 cards might include only, 1) total document reference number, 2) description of capability, and 3) results abstract.

A list of constraints can be derived from an analysis of the capabilities of the system. Groups of have nots in one area might form a constraint. To follow the example further, if there were
no teachers within the system with knowledge of Spanish, and if the budget could not provide sufficient funds to bring in bilingual teachers, together these would probably form a constraint on the type of program to be developed.

In summary, the input evaluation team, with assistance from the decision makers and other groups, will obtain the needed information for the capability identification and assessment. In addition, the input evaluation team will provide information related to the capabilities and potential constraints to the synthesis team. The synthesis team will then write a report based upon the evaluative data which identifies the capabilities and constraints.
TABLE 13
EXEMPLARY CAPABILITY INVENTORY FORM

Source: ___________ teacher ____________

*Total Document Number: 16

1. Description of proposed capability:

   Spanish speaking expertise of teachers in system:

2. How does the proposed capability relate to the program to be developed?

   The number of Spanish speaking teachers within the system may influence type of program developed.

3. How was capability assessed?

4. Abstract of results: *

   Of the 200 teachers within the system in grades kindergarten through third grade, the following estimates of knowledge of Spanish were obtained:

   40 - teachers speak and write Spanish fluently.

   20 - teachers have some knowledge and skill in speaking Spanish.

   140 - teachers have no expertise in Spanish.

5. Cross-referenced under the following categories:
   A. _________ staff development _________
   B. _________ language development _________
   C. _________ bilingual teacher preparation _________
D. Identifying and Assessing Alternative Strategies

The second function of input evaluation, the identification and assessing of alternative strategies for achieving program goals, calls for the use of advocate teams. These teams are used to create the alternative strategies. Methodological approaches for the identification and assessment aspects of this process follow the presentation of overall guidelines:

1. Guidelines

The following seven guidelines set forth some concerns which potential users of advocate teams should be aware of initially:

a) Effective use of advocate teams does not happen by chance. The process requires careful planning and effective implementation.

b) The output from the advocate teams, although influenced by other factors, is largely determined by the selection of the team members and chair. Therefore, selection decisions should be made with care.

c) Although background information will be needed by advocate teams in order to produce useful strategies, the amount and nature of previous documentation should be screened carefully. Indiscriminate use of materials will result in cognitive overload for the team members—a common and very serious problem.

d) Users of advocate teams will invariably be in a dilemma about how much structure to impose on the strategy development. Too much structure may stifle the creativity of the group and too little may result in useless strategies.

e) Effective use of advocate teams' creativity is somewhat dependent upon availability of administrative support during the writing sessions. For example, an hour of a team member's time spent looking for needed blackboards means one hour less of creative input on the task.
f) When advocate teams convene for the actual writing sessions, a certain amount of time will be spent initially in getting to know each other so that the members may function as a group. The amount of time needed varies with each combination of people.

g) The process of identification of criteria and assessment of the strategies requires a close working relationship between the decision makers and the members of the input evaluation team.

2. Strategy Identification Procedural Steps

The following paragraphs contain procedures designed to serve as a framework for advocate team use. Alternative strategies result when the following five tasks are completed: 1) selection of advocate team members and chairmen, 2) selection and distribution of documents, 3) development of specification, 4) holding of an orientation session, 5) completion of the actual writing sessions, and 6) follow-up review and editing. Each of these elements will be presented separately.

Selection of Advocate Team Members and Chairmen. Because of its importance, selection of advocate team members should be preceded by identification and application of criteria. In part IA advocate teams were defined in two slightly different ways. The difference was based on criteria for selecting team members. Therefore, first to be decided is which type of advocate team is needed. If teams which represent differing theoretical and philosophical positions are desired, then one criterion for selection would be whether a potential team member is an advocate of the appropriate view. Before the decision is made to use persons who advocate differing theoretical
and philosophical positions prior to strategy development, several questions need to be answered. First, is the state of the art of the field from which differing theoretical and philosophical positions are being selected sufficiently advanced so that truly different strategies will be identified? If the answer to this question is "yes," then the second question becomes, "Which of the differing positions should be selected?" This may mean that perhaps all positions should be placed on a continuum and a sample of those along the continuum be selected. Arraying the results of strategies developed by teams advocating different positions and looking for commonalities and differences would be one way of using the resulting strategies. Thus, representativeness is an important consideration for that factor and will in part shape the outcomes.

Criteria also need be defined if it is decided to use an advocate team defined in the other way, that is, a group of persons selected to develop strategies which, upon completion, they would advocate as an answer to a given set of objectives. The above criterion of having a certain theoretical and philosophical position would probably not be used but other possible criteria which might be used are:
1) academic credibility with peers, 2) evidence of innovative thinking, 3) interest and knowledge of program content, 4) task orientation, 5) ability to work in groups, and 6) availability.

Selection of chairmen for the advocate teams might be based on the above six criteria as well as the following: 1) ability to move a group, 2) ability to recognize a break-through when it
happens, 3) evidence of group process skills, and 4) known administrative ability.

There are other issues involved in advocate team selection. First, should persons on the teams have worked together previously? Although the output of an advocate team does not require that members have worked together before, certainly the amount of time spent in establishing group working patterns would be less if the persons on the team had previously successfully worked together. On the other hand, a more creative strategy may be developed by a team without previous contact. A second issue becomes, 'Should advocate teams represent different backgrounds?' Having members with different content area backgrounds may result in new perspectives in program development; however, if the backgrounds are too diverse, communication breakdown may lessen the productivity of the group. In selecting team members is it wise for the chairman to select his team members? One procedure would be to select the chairmen first, who then have veto power over other selections, or who selects the team members of his or her choice. Given a veto power, most chairmen will gladly consider offered candidates; thus, team selection can be an interactive process to select an optimum set of participants. The final issue is whether members of advocate teams should be selected from outside the system or from inside the system. This concern is directly related to other factors, such as if there is money to bring in outside people. Selection of people from inside the system would be beneficial in that it would involve people who would help in
Implementation early in the program development, which is a sound principle of educational change. However, selection of members from outside the system would lend objectivity and credibility as well as other perspectives.

The final issue related to the selection of the advocate team members is that of number. Generally, a range of four to six people is best, for if there is less than four, it is often difficult to break into small groups of any size during the actual writing sessions. And, if there are more than six, the large group sessions are difficult to manage and often the inputs from all of the members cannot be accommodated. Another number concern is how many advocate teams should be used. Users must employ at least two advocate teams; however, more than four advocate teams may be very difficult to implement. Thus, for most users, two or three teams is the best number. A further concern is whether the teams should meet simultaneously.

Document Selection and Distribution - In most cases it would be beneficial to send out selected documents to advocate team members prior to the orientation and writing sessions. Selection of documents should result from a careful screening for relevance of what advocate team members should know or have background in so as to help them produce a better strategy. It is suggested that for each document distributed there be attached a brief abstract. In addition, if more than several documents are deemed relevant and necessary as background material, a summary list of all the documents
and some attached rating of priority should be provided. Examples of documents which may be necessary background material for advocate teams are described as follows:

1) Historical background of the subsystem into which the program to be developed will be placed.

2) Important antecedent events which lead to the utilization of advocate teams to generate the strategies.

3) Where the advocate team's involvement comes within the entire study.

4) Evaluations of related programs which illuminate problems that might have implications for the program to be developed.

5) Important information about the relevant capabilities of the system which were generated in the first function of input evaluation.

6) The advocate team design specifications (this will be dealt with in detail in the following sections).

Most of the materials described above could be sent out prior to the orientation session. And additional ideas for relevant documents may be elicited from the advocate team members themselves.

Development of Specifications for Designing Advocate Strategies.

Using the information provided by the input evaluation team, the synthesis team should develop a statement which specifies what the advocate teams are to produce. This document may be referred to as "The Charge to the Advocate Team." Generally, specific items within this document would include a statement of the goal, that is, what the end product is to be. In addition to the goal statement, there should also be a list of objectives. The degree of specificity of the objectives is a matter of concern for the more specific the
objectives are, the more structure that is imposed on the advocate teams which may lower creativity. Therefore, the objectives should probably be stated in rather general form. The advocate teams can specify them in greater detail as one of their initial tasks. Another element of the "Charge" would be a statement of any givens or constraints which the advocate teams will be forced to work within, such as prior developmental work which needs to be fitted into the strategy development. Another element of the "Charge" would be the statement of criteria upon which the strategies will be assessed. These criteria, which will be discussed in length in the assessment activities section provide a framework for advocate teams to consider in their strategy development. It may also be beneficial for the advocate teams to complete a "self report" on how they feel their strategy answers or has components which deal directly with the criteria after they complete their work. Potential users of the advocate team approach should also consider the development of a format statement. The format statement would essentially identify the elements and the sequence of the elements in the report coming from the advocate team sessions. For example, all the reports could start with a statement of the mission. Although a format statement may be beneficial for the assessment of the strategies, it should be remembered that utilization of a format will add more structure that takes away degrees of freedom in advocate team development. Thus, the "Charge" should provide just enough structure so that the strategy developed will communicate and be comparable
with the other strategy reports.

In summary, then, the "Charge to the Advocate Team" should include the following elements: 1) goal statement, 2) objectives (general), 3) statement of "givens" (if any), 4) list of criteria, and 5) format outline.

The Orientation Session. An obvious way to orient team members to their task is to conduct an orientation session. The length of this session is dependent upon many factors, such as the complexity of task, prior knowledge of the advocate team members of the system's capabilities and of the program to be developed, and the amount of money available. Minimum time for an orientation session would probably be one full day, however, this could be extended to two days. When to conduct an orientation session is another concern. It seems beneficial to conduct the orientation several weeks in advance to the actual writing session. This provides what could be called an "incubation period" for team members in that after the orientation session, members return to their local sites, reflect on the happenings of the session, possibly review previous writings which would be related, and integrate the task assignment prior to the actual development of the strategies. An agenda for an advocate team orientation session might include the following:

1) A brief overview of antecedents.

2) A statement of the "Charge" by the major decision makers. It is recommended that major decision makers present the "Charge to the Advocate Team" to the team members. This provides an opportunity for the team to hear it directly from the people who have commissioned the study. Also, with the decision makers present, there is opportunity to question
the nature of the "Charge." The orientation session should be viewed as an interactive session rather than only a presentation session. Question and answer times should be built into the agenda and the atmosphere should be conducive to eliciting free flow of questions and answers. In fact, it might be said that if questions are not generated by advocate team members, two things are possible, either the task is very clear, and there are no questions, or they do not understand the task. It would be beneficial if leading questions were generated ahead of time which would give the decision makers and the input evaluation team some indication of whether the teams do, in fact, understand their task.

3) Discussions and demonstrations of the support services, that is, the use of the input evaluation resource person, technical writer, and the administrative support person should not just be presented or identified. Rather, actual procedures should be demonstrated through exercises. For example, the input evaluation resource person who will be serving as the human computer for relevant capabilities of the system might develop a simulation exercise in which the team members can participate to find out exactly what types of information are available on capabilities. In like manner, team members should have an opportunity to meet with the technical writers in order to set a communication procedure prior to the writing sessions.

4) Opportunity for team members to meet in individual teams. Team members need an opportunity to confer about the nature of the task and to identify any information they may need in addition to that which has been provided.

The Actual Writing Sessions. Actual writing sessions for advocate team members are obviously essential. Elements which must be considered in running the writing sessions will now be described. If possible, the setting of the session should be in a resort area or in a hotel outside of the system in which the strategy would eventually be implemented. The exact setting may be dependent upon factors such as available funds and facilities, however, the setting should be somewhere where advocate team members are comfortable and are not
interrupted. Having the sessions at a hotel or a resort area outside of the immediate area would provide an additional element in that eating and living in the same place could extend the amount of time members could actually discuss and conceptualize the strategy.

A second element is that of how long advocate team writing sessions should be. Although this is dependent upon the complexity of the task, and the availability of persons to some extent, usually advocate team writing sessions require three to five days.

Another key element is whether or not advocate teams should meet at the same time or different times. It may be advantageous to have all teams work at the same time in that all reports are available within a shorter time frame. However, having teams work simultaneously requires that many support persons such as technical writers, input resource persons, and secretaries will have to be used. This may mean extensive training for support service personnel so that equally qualified persons are available for all advocate teams.

The fourth element, administrative support, includes providing material resources such as 3 x 5 cards, rolls of paper for making large charts, chalkboards, magic markers, etc. In addition, the administrative support may include a person to take care of details such as making arrangements for lunch and supervising secretarial help, etc.

Another support service is that provided by the technical writers. If technical writers are used, they should provide feedback early in the sessions. This feedback would assure the members that the
writers are credible, that the content they record is accurate and reflects the content expressed by the team members themselves. It would be beneficial for the technical writers to set up a system whereby they give feedback to the group whenever they ask for it.

In addition, at the start of each day, the technical writers should present what occurred the previous day relative to both group activity and content. Some team members may prefer stenographic assistance rather than a technical writer. If this is the case, the chairmen would be responsible for the actual writing of the report. The decision of whether to use technical writers or stenographers should be made by the chairmen of the teams.

The effectiveness of a technical writer is largely dependent upon several factors such as, 1) the technical writer's knowledge of the content area and awareness of the context in which the program will be implemented, 2) his or her ability to synthesize meaning, i.e., the ability to take comments of the advocate team, hear and read between the lines, and put them together in a form which is not merely a sum of the parts, 3) an ability to work and produce effectively under time pressure, and 4) an ability to write clearly. It may be necessary to provide training for technical writers in which taped exercises are used.

The effectiveness of the input evaluation resource person largely depends upon the comprehensiveness of the original study of capabilities and the achievement of objectives set for the simulation sessions. It is important to set down certain ground rules
for the use of the resource person to avoid contamination. One advocate team strategy should not be contaminated by the other strategy development team through the input resource person. The input evaluation resource person should be seen as the person who has knowledge and information, which is available upon request. Therefore, it would be out of line for the resource person to say, "I have some information on the testing program which the other team considered most valuable, do you want it?"

3. Strategy Assessment Procedural Steps

Problems related to criteria identification, in general, were set forth in section III, part B. The purpose of this section is to set forth procedures which result in the selection of a strategy or the selection and convergence of sections of both strategies. To obtain information needed in order to make this decision, the following procedural steps should be completed prior to strategy development:

1) Delineation of relevant criteria
2) Operationalization of criteria
3) Weighting of criteria
4) Identification of interpretation rules
5) Identification of decision rules

Each of these are described individually.

Delineation of Relevant Criteria. The major steps involved in the delineation of relevant criteria may include holding iterative sessions with major decision makers in the system who will make
selection decisions. If the prior involvement of the decision makers in criteria delineation has been limited, all the following procedural steps might be undertaken by the input evaluation team.

1) Conduct and tape an initial session with decision makers in which two questions are asked: 1) "What would you like to see in the strategies being developed?" and 2) "What are you afraid you will see in the strategies being developed?" The evaluator running this session should focus the discussion so that it doesn't center around content, i.e., "I would like to see a program that uses community persons as teachers aides rather than using community persons in an ombudsman role." This is a content example, but the statement, "I'd like to see a program that involves a large number of community persons," could be converted into a criterion. In addition to staying away from content wants (that's why advocate teams are to be used), the person running the session would probably need to ask for clarification. For example, having a decision maker say that he wants a program that "works," would need clarification, for what he or she means by "works" could probably be converted into a criterion.

2) Following the above session, the evaluator could perform a logical analysis of the value statements and pull out statements which might be converted into criteria. The results of this analysis would be presented at another session with the decision makers, and the list would be expanded and refined.

3) In addition to using the decision makers, the evaluator should go to other sources such as the literature, outside experts and other related reference groups within the system.

4) In another meeting with the decision makers a composite list of criteria from all the sources should be determined.

Operationalization of Criteria. Operationalization refers to the process of taking a criterion and converting it into a criterion variable which implies the measurement element. For example, operationalization of the criterion of legality may mean approval of the strategies by the system's lawyers. Below other examples are provided
by Egon Guba and John Horvat (the criterion is in parentheses):

...dollars (cost), number of required personnel already available in-house (availability of personnel), approval by the Commissioner of Education (political viability), or judgment of a five-man panel representing important reference groups (success probability).19

The process of operationalizing the criteria is, as with the identification activities, the result of interactions with the decision makers.

Weighting of Criteria. All criteria do not have the same importance. For this reason, the next procedural step in the assessment activities is that of assigning weights to the criterion variables. One alternative way would be to have the criteria ranked in order of importance by a panel of judges who may be selected from key decision makers. In this case, the judges would simply put a numerical rank next to each criterion. The ranking of one would indicate that that criterion was most valuable in assessing the strategies, and the ranking of two the next most valuable, etc.

Another alternative would be a ranking of the criteria by the judges. In this case, a scale of perhaps 1-10 representing a continuum from little value to maximum value would be developed. The judges in this case would be asked to rate each criterion on this scale.

More complex means of weight assignment to criteria can result from a series of partial comparisons or successive comparison as

Identification of Interpretation Rules. Interpretation rules can be defined as "...a rule for interpreting information obtained in relation to any criterion variable. These rules specify what should be done in relation to any outcome, e.g., reject alternative if its cost exceeds $10,000." Interpretation rules are worked out with the decision makers prior to the assessment of the strategies. However, it may be necessary to rework these rules upon analysis of the strategies developed by advocate teams. The interpretation rules may be dichotomous (e.g., legality), in which case the rule would be "reject if strategy is illegal." Often, however, a criterion variable will need to be assessed on a continuum. For example, the criterion of cost may result in a rating of high, medium, and low. A rating of high may mean over $500,000, medium $250,000, and low under $100,000. Rules for this criterion may be, 1) reject if rated high, or 2) continue to consider strategy if rating is medium or low. Absolute interpretation rules should be provided to the advocate team prior to strategy development. Team members should know, for example, that if the cost of their strategy exceeds $500,000 it will be rejected.

Identification of Decision Rules. A decision rule provides information on how to combine information based on the criterion


variables so that the strategy selection or convergence decision can be made. A decision rule is relatively easy to construct if every criterion rating can be converted into a number to be multiplied by the criterion weight, and then summed. The strategy with the highest total score could then be selected. However, one must remember that multiple decision rules operate in this case. That is, what is wanted is a basis for determining if one strategy is clearly better than the other, or if there are elements in both strategies which should be converged. A total sum would not provide information on the latter concern, and may not indicate that a strategy is clearly better.

Actual Assessment Procedures. The actual assessment of the strategies is a crucial aspect of input evaluation. Selection of assessment procedures is dependent upon three factors, cost, time, and the quality of information needed. In addition, in some circumstances, politics may be an additional factor. Basically, the types of data collected may range from judgmental to empirical data while data sources may range from several persons to a large number of persons. A series of illustrative means of analyzing strategies is not provided:

1. Judgmental data from a small group.
   a) In one of the case studies on advocate team use, completed prior to writing this manual, two evaluators applied a set of weighted criteria by first constructing a four point evidence rating scale shown below:
The evaluators then provided independent evidence ratings for each criterion for both strategies. The evidence rating for each criterion was multiplied by the assigned weight. The strategy with the highest sum of evidence rating times the weight determined the selection of the strategy.

b) There are other means of applying the criteria by a small group. For example, a task force of representatives from various reference groups or a group of so-called "experts" might meet together and begin their application of criteria for each strategy by independently describing the criteria in terms of each strategy. A compilation of the descriptions might be portrayed through an information matrix. An excellent example of what is meant by an information matrix was developed by John Horvat and Egon Guba in connection with their work with an educational laboratory. The two alternative strategies compared were a teachers' aide program and an ombudsman program. Although the example was developed for a slightly different purpose than when

---

using it for advocate strategy assessment, it is applicable. The information matrix is composed of three parts, the criterion, the Aide Program description in relation to each criterion, and the ombudsman program in relation to each criterion. Only selected criteria have been extracted and placed in Table 14.

c) In the first case study example an evidence scale was used with the criteria. A variety of other scales could be used by small groups. In the Guba, Horvat working paper series, a scale of acceptability was proposed. This scale ranged from non-acceptable to very highly acceptable. Simulated ratings were obtained and used in preparation of a profile. A section of the profile is presented in Table 15 and serves as an example of how alternative strategy assessments based on ratings may be presented. Profiles may be presented in various groups. This example has clustered those criteria generally interpreted as costs. Another cluster might be those criteria which have the highest rankings in terms of importance.

---

23Ibid (pages not numbered).
### TABLE 14

#### SAMPLE INFORMATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION</th>
<th>AIDE PROGRAM</th>
<th>OMBUDSMAN PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost (C)</strong></td>
<td>Plan is for 60 aides in 5 schools for a two year period. Each aide to work 6 hrs. per day for a total of 360 days + 20 days initial training period @ $1.25/hr.</td>
<td>Plan is to train and pay salaries of 5 full-time ombudsmen for two year @ $12,000/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aide salaries: $171,000</td>
<td>Salaries: $120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of initial training: 3,000</td>
<td>Training costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly training sessions: 72 @ $100/each 7,200</td>
<td>$2,000/each man: 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aide recruitment: $3,000</td>
<td>Office costs @ $1,500/yr. each: 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fringe benefits: 10% $17,100</td>
<td>Travel @ $500/yr. each: 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and admin: 60,000</td>
<td>Fringe benefits: 10% 12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning, development &amp; administration: 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Dollar Costs: $251,300</td>
<td>Total Dollar Costs: $222,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIRECT BENEFITS (B)</strong></td>
<td>Promotes self-improvement of the parents selected as aides.</td>
<td>Promotes self-improvement of the parents selected as ombudsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May provide for some leadership personnel within the migrant community—likely to involve only women, however.</td>
<td>Provides a parental power base for activity in areas of community life other than education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEGATIVE EFFECTS (N)</strong></td>
<td>Runs the risk of coopting a few parents and alienating many others if aides are seen as sellouts to the &quot;establishment.&quot;</td>
<td>Runs the high risk of angering the existing power and policy-making figures because of the surveillance and questioning of their actions and motives that is certain to occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May force changes that are not welcome by majority groups.</td>
<td>May force changes that are not welcome by majority groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONVENIENCE (C)</strong></td>
<td>Very high—right down the pipe in terms of what has been done in the past. A good deal is known about aides and consultants are available—familiar territory.</td>
<td>Very low to low—little in-house experience with ombudsmen, very few consultants, very few models to follow, and not a large number of references to study. New or (neo-mobilistic) territory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 15
PROFILE
COST FACTOR COMPARISONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Acceptability</th>
<th>Cost in Funds</th>
<th>Personnel Requirements</th>
<th>Negative Side Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = Ombudsman Strategy
A = Aide Strategy
2. Judgmental data from a large group.

a) In another case study, state-wide participation in the assessment of strategies is planned. Advocate teams were used to develop alternative state strategic plans for the Gifted in the State of Illinois. The project which developed the state plans was also commissioned to prepare a series of dissemination materials designed to seek input from interested educators and laymen throughout the entire state. These materials included: a Mass Media Package (newspaper article, radio and television announcement for town meetings); a Basic Information Package (color film which summarized the alternatives and popularized pamphlet); Town Meeting Package (including instructions for conducting a town meeting, discussion guide, etc.); and finally a Participant Input Questionnaire (including structured and open ended questions). Structured questions centered around checking the plan which best described a respondent's attitudes toward various elements of the plan such as target population, distribution of funds, service centers, etc. The unstructured element asked for modifications in the plan chosen so that it would provide better description of a respondent's attitude.\(^{24}\)

\(^{24}\)Refers to final report by M. J. Conrad et al., The Right to Excel: A Replanning Study of the Illinois Plan for Program Development for Gifted Children, (presented to the State Department of Illinois by the Educational Administration Faculty, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, August, 1972).
b) Another possible means of collecting judgmental data from a large group of persons might be through the use of a Delphi Technique in the application of criteria to the strategies. The first round of the Delphi may include just having the respondents apply each criterion to all the strategies using the same rating scale. The second round may include the criteria and group ratings. In this second round, respondents may be asked to rate each strategy on each criterion and then to provide reasons for their ratings if their rating was higher or lower than the group's rating. Additional rounds may be needed in order to reach consensus. The Delphi may also be used in connection with the information matrix previously described. Statements about each criterion in relation to the strategies may be presented to respondents for ratings so that larger group inputs can be collected of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each strategy.25

3. Empirical data collection in a simulated setting.

a) Empirical data may be obtained by collecting empirical data on criteria through simulated program and population application. For example, if advocate teams developed

alternative evaluation systems for assessing the nation's R & D Centers and Lab Institutions and Programs, a simulated set of reports, documents from a hypothetical lab or center may be processed through both of the strategies proposed and empirical data on criteria may be obtained.

b) It may also be possible to conduct a case study on a program which is in existence that is similar to a strategy developed and has a comparable population. In this particular case study, the investigator would want to collect empirical data on the criteria, as well as how well the program matches the proposed strategy.

4. Collection of real empirical data. It may be necessary to use (that is, the quality of information needed may require use of) a quasi or true experimental design. For example, assessments of three alternative strategies for elementary education such as the open classroom, ungraded education, and the traditional program, may require empirical data which can only be obtained under experimental conditions. Readers are referred to Campbell and Stanley for classic descriptions of experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.26 In addition, readers may want to explore the use of experimental design in evaluation as proposed

---

Before moving to the concluding section of this manual, it is perhaps important to point out that if simulated or real experimentation is needed in the assessment of alternative strategies, the strategy will have to be operationalized before the experimentation can occur. Following experimentation assessment activities, the design activities will include installation and possible full-scale implementation procedures, in addition to any other needed operationalization.

E. Identifying and Assessing Designs for Implementation

Referring to the earlier discussions, a strategy was defined as "an unrefined plan or framework." To believe that a strategy can be implemented in the system is erroneous, for a strategy must be operationalized before implementation is possible. Therefore, the third function of input evaluation provides the transition from strategy development to an implementation design.

Before specific identification and assessment activities are provided, a list of four general guidelines is provided:

1. Guidelines
a) The evaluations of the strategies will result in two possible ways to utilize a design team. The first use of design teams would be to only operationalize a given strategy. This is what will occur if the evaluation indicated that one strategy was clearly superior to the other. If the design team is asked to not only operationalize, but also to converge elements of both strategies, the evaluation of the strategies which preceded this activity must have resulted in the decision to converge.

b) Many of the procedural steps previously described in the identification and assessment of the strategies are applicable. The exceptions to these procedural steps will be explained. Potential users of this manual are urged to refer back to section III, part D2, D3 if greater clarification is needed.

c) The results of this third function of information should include an analysis of one or more procedural designs. If enough time and resources exist it may be beneficial to have two operationalization teams, in which case a similar process to assessing the strategies would be conducted for the designs. However, in many cases, only one operationalization team may be used. If this is the case, then the assessment of the design would be in terms of whether or not it is an acceptable operationalized design rather than which operationalization is most complete or appropriate.

d) In general, the amount of specifications given to a design team will be greater than those given to advocate teams. Therefore, the degrees of creative freedom for a design team will be less than those of the advocate teams.

The following procedural steps can be identified within each major classification of identification and assessment.

2. Design Identification Procedural Steps

A number of major elements comprise the identification activities:

The Selection of Design Team Members. As was true in advocate team selection, in large part the output from the design teams will be dependent upon the selection of team members. Therefore, it is most appropriate to establish a set of criteria similar to those generated for advocate team members before selection is actually made. In addition to these criteria, one might include in design team selection two other criteria such as, 1) ability to utilize planning techniques such as PERT, and 2) synthesis ability. Design
team membership should include high involvement of persons who will ultimately be responsible for program implementation. Involvement of these people on the team will increase the probability that the program will, in fact, be implemented.

Selection and Distribution of Documents. Prior to the orientation session and the actual writing sessions, a list of documents should be provided to design team members. Contents of major documents would include at least, 1) the two or more alternatives, 2) the evaluation results, 3) the "Charge to the Design Team" prepared by the synthesis team, and 4) a list of criteria.

Development of Specifications for the Design Team. The synthesis team working with the input evaluation team would be responsible for the development of a "Charge to the Design Team." This charge, as was indicated in the general guidelines, would probably be more specific than that developed for use with the advocate teams. Whether the task of the design team will be to converge and operationalize, or just to operationalize a chosen strategy is stated within this charge. A rather comprehensive set of specifications should also be included. For example, if the input evaluation was used for a planning grant to develop a new program, guidelines developed by the U.S. Office of Education should be abstracted and presented as specifications for the design team. Most design teams will be asked to operationalize the objectives as well as the procedures. The design specification may request PERT networks, job
descriptions, line-staff organizational plans, procedural specifications and budget. The specifications should include a process and product evaluation design for the proposed program to be used when implemented.

The Orientation Session. An orientation session for the design team is valuable. General guidelines which were provided to guide the development and implementation of the session for advocate teams would be applicable for the design team.

The Actual Writing Session. Elements of the actual writing sessions previously described relating to setting and length would be appropriate for the design teams session. Support services, in particular the input evaluation resource person, may be revised slightly if only one team will be completing the work of operationalization. It is possible in this case for the resource person to play an active role and perhaps serve as a member of the team so that the relevant resources of the system are utilized most effectively in setting up the procedural design.

3. Design Assessment Procedural Steps

Generally the same process would be repeated for assessment procedures of the design as was completed for the advocate team assessment. More specifically, assessment of designs would include an identification of criteria. One cannot assume that the criteria which were used for strategy selection would be appropriate to use in design assessment.
Assessment procedures would also include the operationalization of the criteria as well as the assignment of weights. Interpretation rules regarding the results of the assessment and the identification of the decision rule are also needed. In this particular case the decision rule would be whether or not the design is sufficiently operationalized, or whether additional activities will be required before the program is implemented.

The input evaluation team will provide information on the assessment of the design to the synthesis team. The synthesis team in turn will make decisions about whether it is acceptable as it is, or whether it needs further clarification. Information provided by the input team may include an information matrix which describes the design in terms of the format elements.

F. Summary

In section 1C of this manual, a logical framework was presented. Information in sections II and III provided the basis for filling out the cells when appropriate within the matrix. The matrix is now presented in Table 16. The roles, as defined in the second section, provide the column dimension. The row dimension specifies the three major functions of input evaluation within which delineating, obtaining, and providing processes are included. Specific selected activities within each cell are abstracted from the main text of the second and third sections.
### TABLE 16

#### SUMMARY MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Decision Makers</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Input Evaluation Team</th>
<th>Output Evaluation Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Team</td>
<td>Synthesize overall system capabilities and constraints.</td>
<td>Input, adapt, and retool overall system.</td>
<td>Serve as data sources for information on constraint analysis.</td>
<td>Help specify objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Attend sessions designed to identify relevant capabilities.</td>
<td>Development of standards to identify system capabilities.</td>
<td>Design and develop reference groups to identify system capabilities.</td>
<td>Build system and design teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Team</td>
<td>Conduct adaptations and design teams.</td>
<td>Collect data on capability identification.</td>
<td>Collect literature on capability identification.</td>
<td>Submit evaluation report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preparing and Assessing Relevant System Capabilities**

- Preparation of reports, which identifies system capabilities and constraints.
- Serve as data sources for information on constraint analysis.
- Aid in the analysis of development of instruments to identify system capabilities.
- Collect data on capability identification.
- Conduct adaptations and design teams.

**Serving the Team**

- Review reports of synthesis team.
- Provide information on capability identification.
- Collect data on capability identification.
- Conduct adaptations and design teams.

**Denoting Capabilities**

- Serve as data sources for information on constraint analysis.
- Aid in the analysis of development of instruments to identify system capabilities.
- Collect data on capability identification.
- Conduct adaptations and design teams.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Evaluation Team</th>
<th>Advocate Teams</th>
<th>Design Teams</th>
<th>Technical Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop tentative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Look at related</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communicate wanted</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>draft input evalu</strong></td>
<td><strong>literature to obtain</strong></td>
<td><strong>information on capabilities to resource person</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ation design and sub</strong></td>
<td><strong>leads on cap</strong></td>
<td><strong>communicate wanted</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mission team</strong></td>
<td><strong>ability identifi</strong></td>
<td><strong>information on capabilities to resource person</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>session with decla</strong></td>
<td><strong>cation</strong></td>
<td><strong>communicate wanted</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>rators and other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>information on capabilities to resource person</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>reference groups to</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>identify capabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st specialist in</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop needed instru</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop retrieval</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ment of instru</strong></td>
<td><strong>ments to identify</strong></td>
<td><strong>system for capabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ments to assess</strong></td>
<td><strong>and assess system capabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>assist in data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collect data on</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perform constraint analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organize capability results in retrieval format</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>capabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd specialist in</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provide information</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comply evaluation data in report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ment of instru</strong></td>
<td><strong>synthesis team on capabilities and constraints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ments to identify</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and assess system ca</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perform constraint a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nalysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>data in report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

**SUMMARY MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Decision Makers</th>
<th>Synthesis Team</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Input Evaluation Team</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Resource Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Assessing Alternative Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish criteria for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocate team selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with decision makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Suggest contents of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Charge&quot; to synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Select team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct iterative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sessions with decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makers in order to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify and operational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identify interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and decision rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conduct orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Assessing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify and abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop and run simulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to demonstrate resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retrieval during</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assist in criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Review assessment report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review synthesis team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assist specialist in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of report to synthesis team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Write report on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Evaluation Team</td>
<td>Advocate Teams</td>
<td>Design Teams</td>
<td>Technical Writers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish criteria for advocate team selection through interactions with decision makers</td>
<td>.Review documents prior to orientation session</td>
<td>.Develop procedure to use during writing session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest contents of &quot;charge&quot; to synthesis team</td>
<td>.Attend orientation session</td>
<td>.Review documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select team members</td>
<td>.Develop and run simulation to demonstrate resource retrieval during orientation session</td>
<td>.Attend orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct iterative sessions with decision makers in order to identify and operationalize criteria</td>
<td>.Assist in criteria identification process</td>
<td>.Discuss role with team members at session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Provide administrative support during writing session</td>
<td>.Provide information of report to team members</td>
<td>.Prepare rough draft of strategy and send out to team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Assist specialist in assessing strategies</td>
<td>.Obtain resource information upon request during writing session</td>
<td>.Prepare final reports from advocate team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop method for weighting criteria</td>
<td>.Attend and participate in actual writing session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop design for assessment of strategies</td>
<td>.Use resource person and technical writer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and abstract related documents</td>
<td>.Review draft and return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop information and decision criteria</td>
<td>.Implement procedure during actual writing session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish criteria for strategies developed</td>
<td>.Prepare information of report to synthesis team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct decision rules criteria</td>
<td>.Provide information of report to team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain written evaluation information needed for strategy assessment</td>
<td>.Write report on assessment results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop information and decision criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Decision Makers</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Summary Matrix</td>
<td>Input Evaluation Team</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Team</td>
<td>Assist in Identification and weighting of criteria</td>
<td>Suggest criteria to be used for selection of members</td>
<td>Establish criteria for design team selection through interaction with decision makers</td>
<td>Develop method for weighting criteria</td>
<td>Identify and abstract related documents</td>
<td>Develop and run simulation to demonstrate resource retrieval during orientation session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>Develop report on specifications for team output and report on criteria selected and weight assignment</td>
<td>Approval of selection choices</td>
<td>Suggest contents of &quot;Charge&quot; to synthesis team</td>
<td>Develop design for assessment of design</td>
<td>Assist in criteria identification process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining</td>
<td>Attend criteria identification sessions</td>
<td>Help determine interpretation and decision rules</td>
<td>Select team members</td>
<td>Conduct iterative sessions with decision makers in order to identify and operationalize criteria</td>
<td>Identify interpretation and decision rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Key members attend orientation session</td>
<td>Conduct orientation session</td>
<td>Identify interpretation and decision rules</td>
<td>Conduct orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Assessing Procedural Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying</td>
<td>Review assessment report on design</td>
<td>Review synthesis team decision</td>
<td>Review assessment report on design</td>
<td>Review assessment report on design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Prepare report in which the decision to obtain more information is needed or go to implementation</td>
<td>Assist specialist in writing report</td>
<td>Provide information of report to synthesis team</td>
<td>Write report on assessment results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role to be assumed by team members</th>
<th>Input Evaluation Team</th>
<th>Resource Person</th>
<th>Advocate Team</th>
<th>Design Team</th>
<th>Technical Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish criteria for design team selection through interaction with decision makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest contents of “Charger” to synthesis team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct interactive sessions with decision makers in order to identify and operationalize criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify interpretation and decision rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop method for weighting criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop design for assessment of design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and abstract related documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and run simulation to demonstrate resource retrieval during orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist in criteria identification process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Review documents prior to orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Attend orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Conduct decision rules analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Obtain other evaluative information needed for strategy assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Devlop information and decision matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Attend and participate in actual writing session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Use resource person and technical writer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Critique rough draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Writers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Implement procedure to use during writing session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Review documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Attend orientation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Discuss with team members at session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist specialist in writing report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide information of report to synthesis team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write report on assessment results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare final reports from design team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

EVALUATION

Introduction

Evaluative data on the technical manual were obtained from a number of persons. Essentially, two major evaluative questions were answered through the evaluation.

1. What is the worth of the manual as it now exists?
2. How can the manual be improved?

The sections which follow describe the evaluation procedures used and present the results. Two separate groups provided evaluative information. The first group consisted of the staff of a project which is currently using advocate teams. The second group of persons (the critique panel) consisted of people who had been involved in previous uses of advocate teams. Evaluation of the manual by these two groups will be presented.

The Accountability Project

July 1, 1972, The Ohio State University Evaluation Center received a contract from the Ohio State Department of Education to generate and assess alternative accountability models for the State of Ohio. Since this project included use of advocate teams, it seemed appropriate for the project staff to use the technical manual and provide evaluative feedback to the investigator on the worth of the manual and how it could
be improved. It should be noted that the accountability project did not use the entire manual. In some cases suggestions made in the manual were implemented by the staff, in other cases it was not possible to implement sections of the manual because of the uniqueness of this specific contract and because the staff did not have a copy of the manual until after the project was under way. Although the degree of implementation of the manual was limited, the investigator felt that evaluative feedback by a group of people currently trying to implement the notion of advocate teams would be useful.

Several means of data collection were used in the evaluation of the manual within the accountability project. First, the project staff was asked to keep a log of questions they had pertaining to the manual. A copy of the form used to log questions is presented in Appendix E-1. The second means of data collection on this partial implementation of the technical manual was an analysis of tapes for the first day of each advocate team. In addition to obtaining information on what clarification advocate teams needed, how they used their time, and what documents were referenced, the tapes provided a rich description of three ways advocate teams worked. The third means of data collection was an extensive questionnaire which was completed by the accountability staff.

Results - Log

Analysis of the log of questions set forth by the project supervisor, project director, and project evaluator resulted in the identification of three basic concerns. The first major concern explicated by the project staff was that the manual did not consider or deal with
political pressures which often exist in any real-world use of advocate teams. The project director especially noted that in this particular use of advocate teams the political nature of the task itself, i.e., developing an accountability model for the State of Ohio was very great and the manual did not provide any assistance in dealing with these political pressures. A second major concern about the manual was the lack of specific alternative assessment procedures which might be adopted by potential users of the manual. A response to this criticism led to the addition of another section to the manual before it was sent out to the critique panel. This section included the identification of a number of possible assessment procedures. The third major criticism derived from the log of questions centered around the two definitions of advocate teams provided in the manual. One project staff member felt that even if advocate team members are selected because they represent different philosophies prior to advocate team sessions, these members would undoubtedly come together and develop a plan which upon completion of their working together, they would advocate. He further argued that one never would have a team which would advocate a position prior to strategy development. The other comments obtained through the log of questions were relatively minor. For example, some expenses accrued in this advocate team use were not explicated in the sample budget. Also, the manual should explicate some of the advantages and disadvantages of operating in a hotel setting rather than an office setting.
Results - Analysis of Tapes

The Investigator chose to listen to the first day of each advocate team session. These teams were convened to develop accountability models for the State of Ohio. The tapes were analyzed in order to obtain information on the following questions:

1. What was the approximate time allocation to specific topics on the first day?
2. What references were made to documents advocate teams had available?
3. What clarification or additional information was requested?
4. How many times was the orientation session referred to during the actual writing session?

Individual team results with this information are available in Appendix E-2. This section of the evaluation report will look at similarities across the advocate teams' first day and also look at differences.

Many similarities existed among the three advocate teams during this first day. First, all three advocate teams made extensive use of chalkboards for recording comments and specific thoughts of each advocate team. As might be assumed, another similarity was that of content. Although each advocate team was unique in the degree to which they discussed various content aspects of an accountability model, there was a similarity across advocate teams on content, such as the question of a uniform accountability system, variables that are controllable and those not controllable, and discussions about input, process, and output. Another similarity dealt with utilization of
documents. All three advocate teams extensively utilized the synthesis report provided. All of them discussed the description of the system, the list of constraints and the specifications for advocate team reports. Other documents referred to and discussed throughout sessions were the different accountability models in Florida, Colorado, and Michigan and the Columbus Profile. Another document referred to was the priority rating of various sections of the advocate team specifications that was to have been completed by the members of the Ohio State Department.

Similarities across advocate team sessions also existed in the area of clarification and information needed. One question that all team members had was, "what is our responsibility? Is it to develop a management information system or is it to develop an accountability model?"

The other clarification or information needed across all three advocate teams was "what actual accountability information is now being collected (e.g., the principal's form, the minimum standards, use of site visits)?" All three teams were interested in more information about the voluntary statewide testing program. The synthesis report contained a statement which seemed to indicate that the statewide testing program was not voluntary but mandatory--this presented some problems in one advocate team session. The most significant similarity across all three sessions was the need for more information on what accountability data already exist and in what form. This is probably due to the fact that each advocate team talked about having a phased accountability model and most of them wanted to start with data that were already available on the system which would not require extensive data collection.
Finally, all teams discussed and made references to the orientation session on this first day.

Differences among the three advocate teams were also noticed. First of all, each team differed in the way they approached the problem. One of the teams began by identifying different definitions of accountability and placing them on the board. These definitions were combined, words were changed, and additional ideas were incorporated into the definitions. As soon as they had a definition of two or three sentences, they began to look at various components of that definition and further delineate the definition parts. Another team had a slightly different process, in that a number of possible models were put on the board and various problems with each model were discussed. In this particular advocate team session, many of the same issues such as "what can we control and what cannot be controlled," were brought up in the discussion of each model. The third advocate team had a slightly different approach. Prior to this session, each team member was responsible for writing a short statement on his thoughts on accountability. This team went from one individual to another and each advocate team member reported his perceptions and handed out his written comments. Following each individual presentation there was a discussion of the individual's report and a comparison of that report with previous team members' reports.

Another obvious difference was in the use of examples at the local level during the advocate team session. In one advocate team session a large number of examples at the local level representing either a
superintendent's view, or a teacher's view, or the state department's view were interjected throughout the day. A limited number of actual examples within Ohio were identified in the other two sessions. This was probably due to the fact that the number of representatives from the state serving on the teams differed for each team. One team had four representatives, while the other two teams had only one state representative.

A third difference in the sessions was that one of the advocate teams had a representative from the state department come in and talk with them about specific questions they had generated about the state department. These questions were divided into three classes: questions about the capabilities of the state department; questions on how state department personnel viewed the legislation, and what the state department would like to see in accountability models; and what this particular state department representative thought about the discussions the teams had engaged in previously in the day.

Although none of the advocate teams had a person who dominated the conversation throughout the day, much more input to one advocate team session was provided by representatives of various reference groups throughout the state than those representatives on the other teams.

**Results - Accountability Staff Questionnaire**

A questionnaire was developed by the investigator and administered to the project staff (the project supervisor, director, and evaluator). The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain a description of what
happened in regard to various elements of the technical manual; to obtain a rating on the degree to which elements of the technical manual were implemented (using a five-point scale ranging from "not implemented to any extent" to "fully implemented"); and to obtain a value rating on the content presented about these elements within the technical manual (using a one-to-five scale ranging from "of no value" to "very valuable"). This questionnaire also asked for reasons for the value rating. A copy of this questionnaire can be found in Appendix E-3.

Table 17 which follows provides an overview of the results of the questionnaire given to the three project staff members involved in the accountability project. The vertical dimension of the table contains the six elements which were implemented according to the manual, although the degree of implementation differed. The horizontal dimension contains ratings on the degree of implementation and the value ratings.

As the table indicates, there was a perceived high degree of implementation for all six elements by the project staff. All elements received an implementation rating of 4 or 5 (toward the fully implemented end of the scale) except element number two which dealt with the selection of advocate team members and chairmen. One respondent rated the degree of implementation at 2 because he felt that considerations outlined in the technical manual were used only in the selection of the chairmen.

The ratings on the value of the section in the technical manual on each element contain some differences. All of the respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Implementation Rating</th>
<th>Value Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to any degree</td>
<td>of no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identification and assessment of relevant capabilities of the system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2* 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Selection of advocate team members and chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of specification for advocate team reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Document selection and distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The orientation session</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The actual writing session</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to number of responses.
indicated that they thought the section on selection of advocate team members and chairmen was very valuable (rating of 5). The sections in the manual on document selection and distribution, the orientation session, and the actual writing sessions received either ratings of 4 or 5 (toward the very valuable end of the scale). Two discrepancies existed within the project staff. The first discrepancy was for the first element, identifying and assessing relevant capabilities of the system. Two of the project staff thought this section was very valuable and one of the staff gave it a rating of three and indicated by his comments that he felt the section could be improved by incorporating the ideas presented in his comments. The comments were as follows:

Information about system capabilities is needed at several points in the input evaluation process. Some of the points are: writing specifications for advocate team work, orienting the advocate teams during the advocate team work session, judging the feasibility and efficiency of advocate team strategies, and in converting a selected strategy into design and installing the design.

Different levels of information are required at these different points. At the point of orientation, the advocate teams need general information about boundaries, constraints, and sources of additional information, however, as they begin to write they will need efficient access to specialized information. These cases illustrate that an information system is needed throughout input evaluation to serve the needs of the responsible agents. The information system should employ different means to meet the different information requirements throughout the input evaluation. These means include special orientation papers, orientation sessions (discussion and answer), an information resource person, a library of relevant documents, and the inclusion of knowledgeable actors in this system as parts of the advocate teams.

The only other rating which was not consistent between project staff was that for element 3, the development of specifications for
advocate team reports. The rating of three was explained by this person by indicating that more should be said on who should be on the synthesis team, how they should be organized, and how they should conduct the work. In addition, this respondent indicated that more information should be available on how the synthesis team would work with decision makers to finalize the specifications as a policy to guide the advocate team.

Other suggestions for manual revision obtained through this questionnaire referenced the value of a special orientation and planning session for the team chairmen prior to their work with the teams. The chairmen could then provide input and orient their own team members. Finally, in regard to the orientation session, it was suggested that a sample agenda may improve the section in the manual.

The description of what occurred in this use of advocate teams as corrected by the project staff is located in Appendix E-4. These descriptions explicated another way to run advocate team sessions. The technical manual specified from 3-5 days for advocate team work but it did not deal with the issue of consecutive days vs. intermittent days. One of the advocate teams used for the generation of alternative accountability models chose to meet two days, go home and individually write assigned sections for one day, returning in two weeks to examine and combine the individual reports into a single, complete model. This may be a viable alternative to consider in running advocate team sessions. However, increased travel costs, if advocate team members are geographically dispersed, may prevent the use of this pattern.
Critique Panel Evaluation

A critique panel consisting of twelve members was identified to critique the technical manual as it now exists. Members for this panel were selected from persons who had had some involvement with advocate teams in the past. An exception was one person who had completed previous conceptual work on input evaluation; however, he was not familiar with advocate teams and their use.

Members of this critique panel were categorized into four groups, each group having three members. The first group contained methodologists in general. Persons selected for this group had previously developed methodology for advocate team use or for input evaluation in general. The second group of persons were decision makers who had been involved in a previous use of advocate teams. The third group of persons on the panel were evaluators from previous uses of advocate teams and the remaining group on the panel represented a selection of persons who had served on an advocate team in one of the previous uses. In all cases, three persons for each of these groups were selected. The list of persons serving on the critique panel can be found in Appendix E-5.

The questionnaire which the critique panel completed was divided into two parts. The first part contained a series of sixteen items about the manual or the methodology within the manual. The critique panel was instructed to rate each item by placing an X in the box underneath the description which most closely described their attitude toward the manual or the methodology. The scale used contained four
ratings ranging from "very poor" to "very good." A description for each rating was presented within the box so as to anchor the item. For example, item number one (manual clarity) was presented on the questionnaire as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1 - Manual Clarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Poor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This manual is totally confusing and ambiguous and should be entirely rewritten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some parts are clearly written and understandable, but the majority of the manual is confusing and should be rewritten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manual has an acceptable level of readability throughout although some of the sections could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manual is clearly written and understandable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each rating (e.g., good or poor) for each item had descriptors of this type which were provided by the investigator.

The second part of the questionnaire asked for information on how the manual could be improved in general and/or in relation to specific sections. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix E-6.

The results of the questionnaire completed by the critique panel will be presented in the following sections. The item results will be presented first and the open-ended comments will follow.

**Results - Questionnaire (items)**

The first part of the questionnaire with anchored items can be further delineated into two sections. The first eight items dealt with
the manual itself and were concerned with areas such as clarity, organization, use of illustrations, interest, documentation, need, problem relevance, and completeness. Table 18 graphically displays the ratings of the critique panel on these items. The majority of ratings were in the categories of good and very good. In regard to the concept of manual clarity, eight of the twelve (two thirds) of the critiquers supplied "good" ratings (descriptor: the manual has an acceptable level of readability throughout although some of the sections could be improved). Four fifths of the critiquers thought that the sequencing of the manual sections was appropriate and somewhat easy to follow.

In regard to use of illustrations in the manual, a wide range of ratings was obtained. Over half of the critiquers thought that use of examples could be improved. Two respondents indicated unsatisfactory use of examples while five indicated that use of examples exists but often necessary illustrations are not provided and some of the existing illustrations are inadequate. This item represented the poorest rating on the manual. In addition, a wide range of ratings was selected by a number of persons. When asked about manual interest, three fourths of the respondents indicated that as manuals go, this manual adequately held the respondents' attention. Several of the respondents thought the manual was very alive and exciting. A fourth of the respondents (3) felt that some parts of the manual were interesting but that the majority of the manual just did not hold the respondents' attention.
TABLE 18
MANUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarity</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Illustration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Documentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Problem Relevance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Completeness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R refers to number of persons who chose each rating.
Ten of the twelve respondents felt that a high degree of documentation existed (descriptor: footnotes are used extensively and references cited appeared valuable). Only two of the twelve indicated that this was not how they felt about the manual. The need for a technical manual of this type was rated very high. Three fourths of the persons felt that this manual was the first comprehensive treatment of this topic available and that evaluators would actively seek out this material. In like manner, respondents indicated that the manual would be applicable to a number of problems (rating of good) or the manual would be applicable to many problems they faced (rating of very good).

In the item on manual completeness the majority of respondents indicated that the manual adequately treated the subject and that most relevant topics were included and sufficiently discussed. However, it should be noted that three or one fourth of the respondents felt that less than an adequate amount of information was provided on topics and a few important topics were not discussed.

Items 9-16 in the questionnaire dealt with the methodology contained within the manual. Table 19 shows the ratings. Half of the group indicated that some methodological procedures presented would provide information which would have a high level of internal and external validity (rating of good), while four more persons rated the methodological adequacy as very good (descriptor: the manual contains many methodological elements which when implemented would provide a high degree of internal and external validity). Methodological reliability received a rating of good by over one half of the
### TABLE 19

**METHODOLOGY QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Methodological adequacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Objectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cost-effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Input evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Uniqueness</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to number of persons.
respondents (descriptor: the methodology was sufficiently detailed so that if two different groups in a similar situation used the manual, they would likely determine similar sets of procedures to be followed). A third of the people ranked the methodology reliability as poor (descriptor: the methodology does not contain enough detail and that two different groups in a similar situation would need to rely more on their own ingenuity than on the manual in determining their procedures). Item 11 - Objectivity - as Table 19 shows, received all ratings of either good or very good. The majority of the ratings were made in the good category (descriptor: some methodological elements when implemented would provide information that is highly objective and unbiased).

Ease of implementation of the methodology received all good or very good ratings. Three fourths of the group responded to the good rating (descriptor: methodology could be used with some effort, it is practical and convenient). A wide range of ratings was obtained on methodology cost-effectiveness. Two thirds of the ratings were obtained for the good or very good categories. The descriptor attached to the rating of good stated that in most situations, the value attached to program improvement would somewhat exceed the cost needed to implement the methodology, whereas the very good category stated that the value would exceed the cost by a large margin. However, three respondents did not feel that cost of implementing the methodology would exceed any value attached to program development as indicated through their ratings of poor and very poor.
A wide range of ratings was also obtained for the concept of methodology adaptability. Five of the twelve respondents felt that only a very small part of the methodology could be adjusted to fit individual use and that the majority of the methodology was rigid and very few alternatives were provided. Four persons, however, felt that a sufficient amount of flexibility was provided (rating of good) and an additional three persons indicated that many of the methodological elements could be adjusted to fit most individual use considerations (rating of 'very good'). Consistency in ratings of either good or very good were obtained on the item dealing with methodology relevance to input evaluation problems. The majority of the respondents (7) felt that the methodology was clearly evaluative and was related to many existing input evaluation problems (rating of very good), whereas the remaining five respondents checked the good box which stated that the methodology was related to some practical evaluation problems. A large amount of consistency in ratings was also obtained for the uniqueness of the methodology item. Seven of the twelve respondents felt that the methodology was somewhat different from existing methodology—some elements have been used previously but only a few combinations of elements exist which are similar to those proposed in the manual. One fourth (3) respondents felt that the methodology was unique—a few elements have been used previously, but the synthesis of the elements is proposed for the first time and is creative (rating of very good).

In summary, the results for the items can be described as follows. Although some ratings occur in the poor or very poor categories, a
clear majority of the ratings were obtained in the good or very good categories. The ratio of good or very good ratings as compared to poor or very poor ratings was almost five to one. Generally, it can be stated that the areas of concern on the part of the critique panel were as follows:

1) Manual use of illustrations—over half of the critique panel felt, in general, that there was inappropriate or insufficient use of examples.

2) Methodology adaptability—five members of critique panel felt that only a small part of the methodology could be adapted to fit individual needs.

Five items on the questionnaire did not receive any rating of poor or very poor. These items dealt with the manual organization and need; and methodological objectivity, implementation, and problem relevance.

Six times, respondents did not answer the item. Sometimes reasons were given. For example, one respondent indicated that he did not have the information he needed in order to judge the item on cost effectiveness or methodology uniqueness. Three respondents did not rate the objectivity item, indicating that they could not answer the item but not citing the reason why. The other no response came for the methodological adequacy item. This person indicated that he could not rate the item because it contained both internal and external validity together and he did not think external validity would be high. Several respondents (3) expressed concerns about the
questionnaire items in their written comments. Some of the concerns raised included ambiguous wording and including more than one condition in an item descriptor.

**Results - Comments (Part II of questionnaire)**

The second part of the questionnaire distributed to the critique panel asked how the manual could be improved in general or in relation to specific sections. Three fourths (9 members) of the critique panel did offer content suggestions on the manual. These content suggestions were grouped into four categories. The first category consisted of editorial suggestions or comments; the second category contained general considerations, concerns, or suggestions for improvement of the manual; the third category of comments related to specific sections of the manual; and the fourth category consisted of suggested additions to the technical manual. Comments within each of these categories will now be described.

**Editorial suggestions.** Several respondents indicated a need for a technical writer to review the manual for style, awkward sentences, and punctuation. It was felt that editorial assistance would make the manual more readable to a potential user. Other editorial suggestions included (1) removing "jargon" when possible throughout the manual to increase the readability of the manual and (2) rewriting the manual in a narrative style rather than in the formal dissertation style as it now exists. Other editorial comments merely consisted of misspelled words, added punctuation, etc.
General considerations. The following concerns and suggestions about the content of the manual were provided by the respondents:

(1) One concern was that the manual appeared too rigid and inflexible. It was felt that in actual practice there would be much more recycling than the manual acknowledged. A related concern was the perceived linear flow of information throughout the system. This feeling is reflected in another respondent's comments, which were as follows:

I do, however, have one basic problem with the system. This concern revolves around the linear quality of the major functions of an input evaluation. Whether you mean it or not, I get the feeling that you perceive the three functions as discrete and as occurring in a linear fashion. This causes me problems. For example, I do not believe it is possible, practicable, of even desirable that "total information" relevant to agency capabilities can be identified and assessed... I would, therefore, suggest a methodology of successive approximations in dealing with the situation.

(2) Three of the respondents have concerns about the intended audience of the manual. In general, it was felt that a more general audience which included school personnel might not have the necessary background, e.g. be familiar with the Phi Delta Kappa book, Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. It was suggested that more information be given on topics from this book rather than assuming the previous knowledge on the part of the reader. (3) Another concern raised was that the manual described a massive input evaluation effort, whereas several persons felt it would be extremely helpful if the manual would say something to the potential user who wants to use input evaluation on a smaller scale. (4) It was suggested that a more limited manual only on advocate team use might be more helpful to potential users. (5) Several persons
mentioned that the manual lacks examples (this attitude was also reflected in the first part of the questionnaire). One statement made was that specific anecdotes from previous uses of advocate teams would measurably enhance the manual's readability. (6) Several persons felt that the manual would be easily interpreted only by someone who is versed in the CIPP Model and has a tendency to follow it. The suggestion was made that the manual should not follow the CIPP Model as closely as it does. (7) One respondent felt that one task of the manual was to communicate the importance of evaluation in such a way that you sell the idea of input evaluation. He felt that the manual in its present form does not sell the concept and it should. (8) Finally, some respondents felt that an insufficient amount of information was available on how to do input evaluation. Although it was recognized that Chapter 3 spoke directly to "how to": concerns, preceding Chapter 3 by Chapters 1 and 2 tended to confuse the reader. Several persons suggested reversing the order and having the "how to" section first.

In summary, there were eight general concerns about the manual. The first three concerns listed were mentioned by three or more respondents. These three concerns centered around the perceived linear quality of the manual; the need for providing information for a wider audience of users; and describing input evaluation on a large scale while it was thought that input evaluation on a smaller scale should have also been described.

Comments on Specific Sections of the Manual. A large number of comments were made about specific sections of the manual. Each section and the comments will be described next.
(1) **Introductions and definitions** section: Specific suggestions for this section were as follows: provide a clearer definition of advocate teams and how advocate teams relate to input evaluation. Three respondents felt that this section was adequate in the present manual.

(2) **Statement of conditions** section: Questions concerning this aspect of the manual included whether the necessary conditions are sufficient, i.e., if you have all these conditions will you be able to use advocate teams most effectively? Also, a more elaborate rationale is needed for why a close relationship between decision maker and evaluator is desirable. In terms of the budget section of the manual, many comments and suggestions were made. One respondent felt that the cost estimate and staff needs were projected higher than they would be in reality. Another respondent suggested that the budget be completely deleted and that functions and tasks be completed and approximations of man days or man months required to do tasks be suggested. Another suggestion to improve the budget section was to talk about costs in terms of the total project budget. This person would use cost estimates, for example, 10% of the project cost, rather than a detailed budget.

(3) **Role** section: Several concerns and suggestions were identified by the respondents. First of all, one respondent felt that the described role of the decision makers seemed too much to ask of the decision makers in reality situations. Second, it was suggested that all roles be considered part of the input evaluation team and break down responsibilities from there. Third, one respondent felt it more
valuable to stick to functions, not persons, titles, or roles. Finally, one respondent felt that it was not clear that roles in sections A-D (decision makers, input evaluation team, advocate team, and design team) were essential whereas AE (technical writer) was presented as an option depending on resources.

(4) Criteria section: The comment was made that the list of criteria presented in the technical manual as they stand do not provide enough information to a potential user. The respondent indicated that a fuller definition of these criteria would have been much more useful.

(5) Flow Chart section: Several people had difficulty in using the flow chart in the manual. One person indicated that he did not think that a standard procedure for flow charts was used. He also questioned the method for showing feedback or recycling. Another problem with the flow chart was the use of the word complete in various sections. It was suggested that the flow chart be revised in terms of specific examples from the real world. Another concern about the flow chart was that criteria may not be known in advance and in the flow chart it does show that these should be identified in advance.

(6) Identification and Assessment of Capabilities section: The concern about this section is illustrated through the following quotation from one respondent:

The matter of capabilities is troublesome. How exhaustive must knowledge be? How detailed? One should not operate in a vacuum, nor should one over-focus on capabilities since this is time and money consuming and tends to restrict input options from consideration.
(7) Strategy Identification and Assessment section: One respondent was concerned that the manual did not stress sufficiently the need for informed "support" to the advocate teams. He felt they need people from the system who know what's happening more than they need paper clips and magic markers. Another concern mentioned was that the manual did not discuss the problem of cross contamination of the advocate teams. Suggestions for improvement of this section cited by one respondent was that types of criteria should be described: first, criteria that are of the "go no go" type (those that must be present); and second, weighted criteria.

(8) Summary charts: Several suggestions were made which included previous reference to the charts in the manual and revising the charts so that the information is portrayed in a clearer fashion.

Additional Sections: Two additional elements were suggested. One respondent thought that a brief, readable narrative tracing several projects from beginning to end would give users a better overall grasp of the methodology. Another respondent thought the addition of a checklist of activities which a user could fill out would be appropriate.

Evaluation Results - Discussion

Two evaluative questions were listed at the beginning of Chapter V as follows:

1. What is the worth of the manual as it now exists?
2. How can the manual be improved?

The results just presented provide an answer to these questions.
Relative to the question, "What is the worth of the manual as it now exists?", several points are obvious. First, in the data collected from the accountability project staff on the elements of the manual which they attempted to implement, a large number of high ratings were obtained. Those six sections were viewed as very valuable to the staff. These results indicated that the staff thought that the manual was worthwhile and they attempted to implement it whenever possible. Therefore, these three respondents viewed the manual as very instructive in using advocate teams. The questionnaire results provided by the critique panel supported the accountability project staff's perceptions of the value of the manual. Many more ratings of good were obtained for the criteria used to evaluate the manual than ratings of poor or very poor (five to one ratio). The manual itself as well as its suggested methodology were seen as having utility to a potential user. However, examples used in the manual and the methodology adaptability need improvement. Overall, these findings indicated that there is a great need for a manual of this type.

The second question stated at the beginning of Chapter V is "How can the manual be improved?" Data obtained in answer to this question were of great importance to the investigator. It is the intent of the investigator to proceed in the developmental process of the technical manual and to revise that manual extensively subsequent to the completion of this study. Numerous suggestions were received which will guide manual revision, and since revision is to continue, a detailed discussion of the revision data and planned revisions will be outlined in the following chapter.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The previous chapters described the process of developing and evaluating a technical manual containing methodology for input evaluation using advocate and design teams. Briefly, this process included the following activities. A series of four case studies were completed on previous uses of advocate teams. The analysis of these cases provided content suggestions for the technical manual and indicated the areas where additional literature was needed. Upon completion of the needed related literature, drafts of the manual were prepared and revised. The latest draft of the technical manual appearing in chapter IV was evaluated. The evaluation included feedback from the staff of a project currently implementing sections of the manual and reaction to the manual by a critique panel composed of persons who had been previously involved in advocate team use.

Content for this final chapter includes a description of future development efforts and the identification of areas where further investigations are needed.

Future Development Efforts

The investigator plans to revise the manual using the information
obtained through the evaluation. The content revision data to be
discussed here are grouped into two categories. The first category
relates to major content revisions which will require content
revision throughout the manual; and the second category relates
to minor revision affecting only individual sections of the manual.
Each of these categories will be described in the following two
sections.

Major Revision Efforts

Perhaps the most valuable contribution of the evaluation of
the manual was the identification of a weakness which exists
throughout the manual. In the manual the functions of input eval-
uation erroneously are presented in a strict linear fashion as
discrete functions. This concern was one most frequently
identified by the critique panel. Though the panel was not sure
this emphasis was intended, the respondents felt the manual did
present a perception of linearity.

The accountability project staff supported the critique panel's
concern about linearity. They pointed out that at different times
during input evaluation different levels of information about system
capabilities are needed. In the analysis of the first-day tapes,
the need for different types of information about system capabilities
at different times during the input evaluation process was observable.
For example, there was a need for a different level of information at
the orientation session and prior to the writing session than was
needed during the writing session.
Other evaluation data relating to the linearity concern is the relatively low ratings on adaptability of the methodology. The perceived linear movement from one function to another often results in a rigid, inflexible system. Because of the evaluation, major content revision will include identification of processes and activities which provide linkages between the three functions of input evaluation. For example, capability information will be woven throughout the different stages of input evaluation. Also, revisions will contain linkages between the strategy development and the design development.

Another major area of concern which will directly affect the revision centers around the use of examples throughout the technical manual. Five of twelve persons on the critique panel felt that examples were not cited when appropriate, and often the examples cited were not fully discussed or they were presented in an abstract form. Each example provided in the manual will be modified to adequately and realistically describe a situation relative to information needed by potential users. In addition, more examples from actual case studies of advocate team use will be included.

**Minor Revision Efforts**

In addition to the two major content areas which will require substantial revising throughout the manual, a number of other smaller revisions will be made:

1. Editorial assistance will be obtained for the next version of the manual. Hopefully, this assistance will
also assist in eliminating unnecessary jargon in the manual which should make it more readable to a larger audience.

2. Some of the critique panel members voiced a concern about the fact that the manual followed closely the CIPP model, particularly input evaluation. The investigator feels that this is not a negative criticism for the purpose of the manual was for doing CIPP related input evaluation using advocate and design teams. CIPP provided the overall conceptual framework upon which the manual is based. However, the next version of the manual can be strengthened by providing a sufficient amount of information about what input evaluation can do for an educator as well as "selling" the importance of input evaluation. In like manner, a clearer description of advocate teams and their relationship to input evaluation should be developed for the revised edition.

3. The definition of advocate teams as presented in the technical manual needs clarification. For example, one probably would never have a group of people come in and advocate a position prior to development, although all advocate teams will probably advocate programs, upon completion of the task. Groups of people, however, may be selected who represent a certain content area
or philosophy and their particular biases or assumed advocacy will generally affect the particular program developed. Even then, teams would not advocate a specific program prior to program development, for if this were the case there would be no point in having a group work on new program development.

4. In the revision, the budget will probably be replaced with one of the alternatives provided by the respondents, such as using man-days and man-months, or giving percent estimates of the total budget.

5. Suggestions to include fuller definitions of criteria presented in the criteria section, and to revise the summary chart will be incorporated in the revision.

6. Respondents' concerns about the flow chart indicate that revision is needed. It should be noted that the flow chart as it now stands is evidence that the original manual presents the functions of input evaluation as linear and discrete (recycling loops were indicated only within three functions of input evaluation). Although several sentences within the text stated that there is linkage between the functions, much more information and prescribed activities need to be included.

7. The manual described a large input evaluation effort without enough guidance for a smaller scale input
evaluation effort. Although sections of the technical manual did discuss combining roles and some means for input evaluation on a smaller scale, the manual should provide additional information for potential small scale users. It also may be beneficial to describe how certain aspects of the total process would be extracted for specific needs when they occur.

After the manual has been revised, incorporating the content suggestions provided through the evaluation, a number of other evaluations of the manual are possible. First, a useful evaluation of the readability of the manual could be provided by having a group of persons representing evaluators in various settings, e.g., school system evaluators and R & D Center evaluators, analyze and review the document for readability. It may also be useful to obtain information on the readability of the manual from "informed others" such as doctoral students in the areas of philosophy or English.

Second, additional evaluative data could be obtained on the manual by finding a project that could attempt to implement the manual from start to finish. Although the accountability project implemented sections of the manual, there has been no clear use of the manual from the beginning of the process to the end in a real situation.

**Areas For Further Investigation**

A large number of areas surrounding input evaluation and use of advocate teams need additional investigation. Further conceptual development is needed. The manual dealt specifically with using
advocate teams for identifying alternative strategies when there are no acceptable existing alternatives, however, another aspect of input evaluation is the identification of available alternative strategies and assessing those available strategies in terms of a set of criteria. This aspect of input evaluation was not considered to any great extent in the manual nor is it developed elsewhere.

There is also a great need for empirical data on input evaluation in general, and specifically on using advocate and design teams. No empirical data exists which would indicate that the functions of input evaluation will, in fact, make a difference. For example, what is the effect of identifying capabilities at different levels throughout the input evaluation on strategies development? In addition, a large number of other empirical questions to be investigated could be derived from this dissertation, e.g., the number of members appropriate for advocate teams and the effects of orientation sessions. The ultimate research question in regard to conducting input evaluation using advocate and design teams is, "does it result in an improved program?" Therefore, it would be useful to have several groups address a common problem where one group uses the procedures outlined in the technical manual, and another group uses traditional procedures for program identification (generally staff deliberation). Data could be collected on the degree to which the strategies and designs developed by the groups related to predetermined criteria. Such a comparative analysis would go far to establish the usefulness of the advocate team methodology. It would
also be interesting to obtain cost effectiveness ratios on alternative means of generating and assessing alternative educational programs.

Although a lack of empirical data exists, input evaluation using advocate teams has been used successfully. The process appears to be a valuable alternative for educational program development and assessment.
APPENDIX A-1

WORK BREAKDOWN SCHEDULE
CASE STUDIES

1. Case study procedures
   1.1 Seek as much information in form of documents as possible to develop main threads of story
      1.1.1 Write up perceptions, identify gaps, discrepancies
      1.1.2 Label documents
      1.1.3 Identify perceived primary actors and secondary actors
      1.1.4 Prepare outline of case study content based on dimension
   1.2 Contact basic sources of data through interview
      1.2.1 Have them identify other actors
      1.2.2 Have them identify other relevant documents to study
      1.2.3 Verify your conception of main threads and record discrepancies
      1.2.4 Obtain information on gaps that you have identified
      1.2.5 Obtain permission to use case study or find out who will have to be contacted for permission
      1.2.6 Obtain appropriate antecedent conditions, internal and external, social and physical environment, outside forces and other related issues
      1.2.7 Obtain relevant sociological, psychological, biographical, and physical-materials aspects of advocate team use
      1.2.8 Identify primary actors to review final draft for accuracy
   1.3 Begin to construct fuller picture of case
      1.3.1 Search documents identified in 1.3 set of interviews to obtain fuller picture
      1.3.2 Update case study elements developed in 1.1
      1.3.3 Record discrepancies and identify gaps
      1.3.4 Update outline developed in 1.1
   1.4 Contact other primary actors through interview procedures
      1.4.1 Verify updated case study
      1.4.2 Obtain data on discrepancies and gaps
      1.4.3 Check to see if data is collected on elements in outline
   1.5 Decision point: Continue iterative process described in 1.2 and 1.3 and 1.4 if necessary—decisions will be based on whether or not an adequate data base has been obtained; whether interview responses in last cycle verified case picture, and further discrepancies were not identified
1.5.1 Compare with outline; if aspects are missing provide evidence of why outline was changed
1.6 Have two primary actors review final case study for accuracy
1.7 Respond to discrepancies either by obtaining additional information or listing as discrepancies
## APPENDIX A-2

### CHECK LIST
OF CASE STUDY
PROCEDURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date study began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date study ended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check When Completed</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Obtain copies of known relevant documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Classify documents and prepare list describing each in terms of content and nature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. From documents, develop main threads of case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Identify and state gaps from documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Identify and state discrepancies within documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Identify and state perceived primary actors and secondary actors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Prepare preliminary outline of case study based on dimensions and logical framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Identify and schedule three people to interview who from the documents appear to be the primary actors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check When Completed</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Construct interview questions and select actual procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Complete interview and complete interview form (described elsewhere).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Primary actor #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Primary actor #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Primary actor #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Identify and analyze additional documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Add document description and classification to original list.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Incorporate additional document information and results from interviews into fuller picture of case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Identify and state gaps that exist using outline as framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Identify and state discrepancies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Construct interview questions and select actual procedures for interviewing additional personnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Complete interviews and complete interview form (described elsewhere).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Additional interviewee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Additional interviewee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Additional interviewee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Additional interviewee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A-3

INTERVIEW FORM

Case ______________________________________

Name of Interviewee ____________________________________

Date ____________________ Time _________________________

1. Purpose of Interview __________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

2. Questions:

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX A-4

INTERVIEW WRITE-UP FORM

Case _________________________________________________________

Name of Interviewee ______________ Date Interviewed __________

Present Title of Interviewee ___________________________________________

Role Interviewee Played in Case Study ________________________________

1. Description of Activities: __________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

2. Summary of Results:
3. Discrepancies Identified:

4. Other Documents and Primary Actors:

5. Problems of interviewee:

6. Date Write-Up Completed: _____________________________
Dear [Name]:

Enclosed is a copy of a rough draft of a case study on advocate team use in which you were actively involved. This case study was one of four completed to obtain a "state of the art" picture of previous uses of advocate teams and is a part of my dissertation.

If you recall from our conversations, I would like you to read the document for accuracy and complete the enclosed short questionnaire.

Since I am on a rather tight time schedule, returned responses before October 14th would really be appreciated.

If you have any question, please feel free to contact me at 422-1231.

Sincerely,

Diane L. Reinhard

DLR:mrd
Enclosure
1. Are there activities not explicated in the case study which in your opinion should be included?

_________ Yes  __________ No

If yes, please specify and indicate why they should be included.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
2. Please list any specific concerns you have indicating the correct version, page reference and why the original is in error (e.g., Bill Jones was not involved as stated).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correction</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reason for Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reason for Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B-3

CASE STUDY CORRECTION

Corrections cited on the case study questionnaire could be categorized as follows:

A. Editorial suggestions
B. Clarification suggestions
C. Sequence suggestions
D. Minor errors
E. Major errors which directly affected the content of the case study.

Comments within categories A, B, C, and D were incorporated into the case studies. The largest number of comments were editorial in nature. Several minor errors were identified such as saying "grant" instead of "contract", etc.

The only major error which directly affected case study content was found in the comments for Case Study #4. This error centered around the use of advocate teams and the holding of brainstorming sessions. The original case study stated that in the first use of advocate teams in this study, a brainstorming technique was employed to identify local program options for the Illinois Gifted. Actually, the brainstorming session preceded the first use of advocate teams. The actual purpose of having advocate teams was to develop or advocate clusters of local program options which the second use of advocate
teams would have to consider in their development of state strategic plans. This error was corrected throughout the case study.
## APPENDIX C

### PERSONS INTERVIEWED FOR CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present Institutional Affiliation</th>
<th>Case Study #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Blough</td>
<td>Bexley, Ohio Public Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Brooks</td>
<td>Circleville, Ohio Public Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roald Campbell</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Conrad</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Eye</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egon Guba</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hough</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kennedy</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lange</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Lujan</td>
<td>Southwest Educational Development Laboratory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Marks</td>
<td>Mont Claire, New Jersey Public Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Merriman</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio Public Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Muth</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphael Nystrand</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Portor</td>
<td>Southwest Educational Development Laboratory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Ray Rackley</td>
<td>Northwest Regional Laboratory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Present Institutional Affiliation</td>
<td>Case Study #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Randall</td>
<td>Southwest Educational Development Laboratory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Root</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Shea</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Stufflebeam</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Vale</td>
<td>Southwest Educational Development Laboratory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Walker</td>
<td>Center for Vocational &amp; Technical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wayson</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D-1

CASE STUDY #1-LIST OF NAMES
WITHIN CLUSTERS OF ACTORS

1. Administration:

   Edwin Hindsman, Executive Director, (SEDL)
   Rogers Barton, Associate Director for Programs
   Robert Randall, Associate Director for Evaluation (SEDL)
   Jose Cardenos, Director of Texas Migrant Educational Development Center

2. Context-Input Evaluation Branch:

   Jerry Walker, Chief
   Juan Lujan
   Walter Wakefield
   Ben Dawd
   Rodman Porter

3. Consultants:

   Egon Guba, Indiana University
   John Horvat, Indiana University
   Daniel Stufflebeam, Ohio State University
   Robert Hammond, Ohio State University

4. Members of the Rating and Ranking Team:

   Jose Cardenos, SEDL
   Robert Randall, SEDL
   Leon Graham, TEA
   Severo Gomez, TEA
   Dorothy Davidson, TEA
   Lee Frasier, TEA

5. Advocate Teams:

   Advocate Team #1:

   Victor Naegele
   Juan Lujan
   Walter Wakefield
Advocate Team #2:

Arnulfo Martinez
Ben Dawd
Juan Rivera

Advocate Team #3:

Winfred Steglich
Chuck Denton
Tony Garcia

6. Pre-Strategy Design Team Members:

Jerry Walker, SEDL
Juan Lujan, SEDL
Arnulfo Oliveira, SEDL
Norma Foreman, SEDL
Marjorie Menefee, SEDL
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HOW SECONDARY STRATEGIES EVOLVED

Suggested at Conferences (August, 1968)
Student (S) Townspeople (TP)
Parents (P) Auxiliary Personnel (AP)
Teachers (T) Administrators (A)
Non-education Professionals (NEP)

February 1969
Advocate Teams

March 1969
Pre-Strategy Design Team

Legislative and Texas Education Agency Policy Changes (TP, T, AP, NEP)*

Curriculum Modification (T, Ad) → Flexible Teaching Methods → Innovative Migrant Curriculum

→ Programmed Instruction → Goal Directed Auditing

Better Auxiliary Services

→ Each one-Teach one Programmed Instruction

→ Increased Student-Teacher Interaction → Personalized Counseling

Vocational Training (TP)

Financial Aid to Students and Parents (P)

Parental, School and Community Involvement (S,P,TP,T,AP)

Staff Development (NEP)

Special Programs, Materials, etc. (S,T,Ad)

→ Peer Tutor Aides

→ Migrant-Teacher Labor Program

→ One Year Travel Study for Migrant Teachers

→ Positive Bicultural Adjustment

→ Conceptualization and Vernacular Building in Spanish

→ A Residential School

*Groups that listed solution as priority.
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CASE STUDY #2-LIST OF NAMES
WITHIN CLUSTERS OF ACTORS

1. Administrators:
   Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Project Director
   Darrell K. Root, Executive Officer of the Evaluation Center

2. Consortium Decision-Making Team:
   Arnold Ashburn
   Gerald B. Bay
   Robert L. Hammond
   Ronald G. Havelock
   John L. Hayman, Jr.
   James N. Jacobs
   Robert Ricci
   Donald P. Sanders
   Daniel L. Stufflebeam
   Jack P. Taylor
   Robert E. Taylor
   William Gephart

3. Context Evaluation Team:
   Walt Marks
   Joel Rosenberg
   Robert Schultz

4. Input Evaluation Team:
   Walt Marks
   Diane Reinhard
   Joel Rosenberg

5. Advocate Teams:
   Advocate Team #1:
   Robert R. Bargar
   Virgil E. Blanke
   Roald Campbell, Captain
   John B. Hough
   Howard O. Merriman
Advocate Team #2:

Francis S. Chase, Captain
John J. Kennedy
Robert R. Lange
William C. Morris
Jerry P. Walker

6. Convergence Team:

Robin H. Farquhar
Ronald G. Havelock
Darrell K. Root
Donald P. Sanders
John R. Shea
Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Captain
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CASE STUDY #3-LIST OF NAMES WITHIN CLUSTERS OF ACTORS

1. NCERD Decision Makers:
   - Harry Silberman, Associate Commissioner, NCERD
   - Charles Frye, Director, DMI
   - Ward Mason, Chief, Program Operations Branch, DMI

2. Program Review Team:
   - W. Ray Rackley, Leader, Program Review Team, DMI
   - Greta Gibson, Program Specialist, DMI
   - Sarah Gideonse, Program Specialist, DMI
   - Susan Gruskin, Program Specialist, DMI
   - Judy Coffey, Program Specialist, DMI

3. OSU Project Personnel:
   - Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Project Supervisor
   - Diane Reinhard, Project Director

4. Advocate Team Members:
   Advocate Team #1:
     - Michael Scriven, Chairman
     - Gene Glass
     - Wells Hively
     - Robert Stake

   Consultants:
     - John Holland
     - Richard Schutz

   Advocate Team #2:
     - Daniel Stufflebeam, Chairman
     - Henry Brickell
     - Egon Guba
     - William Michael
Consultants:

Max Abbott
Robert Randall

5. Invited Judges Panel:

Steven Bailey
Francis Chase
Jason Millman
Elwin Svenson
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LIST OF NAMES WITHIN CLUSTERS OF ACTORS

1. Base Team:

M. J. Conrad, Director
David Colton
Robert Kelly
Kenneth W. Brooks

2. Advocate Team Use #1 Program Options:

Paul Plowman
Mrs. Terry Elofson
Ken Hage
Margaret Koste
William Vassar
Sigmund Abeles
Dorothy Sisk
Robert Nelson
Joe Steele
John Hough
Edgar Dale
Julie Triplett
Alex Baldwin
Ed Bernstein
Marvin Gold

3. Advocate Team Use #2 Strategic Plans:

Truman Burton
Ernest House
Tom McCullough
Alan Tom
Raphael Nystrand
Dennis Gooler
Gordon Hoke
Roy Larmee
Charles Meisgeier
Bill Wayson
David Clark
N. L. Pielstick
Dwayne Gardner
Phillip Montag
Terry Denny

M. J. Conrad
David Colton
Robert Kelly
Kenneth Brooks
Frederick Staub

4. Advisory Committees:

State Level Advisory Committee:

Representative Clyde Choate
Honorable R. Dale Heagy
Senator Gene Johns

Jeanne Flynn
Carol Kimmel
Tom Knauer
Marjorie Lerch
Charles Matthews

Lloyd Mendelson
Walter Moore
Robert Ribbey
Andrew Robinson
Ray Quick

Faye Shaffer
John Small
Lee Sycle

Field Advisory Committee:

Wayne Addison
Leon Bergfield
June Bouknight
Jo Anne Brown
D. George Burdette

Douglas Clark
Bill Coats
Norma Dalrymple
William J. Davis
A. Gordon Dodds
Allen Dornself
Robert Eberle
Mike Etter
Virgil Fry
Carl O. Gandt

Herman Graves
William Holder
Donald Hubbard
Norma Judkins
Mary Kooyumjian

Thomas Laughline
Lloyd Leaverton
Don Martin
Dyane R. Need
Frank Parrino

Rick Shea
Eugenia Small
Mike Staff
Gilbert A. Tonozzi
Wilbert Trimbe

Key OSPI Personnel Advisory Committee:

Robert Hardy
David Jackson
Thomas Kerins
James Robbins
Fred Rozum

Jack Watson

5. Technical Writers:

Don West
Tom Tucker
Fred Chancellor
Phoebe Wienke
Ken Brooks

George Crawford
David Houck

6. Evaluator:

Rod Muth
## APPENDIX D-5

### DESCRIPTIONS ACROSS CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study #1</th>
<th>Case Study #2</th>
<th>Case Study #3</th>
<th>Case Study #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>Model Training Program</td>
<td>DHI Assessment System</td>
<td>Illinois Gifted Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Education Agency; in partnership with Southwest Educational Development Lab;larger scope of work</td>
<td>U.S.O.E., NCERD, Research Training Branch; a planning grant; contract with The Ohio State University Evaluation Center</td>
<td>U.S.O.E., NCERD, Office of DHI (Division of Manpower and Institutions), a contract presented to The Ohio State University Evaluation Center</td>
<td>Illinois State Department of Public Instruction; a contract awarded to The Ohio State University Educational Administration Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To develop a conceptual design model program for training research-related personnel</td>
<td>- To develop competiting programs designed to achieve a given set of objectives as determined by a prior context evaluation</td>
<td>- To develop competing assessment systems for DHI</td>
<td>- To identify three alternative state strategic plans for the Gifted in Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change and Input Branch</strong></td>
<td><strong>Change and Input Branch</strong></td>
<td><strong>Change and Input Branch</strong></td>
<td><strong>Change and Input Branch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Major responsibility for running advocate teams</td>
<td>- Major responsibility for running advocate teams and assessing the strategies</td>
<td>- Responsible for background study and monitoring of OSU grant.</td>
<td>- Responsible for running advocate teams, providing documents to orient the teams, and analyzing the state strategic plans; this team also developed one state strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RA. Input Evaluation Team</strong></td>
<td><strong>RA. Input Evaluation Team</strong></td>
<td><strong>RA. DHI Program Review Team</strong></td>
<td><strong>RA. Case Team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developed alternative programs</td>
<td>- Responsible for selecting and orienting advocate team members and running writing sessions</td>
<td>- Responsible for generating alternative strategies</td>
<td>- Responsible for running advocate teams, providing documents to orient the teams, and analyzing the state strategic plans; this team also developed one state strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RB. Advocate Team Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>RB. Advocate Team Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>RB. OSU Contract Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>RB. Advocate Teams</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developed alternative programs</td>
<td>- Responsible for generating alternative strategies</td>
<td>- Responsible for selecting and orienting advocate team members and running writing sessions</td>
<td>- First use: to identify clusters of local program options; second use: to develop alternative state strategic plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RC. Convergence Team Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>RC. Convergence Team Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>RC. Advocate Team Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>RC. Advocate Team Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Started to operationalize selected strategy</td>
<td>- Responsible for generating alternative strategies</td>
<td>- Responsible for generating alternative strategies</td>
<td>- First use: to identify clusters of local program options; second use: to develop alternative state strategic plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RD. Project Administration</strong></td>
<td><strong>RD. Project Administration</strong></td>
<td><strong>RD. Invited Judges</strong></td>
<td><strong>RD. Invited Judges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provided conceptual assistance to entire input evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reviewed strategies, attended session in which they could question chairmen; provided counsel to NCERD decision-makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D-5
### DESCRIPTIONS ACROSS CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study #1</th>
<th>Case Study #2</th>
<th>Case Study #3</th>
<th>Case Study #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migrant Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Model Training Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>DMI Assessment System</strong></td>
<td><strong>Illinois Gifted Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To develop a plan for a Model Training Program for training research related personnel</td>
<td>1. To design an assessment system for DMI</td>
<td>1. To identify three alternative state strategic plans for the Gifted in Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. U.S.O.E., NCERD, Research Training Branch; a planning grant; contract with The Ohio State University Evaluation Center</td>
<td>2. U.S.O.E., NCERD, Office of DMI Division of Manpower and institutions; a contract presented to The Ohio State University Educational Administration Faculty</td>
<td>2. Illinois State Department of Public Instruction; a contract awarded to The Ohio State University Educational Administration Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To develop competing programs designed to achieve a given set of objectives as determined by a prior context evaluation</td>
<td>3. To develop competing assessment systems for DMI</td>
<td>3. First use—to identify clusters of local program options; Second use—to develop alternative state strategic plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A. Input evaluation team—responsible for running advocate teams and assessing the strategies</td>
<td>4A. DMI Program Review Team—responsible for background study and monitoring of OSU grant.</td>
<td>4A. Case Team—responsible for running advocate teams, providing documents to orient the teams, and analyzing the state strategic plans; this team also developed one state strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B. Advocate team members developed alternative programs</td>
<td>4B. OSU Contract Personnel—responsible for selecting and orienting advocate team members and running writing sessions</td>
<td>4B. Advocate teams; first use for development of clusters of local program options; second use for development of state strategic plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C. Convergence team members started to operationalize selected strategy</td>
<td>4C. Advocate team members—responsible for generating alternative strategies</td>
<td>4C. Evaluator; provided formative evaluation to project personnel; helped design instruments to obtain input from reference groups throughout Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D. Project administration provided conceptual assistance to entire input evaluation</td>
<td>4D. Invited judges—reviewed strategies, attended session in which they could question chairmen; provided counsel to NCERD decision-makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Identification and assessment of capabilities</td>
<td>4E. System-decision-makers assisted in final report to TEA; some served on ranking-rating team</td>
<td>4E. Decision-making Team--selected and ranked criteria; reviewed proposal</td>
<td>4E. NCERD decided attended or made select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4F. Rating and Ranking Team--rated problems and ranked solutions</td>
<td>4F. Technical writers--worked with advocate teams in generation of alternative strategies</td>
<td>4F. ------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A. Selection and number of advocate teams</td>
<td>7A. Three teams of three persons; each team was assigned a problem area for which they were to develop three solutions</td>
<td>7A. Two teams of five members were given the objectives around which to develop a program</td>
<td>7A. Two teams of five members were given the objectives around which to develop a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B. Criteria for selection of A.T. members</td>
<td>7B. None written down; chose one person outside of Lab, two inside; familiar with Migrant Education; team members not selected because they represented different philosophies prior to strategy development</td>
<td>7B. Eleven criteria statements written down prior to selection of members; team members not selected because they represented different philosophies prior to strategy development; all team members selected by project staff</td>
<td>7B. Chairmen of selected presented different philosophies prior to strategy development; all team members selected by project staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Identification and assessment of capabilities</td>
<td>4E. System-decision-makers assisted in final report to TEA; some served on ranking-rating team</td>
<td>4E. Decision-making Team--selected and ranked criteria; reviewed proposal</td>
<td>4E. NCERD decided attended or made select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4F. Rating and Ranking Team--rated problems and ranked solutions</td>
<td>4F. Technical writers--worked with advocate teams in generation of alternative strategies</td>
<td>4F. ------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A. Selection and number of advocate teams</td>
<td>7A. Three teams of three persons; each team was assigned a problem area for which they were to develop three solutions</td>
<td>7A. Two teams of five members were given the objectives around which to develop a program</td>
<td>7A. Two teams of five members were given the objectives around which to develop a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B. Criteria for selection of A.T. members</td>
<td>7B. None written down; chose one person outside of Lab, two inside; familiar with Migrant Education; team members not selected because they represented different philosophies prior to strategy development</td>
<td>7B. Eleven criteria statements written down prior to selection of members; team members not selected because they represented different philosophies prior to strategy development; all team members selected by project staff</td>
<td>7B. Chairmen of selected presented different philosophies prior to strategy development; all team members selected by project staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decision-makers as-&lt;br&gt;in final report to&lt;br&gt;some served on ranking-&lt;br&gt;team</td>
<td>4E. Decision-making Team--selected and ranked criteria; reviewed proposal</td>
<td>4E. UCERD decision-makers attended orientation session; made selection decisions</td>
<td>4E. Advisory groups provided input into goal identification and procedures used in the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Ranking Team--problems and ranked</td>
<td>4F. Technical writers--worked with advocate teams in generation of alternative strategies</td>
<td>4F. ----</td>
<td>4F. Technical writers--used with both sets of advocate teams--they were not responsible for writing reports--just for taking notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;br&gt;development of &quot;Monster&quot;;&lt;br&gt;ing of constraints</td>
<td>6. Parts of the context evaluation dealt with capabilities of O.S.U. and consortium of agencies involved.</td>
<td>6. Some information available on capabilities of system in series of documents provided to each member of advocate teams</td>
<td>6. Some information available in series of working papers developed for advocate team members (especially Working Papers #7, 10, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teams of three per-&lt;br&gt;each team was assigned &lt;br&gt;item area for which &lt;br&gt;were to develop three &lt;br&gt;ons</td>
<td>7A. Two teams of five members were given the objectives around which to develop a program</td>
<td>7A. Two teams of four members each; two additional consultants on each team</td>
<td>7A. First use--four teams with five members; Second use--four teams with five members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written down; chose &lt;br&gt;person outside of Lab, &lt;br&gt;side; familiar with &lt;br&gt;Education; team &lt;br&gt;not selected because &lt;br&gt;represented different philosophies prior to strategy development</td>
<td>7B. Eleven criteria statements written down prior to selection of members; team members not selected because they represented different philosophies prior to strategy development; all team members selected by project staff</td>
<td>7B. Chairmen of two teams were selected because they represented different positions on evaluation; chairmen selected rest of their team; another criteria was national prominence of chairmen</td>
<td>7B. None written; some subjectively considered; rating of potential team members by several persons--selected from top of list (those persons who could contribute the most to the program development); Advocate team members not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C. Perceived Importance of A.T. Selection</td>
<td>7C. High Importance—a critical factor to success</td>
<td>7C. High Importance—a critical factor to success</td>
<td>7C. High Importance—a critical factor to success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7D. Use of documents by A.T. members</td>
<td>7D. A large amount of information (100 pages) plus use of literature search in forms of card file during sessions</td>
<td>7D. Context evaluation (over 180 pages) plus charge and format statements</td>
<td>7D. A portfolio (over 400 pages) of other writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7E. Summary of perception on use of documents by those interviewed</td>
<td>7E. Too many documents used; should be screened for relevance; almost no one used the &quot;Monster&quot; (could be they didn't have time to find out what was in it). Advocacy statement used often but sometimes confusing</td>
<td>7E. Some reference to context evaluation—important parts should have been summarized; used charge often; did not find format statement helpful so both teams rejected it</td>
<td>7E. Most of it was useful; some reference to context evaluation was useful; the &quot;Monster&quot; wasn't used at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F. Specifications for advocacy teams</td>
<td>7F. Teams had great difficulty in understanding what they were supposed to do; however, team reports somewhat followed specifications</td>
<td>7F. The charge was used often by team members; the format statement was rejected by both teams; many team members thought too much structure was given to strategy development but they didn't feel obligated to follow it—in some aspects they didn't.</td>
<td>7F. The charge was used often by team members; some members felt it was too specific to their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7C. High Importance—a critical factor to success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7D. Context evaluation (over 180 pages) plus charge and format statements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7E. Some reference to context evaluation—important parts should have been summarized; used charge often; did not find format statement helpful so both teams rejected it</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7F. The charge was used often by team members; the format statement was rejected by both teams; many team members thought too much structure was given to strategy development but they didn't feel obligated to follow it—in some aspects they didn't</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7C. High Importance—a critical factor to success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7D. A portfolio of documents (over 400 pages) plus use of other documents at time of writing session</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7E. Most of documents seemed useful; those documents brought to writing session were seldom used,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7F. The charge was used often; some members thought it was too specific but members felt free to change it and they often did</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>78. because they represented different philosophies prior to program development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7C. High Importance—a critical factor to success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7D. A series of twelve working papers (over 200 pages) plus charge to advocate team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7E. Some working papers viewed more useful than other; papers should have been screened and summaries presented; advocacy statement used often</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7F. Little specifications given to first use of advocate teams which resulted in confusion about task; greater specifications given to second teams; specifications were followed for the most part by the second advocate team members, however some deviation was made</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7G. Use of orientation session</td>
<td>7G. Held 1½ day orientation session composed of opening comments, discussion of Charge, review of documents and simulation exercise</td>
<td>7G. One half day session; included review of context evaluation; review of Charge and format statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7H. Perception on value of orientation sessions</td>
<td>7H. Too many opening statements which were not related to task; no questions generated by team members; ought to have exercises which show in some way the information that is available for advocate teams to use</td>
<td>7H. Many team members did not recall the orientation session; project staff recalled there were not many questions generated; however, some questions about priorities of the criteria and format were asked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7I. Advocate team (writing sessions)</td>
<td>7I. No formal sessions (gave teams five man days pay and a certain time frame to develop programs); some teams met in a marathon session, other teams wrote individual sections</td>
<td>7I. Held formal sessions for four days—at different times; one team used motel, other team used Evaluation Center; had use of technical writer, secretarial help, member of input evaluation team; one team broke into small groups after a day and a half; other team stayed in large group all through sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7J. Perceptions of interviewees on writing sessions</td>
<td>7J. Many questions about task; teams did not use resource people from Labs; some Lab personnel ended up writing parts of advocate team reports; difference of opinions as to whether holding formal sessions would have been better</td>
<td>7J. Both teams thought the technical writers did good job (these persons were responsible for writing the reports). Some members were frustrated because of the time which was spent in getting to know one another; most thought number of days was all one could take</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1/2 day orientation session composed of opening statements, discussion of exercises which were not related to no questions generated by team members; ought exercises which in some way the information that is available to advocate teams to use

### 7G
1/2 day session; included review of content, discussion of exercise; Individual group meetings with resource persons; liked the fact that the orientation session was several weeks before writing session—which served as an incubation period

### 7H
Many team members did not recall the orientation session; project staff recalled there were not many questions generated; however, some questions about priorities of the criteria and format were asked

### 7I
Held formal sessions for four days—at different times; one team used motel, other team used Evaluation Center; had use of technical writer, secretarial help, member of input evaluation team; one team broke into small groups after a day and a half; other team stayed in large group all through sessions

### 7J
Both teams thought the technical writers did good job (these persons were responsible for writing the reports). Some members were frustrated because of the time which was spent in getting to know one another; most thought number of days was all one could take
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Strategy assessment procedures</td>
<td>8A. A comprehensive list of criteria were generated and presented to advocate team members; a substantive part of the advocate team reports consisted of a description and defense of each solution in terms of each criterion</td>
<td>8A. A list of thirty criteria were identified and rated on importance by members of the decision-making team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A. Identification of criteria</td>
<td>8B. A section of the charge to the advocate teams included an estimation of the importance of each criterion on a 1-5 scale; this section also included remarks</td>
<td>8B. A weight for each criterion was established by rankings of importance by members of the decision-making team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B. Weighting of criteria</td>
<td>8C. The pre-strategy design team did not systematically apply the criteria to advocate team strategies; consultants suggested an analysis of &quot;power&quot; and &quot;tractibility&quot; however this analysis was not used either</td>
<td>8C. The two strategies were related to 35 criteria; the weight determined selection of one strategy over the other; additional analysis were conducted on the format statement for each strategy; recommendations for combining the strategies were made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C. Application of assessment procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>8C. The two strategies were evaluated by expert judges who were asked questions by advocates and to assess the strategies in this evaluation of the OS strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Identification of design</td>
<td>9. No operational designs were developed; strategies which were selected and submitted to the Texas Educational Agency were submitted as strategies which needed further operationalization</td>
<td>9. A convergence team was identified to converge sections of both strategies and further operationalize each strategy; the output from this team was disappointing to project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No operational designs were developed; strategies which were selected and submitted to the Texas Educational Agency were submitted as strategies which needed further operationalization</td>
<td>9. Staff with operational strategy; thought it implement further progression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. A comprehensive list of criteria was generated and fed to advocate teams; a substantive part advocate team reported them of a description of each solution of each criterion on the charge to a team included in the import of each criterion on a list; this section also includes remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A. A list of thirty criteria were identified and rated on importance by members of the decision-making team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B. A weight for each criterion was established by rankings of importance by members of the decision-making team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C. Two persons rated both strategies on each criterion using an evidence scale of 1-5; the evidence rating X the weight determined selection of one strategy over the other; additional analyses were conducted on the format statement for each strategy; recommendations for combining the strategies were made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A convergence team was identified to converge sections of both strategies and further operationalize each strategy; the output from this team was disappointing to project staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A. No criteria were specifically generated upon which to assess the strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B. No weight assigned to criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C. The two strategies were sent to related reference groups; thirty narrative responses were obtained; four invited judges were brought in to ask questions of the chairmen of each advocate team and to assist DMI decision makers in making a selection; this evaluation was not part of the OSU contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Staff within DMI proceeded to operationalize the chosen strategy; those interviewed thought it was impossible to implement the strategy without further operationalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C. The base team reviewed the four strategic plans and subjectively combined elements so that they came up with three viable state strategic plans; the project developed mass dissemination procedures to be used throughout the state to obtain perceptions of important reference groups on each of the state plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is anticipated that the three state strategic plans will be synthesized upon completion of the state-wide assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assessment of design</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Project staff reviewed output from convergence team, set up an outline of what was needed to submit to Washington and assigned project staff to write various sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Project staff reviewed output from convergence team, set up an outline of what was needed to submit to Washington and assigned project staff to write various sections</td>
<td>10.-----</td>
<td>10.-----</td>
<td>10.-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E-1

### LOG OF QUESTIONS

Directions: Please identify any questions you have regarding use of the manual. In the last column, briefly describe reason for question—i.e., could not understand what was written (coherence); statement is inconsistent with ________________, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments—why the question?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Page #</td>
<td>Comments—why the question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E-3

ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT
STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Element:

2. Technical Manual page reference:

3. Description of activities:

For each of the six elements, information called for on this page was provided to the project staff.
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ADVOCATE TEAM #1
TAPE ANALYSIS

I. Time allocation (first day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Introduction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Review of Orientation Session</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Description of system</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Full state funding issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non public school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State-wide testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Accountability system for whom (legislator, etc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Description of system (cont'd)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Discussion of constraints</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Discussion of content of Advocate Team Reports (specifications)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Discussion of alternative definitions of accountability</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Discussion on elements or functions of accountability system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Functions of determining responsibility (goal objectives and sessions)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Function of analyzing performance (phasing of accountability system)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resource reallocation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Related topics</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) State of art measurement, objective setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Longitudinal study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Reporting information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Minimum standards already developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Whats done now on site visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Summary</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. References to documents

A. Specifications page 29 and discussion (capabilities) error in state-wide testing constraints | 21
B. Specifications page 30 and discussion 10
C. Specification (contents of report) and discussion 27
D. Legislation
E. Minimum standards (brought by Bill)
F. Statement of objectives
G. Michigan and Florida plans
H. Columbus and Dallas Profiles
I. Specifications (appendix)
J. Ratings of priorities on specifications

III. Clarification and information needed

A. On state-wide testing—What do they actually do?
B. Actual accountability documents now used (self evaluation reports, principal form, minimum standards)
C. On computer capabilities
D. State of PPBS
E. What is wanted—an accountability system or an overall management information system?
F. Priorities on advocacy components

IV. Reference to Orientation Session

A. Description at beginning of session 17
B. Number of references made about Orientation Session during the day—8
C. Not sure of focus of Orientation Session

V. Summary

This team went right to work on the content issue of defining accountability. Comments seem to suggest that the team would have preferred more information which described the system such as minimum standards, state testing, etc. Numerous references were made about discussions from during the Orientation Session. This team appeared to work well together; no one dominated the conversation and all members contributed. Less input was provided by participants from the state department. There seemed to be some confusion about the task itself (Specifications, Part III) however, this did not prevent this team
from proceeding forward. Laughter was often a part of the team's work and team members did not appear to be highly frustrated with their task.
APPENDIX E-2

ADVOCATE TEAM #2
TAPE ANALYSIS

1. Time allocation (first day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Introductions, lunch arrangements</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. History of legislation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Discussion of aspects of bill</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Uniform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Levels problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Full state funding</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Nature of system—futuristic or just</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization of data available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Discussion of input, process, output</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Exploration of issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarifying input</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Standards and controllable and noncontrollable inputs and processes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reading of specifications for advocate teams</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Means for developing goals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion of constraints from specifications</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reporting of accountability data</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The role of negotiation in accountability</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The role of the state department (regulatory or leadership)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Discussion of specifications for Advocate Team Reports</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Definition of accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching-Learning Model</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Glazer/Alkin (three types of accountability—goal, program, outcomes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is malpractice in education</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accountability for what (reference to Michigan and Colorado)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What can be controlled and what cannot (pyramid of role responsibility</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Description of three prong accountability model (restore confidence in schools, fiscal trace system and long range negotiation and improvement of evaluation capability)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Discussion about three prong approach

II. References to documents

A. Brief description of documents available
B. Synthesis Report (legislation section)
C. Reference to Process Report submitted to legislature last June
D. Principals's Report
E. Columbus Profile (three times)
F. Specifications for Advocate Team Report
G. Constraints from Synthesis Report
H. Colorado and Michigan Model (four times)

III. Clarification and information needed

A. Copies of Title III Project working on state-wide models
B. State forms (What do we have now?)
C. Request for other state accountability models (Colorado, Michigan)
D. Description of state-wide testing program
E. Priorities of specifications by state department personnel

IV. Reference to Orientation Session (seven times)

V. Summary

The first day of this advocate team was primarily devoted to the exploration of important issues related to accountability in general. Questions about their actual task as specified by the Synthesis Report and interpretation of the legislation were also discussed. It was not until the end of the day that a description of an accountability system was identified. A large amount of time was spent in the description of actual problems within school districts in relation to specific topics under consideration. State representatives were very focal in this session. One of the team members not representing a particular state reference group talked more than the other three members. The content breakdown shows the range of topics...
discussed. Often topics would reappear throughout the session, e.g., what variables can be controlled and which ones cannot be controlled. Group laughter seldom occurred during the day.
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ADVOCA T E  T E A M  #3
TAPE ANALYSIS

I. Time allocation (first day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Introduction procedures for reviewing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft, secretarial resources available,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Importance of developing phased model</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Description and reaction to Florida system</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Individual reports (what accountability is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and what it is not)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. First team member— not accountability</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but responsibility; discrepancy analysis;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rewards not allocated on discrepancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis but what professionals do about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it; system must have R&amp;D emphasis;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory of little differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second team member—levels of accounta-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bility; hidden components of accountabil-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compare and contrast first two presenta-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Third team member—political sensitivity;</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructive utilization of output; perscrip-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tive not just diagnostic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Compare and contrast first three present-</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions asked of state department</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Kinds of resources (curriculum and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation) specialists are available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to help districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic school statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State-wide testing program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minimum standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Previous evaluative study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perception of superintendent and state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department on what they want</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How representative reacts to accountabili-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ty features already discussed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organization of state board and state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Data at state, district or building level

10. What is management information system and are we responsible

F. Return to individual reports
   1. Fourth team member—negotiation; publicizing information

G. Orientation of proceedings so far to team member who just arrived

H. Fears of administrators about the legislation

I. Return to individual reports
   1. Fifth team member—professional responsibility; encourage experimental approach; New York City approach
   2. Sixth team member—do not give them an accountability model; if do specify unanticipated consequences; moral and political questions
   3. Compare and contrast all presentations (other issues involved, i.e., management information system)

II. Reference to documents

A. Referencr to document list
B. Entire Synthesis Report (three times)
C. Florida system
D. Other models (three times)
E. Legislation (in Synthesis Report) (three times)
F. Testing program (discussed once and mentioned four times)
G. Priorities for specification of reports (three times)

III. Clarification and information needed

A. Resources available at state level
B. Basic school statistics((enrollment, etc.)
C. State-wide testing
D. Organizational Chart -state department
E. Minimum standards
F. Previous evaluation studies
G. What management information system exists now
H. Priorities of Advocate Report
I. Other projects, Title III and I which relate
J. Michigan plan
IV. Reference to Orientation Session (six times)

V. Summary

Members of this team came in with written comments about thoughts on accountability. Each member described their written responses and discussed and contrasted elements of each other's responses. This team also spent over an hour talking with a state department representative and asking questions about state department resources. Also some time was spent in orienting one team member who came in late. This team seemed to work well together and many concepts were introduced. There seemed to be more input from three members than from the other members. Laughter occurred often.
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ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please list corrections or additions to description attached.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. Please rate the degree of implementation of manual on the five point scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not implemented</td>
<td>fully implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to any extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please rate the value of the content presented in this section of the technical manual to a potential user.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of no value</td>
<td>very valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please cite reasons for your value rating.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

For each of the six elements, the project staff completed this form
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DESCRIPTION OF THE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT
ACTIVITIES BY ELEMENTS

1. Element: Identifying and assessing relevant capabilities

1. Of the material available some documents were concerned with capabilities such as:
   A. Operating plan of the Ohio Department of Education from the 1972-1973 year
   B. Financial data on schools (from OEA and Auditor's Office)
   C. Reports from other Title III grants, i.e., PPBES
   D. An organizational chart
   E. Minimum standards
   F. Other forms

2. At the Orientation Session, the computer man made a brief presentation on computer capabilities. Other capabilities of the state were discussed. In addition, a presentation was made by State Department of Education administrators in regard to:
   A. Political history of legislation
   B. Political feedback from relevant groups (OEA, local administrators, legislators)
   C. Discussion of the "search for consensus" work on state goals and objectives

3. The Synthesis Report included brief descriptions of the system (page 29).

II. Element: Selection of Advocate team members and chairmen

The chairmen were identified primarily by the project director and the project supervisor. At that point, the chairman of each team was contacted to see if he would accept this responsibility. No specific criteria was used in selection of chairmen, however, the project administration wanted advocate models and the best people to chair the teams. The three
chairmen represented areas of administration, evaluation, and measurement or psychometrics. Each chairman was then asked who he would like to serve on his team. Copies of the specifications and law were sent to each chairman. It was suggested that someone in measurement and someone from the state be included as members of the team. With these suggestions in mind, the chairmen selected their team members. The number of members differed for each team. One team had eight members, one had seven members, and one had six members. Four state representatives served on one team while only one state representative served on each of the two remaining advocate teams.

III. Element: Development of specifications for Advocate Team Reports

Pages 30-32 of the Synthesis Report contained specifications for the advocate Team Reports. One section of these specifications identified constraints upon any model while the other section cited necessary components of the Advocate Team Reports. The specifications represented the opinion of the Synthesis Team as to what an accountability model should be. Other accountability models and state department personnel concerns were considered by this team in their development of the specification. At the Orientation Session, advocate team members asked for ratings of importance for various elements of the specification. These ratings were provided to advocate team members.
IV. Element: Document selection and distribution

(Technical Manual page reference 41)

A list of materials that were available was distributed to advocate team members by the project staff. Materials included reprints, books, ETS materials, and the three existing accountability models (Florida, Colorado, and Michigan), etc. These materials were made available to each team member and to each team prior to the writing session. The materials included background material on the subsystems in Ohio and also any events that led into the generation of the Synthesis Report and the legislation.

V. Element: The Orientation Session

An Orientation Session for the advocate team members was held prior to the writing session. The Orientation Session lasted for one day. It was not a required meeting, but members were urged to attend by the chairman of each team and by the project staff. The meeting was divided up into two sections. During the morning session, the advocate team members met with the State Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent, the Director of Planning and Evaluation and the person in charge of computer capabilities at the state level. Advocate team members were allowed to ask any questions about characteristics of the system. Also the state representative related certain concerns they had about an accountability model. The Charge was given to the advocate teams by the State Superintendent and the Deputy
Superintendent. There was a brief discussion about services such as computer capabilities in the state. One team met during the luncheon meeting and generated questions and discussed what happened in the morning meeting. During the afternoon persons representing the teachers' organization and other associations were allowed to ask the team members any questions and these persons also responded to any questions the team members had. The biases of the different individuals and organizations were brought out. The advocate team chairmen were told that they could place a conference call to their team members after the Orientation Session—one chairman did so.

VI. Element: The actual writing session

Administrative support for the writing session included typing service, typewriters, and tape recorders. Each team had a different style of meeting. One team met for two days to discuss and outline their model, at which time they went home and wrote a section. Two weeks later they met for another two days to discuss each others written section. Another team met for four days during which time they outlined and described the problem of accountability and assigned writing tasks. Sections of the paper were sent to the chairmen and rewrites were completed through a mailing process. The third team met for five consecutive days during which time they completed (except for editing) their report. Two of the three teams had technical writers who took notes. The other team used an editor once upon completion of the rough draft.
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INPUT EVALUATION
TECHNICAL MANUAL

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ____________________________
Date ____________________________

Return to: Diane L. Reinhard
Evaluation Center
The Ohio State University
1712 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Return by November 1, 1972
**PART I**

Directions: Rate each item below by placing an X in the box underneath the description which most closely describes your attitude toward the manual or methodology. The first set of items (1-8) refers to the manual, the second set (9-16) refers to the methodology presented within the manual. Please answer all items using only one X per item.

### Item 1 - Manual Clarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This manual is totally confusing and ambiguous and should be entirely rewritten.</td>
<td>Some parts are clearly written and understandable, but the majority of the manual is confusing and should be rewritten.</td>
<td>The manual has an acceptable level of readability throughout although some of the sections could be improved.</td>
<td>The manual is clearly written and understandable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 2 - Manual Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing of manual sections appears to have been randomly determined.</td>
<td>The majority of the sections were inappropriately sequenced.</td>
<td>Sequencing of manual sections was appropriate and somewhat easy to follow.</td>
<td>The manual is presented in an easily followed logical fashion. The sections flowed from one to another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 3 - Manual Illustrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Un satisfactory use of examples exists. There are not enough examples and examples presented do not clarify points to be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of examples exist, but often necessary illustrations are not provided. Some existing illustrations are inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most examples appear where needed and clarify points to be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manual is outstanding in its use of examples. Each example presented is necessary and contributes extensively to users' understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 4 - Manual Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The manual is dull and boring. It put me to sleep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some parts are interesting but the majority of the manual just didn't hold my attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As technical manuals go, this manual adequately held my attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found the entire manual alive and exciting. I couldn't put it down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 5 - Manual Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation within the manual is inadequate. It needs much more in the way of supporting content presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than an adequate amount of documentation is provided. Footnotes are not cited when needed and there is an insufficient use of references.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high degree of documentation exists. Footnotes are used extensively and references cited appear valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manual is outstanding in regard to documentation. An abundance of footnotes are available. Additional references cited are valuable and add extensively to content of the manual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 6 - Manual Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>A surplus of existing technical manuals comprehensively covering this topic are available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Other appropriate material related to this topic exists, but this manual provides an alternative of manuals to choose from.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>There is a sufficient desire for information on this topic. Evaluators would be interested, for there is not enough material or information available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>This technical manual is the first comprehensive treatment of this topic available. Evaluators would actively seek out this material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 7 - Manual Problem Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>The manual on this topic is an academic exercise. I cannot think how it would provide help for any problem existing in education today.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>An extremely limited number of uses of the manual would exist. It deals with problems that seldom occur in real life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Educators would find the manual applicable to a number of problems they face. They would use it. Dissemination is worthwhile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>There would be extensive use of a manual on this topic to help solve many educational problems—dissemination is a must.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 8 - Manual Completeness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>The manual shows inadequate understanding of subject. Many important topics are not mentioned and topics discussed are treated superficially.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Less than an adequate amount of information is provided on relevant topic and a few important topics were not discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The manual contained adequate treatment of the subject. Most relevant topics are included and sufficiently discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Treatment of the subject was outstanding. The manual contained a comprehensive analysis of relevant topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 9 - Methodological Adequacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The manual contains no methodological element which, when implemented, would provide information having a high level of internal and external validity, i.e., true and generalizable information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host methodological elements presented, when implemented would provide information having a low level of internal and external validity, i.e., true and generalizable information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some methodological elements when implemented would provide information having a high level of internal and external validity, i.e., true and generalizable information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manual contains many methodological elements, which, when implemented would provide information having a high degree of internal and external validity, i.e., true and generalizable information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 10 - Methodology Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The methodology does not contain enough detail. Two different groups in a similar situation would follow the same set of procedures only by chance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology does not contain enough detail. Two different groups in a similar situation would need to rely more on their own ingenuity than on the manual in determining their procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology is highly detailed. Two different groups in a similar situation using the manual would likely arrive at comparable sets of procedures to be followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology is highly detailed. Two different groups in a similar situation using the manual would consistently select the same procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 11 - Methodology Objectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The manual contains no methodological element which when implemented would provide information that is highly objective and unbiased.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manual contains a few methodological elements which when implemented would provide information that is highly objective and unbiased.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some methodological element which when implemented would provide information that is highly objective and unbiased.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manual contains many methodological elements, which when implemented would provide information that is highly objective and unbiased.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 12 - Methodology Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be almost impossible to implement this methodology. It is just too impractical and inconvenient.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be extremely difficult, but possible, to use. It is impractical, and a high amount of effort would be required.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology could be used with some effort. It is practical and convenient.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology could be put into action with very little effort. It is very practical and convenient.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 13 - Methodology Cost-Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In almost all situations, the cost of implementing this methodology will be more than the value attached to program development.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In most situations, the cost of implementing this methodology would be more than the value attached to program improvement.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In many situations, the value attached to program improvement would somewhat exceed the cost needed to implement this methodology.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In most situations, the value attached to increased program improvement would exceed the cost needed to implement the methodology by a large margin.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14 - Methodology Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Poor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td><strong>Very Good</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology presented is rigid and inflexible, and too few alternatives are provided for a potential user, it would be extremely difficult for a user to adjust the methodology to fit his individual needs.</td>
<td>A very small part of the methodology can be adjusted to fit individual use. The majority of the methodology is rigid and very few alternatives are provided.</td>
<td>A sufficient amount of flexibility is provided and some alternatives are presented. It is possible to adapt methodology to some degree.</td>
<td>Many of the methodological elements can be adjusted to fit most individual use considerations, for many alternatives are provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15 - Methodology Relevance to Input Evaluation Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Poor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology is not related to any evaluation problem in existence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 16 - Methodology Uniqueness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Poor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing new, the same methodology can be found in a number of evaluation and research textbooks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II

Directions: Please indicate how the manual can be improved in general and/or in relation to specific sections of the manual. Please use extra sheets if necessary. Your cooperation is appreciated.
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