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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Guidance program evaluations, as well as total school program evaluations, have been conducted in numerous schools across the country for several years. Nationally, there are two types of organizations with power and responsibility to exert a positive influence on the American educational establishment: (1) the various state departments of education and (2) the six major regional accreditation associations. These two agencies establish and enforce minimum standards in schools under their jurisdiction while encouraging improvements of the process which is education (Richmond, 1970).

The final report of the evaluations completed by these two organizations generally takes the form of commendations and recommendations, strengths and weaknesses, and/or priorities for improvement of the program being studied. In this regard, few follow-up surveys have been conducted on the value of school program evaluations and ever fewer studies can be found concerning the degree of educational change that is achieved after an evaluation is completed. Without such follow-up data the true effect of any well intended evaluative process will never be known—nor can that evaluative process be improved or strengthened to realize maximum benefit to the particular school system or program studied.
Five years ago, a battery of instruments for guidance program evaluation was developed and validated at the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education by Wysong (1968). In each of the succeeding years since this battery was developed, field services personnel at the Division of Guidance and Testing have conducted numerous school guidance program evaluations using this battery of instruments. To this date, however, no follow-up has been made of these guidance evaluations in order to assess the effectiveness of the review, and to determine the degree to which the various recommendations were implemented.

Importance of the Study

According to Humphreys, Traxler, and North (1967, p. 240):

Conducting an evaluation study is one of the most difficult and at the same time one of the most important tasks a guidance worker faces.

Holliman (1969) reported in a study involving a follow-up to school evaluations conducted in Texas that the follow-up program ultimately determined the success of the total evaluation. Cope (1952) and Newman (1955) both stressed the values of a planned program of follow-up to the achievement of positive educational change resulting from evaluation.

A study by Boersma and Plawicki (1972), which involved the degree of educational change resulting from the North Central Association Evaluations, focused on the question of whether the results of the evaluations can really justify the enormous output of time expended by the school staff and visitation committees. Their methodology in
answering the question involved following up the schools to determine if recommendations emanating from the visitation team had been implemented.

The State of Ohio requires a comprehensive evaluation at least every five years for every aspect of the school program including, of course, guidance:

Constant evaluation and research are the processes which seek to effect improvement in the purposes of the school, understanding of pupils, instructional methods, and assessment of educational outcomes. The research and evaluation shall provide means of evaluating the purposes of the school, the pupils, the teachers, methods and materials, curricular content, organization, and the final product.

Systematic use shall be made of recognized national, regional, or state evaluative criteria.

All major phases of the school's program, both instruction and services, shall be carefully studied and evaluated at least once every five years. The results of such studies shall be used to implement improvements (State Board of Education, 1968, pp. 17,18.)

In view of the previously stated requirements for evaluation in Ohio, it is important to determine whether or not the guidance program evaluation process has led to improvements, and to determine whether the evaluation process is seen as valuable to the school system.

By following up schools that have undergone the voluntary guidance program evaluation process that is offered through the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education, two very essential questions can be answered:

(1) Does the process of guidance program evaluation lead to educational change, as defined by the recommendations of the visitation team?
How can the various steps in the guidance evaluation process be improved or strengthened to realize maximum benefits for the school systems who participated?

In addition to these questions, such relevant questions as "What are some of the factors that prevent schools from implementing desired changes in their guidance services?", "Are differences in evaluation results achieved among consultants at the Division of Guidance and Testing?", "Does the size or organizational framework of a school affect the rate of implementation of visiting team recommendations?", and "Do differences in opinion exist among staff members with respect to the value of different aspects of the evaluation process?" are examples of related areas that need to be examined in this follow-up research. In summary, such an investigation would enable the Division of Guidance and Testing to: (1) assess the degree to which guidance program evaluation leads to change, and (2) collect information on the many factors that tend to affect the efficiency and value of such evaluations.

**Approach to the Problem**

In order to assess the impact of the guidance evaluation process, the investigator conducted a follow-up study of all of the secondary schools in the State of Ohio that completed the Division of Guidance and Testing's guidance program evaluation during the 1970-1971 school year. Using instruments that were constructed specifically for this study, all of the personnel involved on the local evaluation committee from each of the participating schools were surveyed in order to:
(1) determine each person's attitudes concerning the value of the evaluation process completed the previous year; (2) determine the percent of the visiting team recommendations that have been implemented since the evaluation; and (3) secure opinions from each person concerning how the evaluation process they experienced could be strengthened.

**Purposes of the Study**

The main purposes of this research project were as follows:

1. To develop a follow-up instrument that could be used effectively to assess the impact of Guidance Program Evaluations conducted by the Division of Guidance and Testing;
2. To determine to what extent the Guidance Program Evaluation recommendations made by the visiting team during the evaluation were implemented;
3. To determine, in those instances where recommendations were not implemented, the primary reasons why schools did not implement the suggested changes;
4. To determine the relative value of each step of the Guidance Program Evaluation process as perceived by counselors, teachers, administrators, students and lay people involved in the guidance evaluation;
5. To gather opinions from those persons who experienced the evaluation process to improve the evaluation procedures.
Hypotheses

Several hypotheses were tested regarding the data gathered in this study. The hypotheses involved either the rate of implementation of recommendations, or the relative values of various steps completed during the evaluation process. In each case, the .05 level of significance was used as the criterion. In all instances where tests of significance were computed, the null hypothesis was chosen to hold true. It can be stated in the following manner: No significant difference shall be observed between the responses of different groups on identical items when using the .05 level of significance. The hypotheses were as follows:

1. No significant difference in the rate of implementation of recommendations shall exist among the evaluated schools when analyzed according to the five field services staff members from the Division of Guidance and Testing who conducted the twenty evaluations.

2. No significant difference in the implementation rate of guidance program recommendations shall exist among various size schools.

3. No significant difference in the implementation rate of recommendations shall exist between schools organized as city or local (county).

4. No significant difference in the value of various evaluation activities shall exist between chairmen and committee members.

The major intent of this investigation, which was to determine the general value of the total Guidance Program Evaluation, will not be stated in the form of an hypothesis because of its dependence on
the outcome of numerous questions relating to the current implementation status of the visiting team recommendations and the perceived value held of each evaluation activity.

Definitions of Terms Used

It is essential that certain terms that will be extensively referred to later in this investigation be described in clear and concise language. Consequently, the following key terms have been defined to aid the reader:

1. Chairman. The chairmen are the individuals from each of the twenty schools who coordinated the total evaluation process from start to finish. They were responsible for seeing that each step was completed on time in order to assure the completion of the evaluation. In most instances the chairman was the head of the guidance department, but some were teachers, administrators, or counselors. Most often the committee chairman was appointed by the school administration.

2. Committee. This term refers to those individuals who served on the in-school evaluation committee for each of the twenty schools involved in the study. They served under the direction of the chairman described above. These individuals were teachers, administrators, students, lay citizens, or counselors. Although they were acquainted with all of the evaluation activities, they were most intimately involved with the development of guidance objectives and the evaluative criteria portions of the evaluative process. They were selected for participation by the chairman and school administration.
3. **Guidance Program Evaluation.** This term shall refer to the evaluation process used by the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education, to assess a school's guidance program.

Originally developed by Wysong (1968), the evaluation process includes several very important steps. A brief description of each evaluation step is included below in chronological order of completion during the evaluation process. An example of each step can be found in Appendix A.

a. **Developing guidance objectives** is the initial step completed by the in-school evaluation committee. The committee cooperatively develops a list of appropriate guidance objectives and the degree to which the school reaches the objectives agreed upon constitutes a major aspect of the evaluation.

b. **Committee use of evaluative criteria** refers to a rather extensive listing of guidance activities that are generally held to be of value in most guidance programs. Each committee member completes an individual evaluative rating on the basis of whether or not he thinks the activity is being met: (1) exceptionally well, (2) adequately, (3) not adequately and improvement is needed, (N) the activity is not appropriate to the objectives of this school, or (?) not enough information is known to make a judgment.
a. **The student survey** is a rather extensive listing of 98 items that are asked of most students in the school concerning the services of the guidance department and the school in general. The school is provided an item-analysis report of student responses for each question by grade level.

d. **Teacher survey** refers to a questionnaire of 60 items given to all teachers. It is designed to determine teacher opinion of the school's guidance services. An item analysis report of teacher responses for each question is provided.

e. **The counselor time-analysis charts** are charts each counselor responds to twice: (1) the percentage of time he now spends working with students, teachers, parents, etc., and (2) the percentage of time he feels he **should** be spending with the same guidance activity. It provides a measure of the gap between ideal and real counselor time expenditure.

f. **Comment sheets** are single sheets of paper given to students and teachers in the school to determine: (1) "How has the counselor been of help to you this school year?" and (2) "How could the counselor be of more help to you?". It provides responses in greater detail than is possible on any of the previously described instruments.

g. **Brief case reports** refers to the completion of case reports by the counselors. This step is designed to determine their methodology and technique in helping students with particular problems.
h. **The visiting team presentation to evaluation committee** is the culminating activity in which the visiting team of experts present the guidance evaluation findings to the in-school evaluation committee. This oral report is usually in the form of commendations and recommendations.

i. **The visiting team report to total staff** is the final activity of the visiting team's two-day involvement in the evaluation. A brief oral report is given to the entire faculty and it generally includes only the evaluation highlights.

4. **Guidance Program Evaluation Follow-Up.** This term shall refer to the three instruments used in the collection of data for the study. Parts I and II, completed by the chairman only, were designed to collect information concerning (I) the recommendations of the visiting team that have or have not been implemented; and (II) the opinions held concerning the value of each evaluation step completed. Part III, completed by the committee member only, collects information concerning the value of the various evaluation steps.

5. **School.** This term shall refer to any of the twenty schools involved in the Division of Guidance and Testing's Guidance Program Evaluation during the 1970-1971 school year. The schools were selected solely on their having completed the total evaluation. Appendix B contains the identity of the twenty schools.

6. **Visiting Team.** This term includes those individuals from outside the school who were charged with evaluating the guidance program and submitting a list of recommendations to the school. The current status
of these recommendations constituted a major portion of this study. Typically, the visiting team is composed of a representative from the Division of Guidance and Testing, a practicing counselor, and a school administrator.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study is subject to certain limitations, some of which are inherent to most follow-up surveys and the rest are unique to this particular study. They are summarized below.

First, surveys often reflect opinions and opinion is not necessarily fact; opinion is subject to social pressure, and may not be accurate. Also, degrees of opinions and attitudes are difficult to measure and may not be discernible. Thirdly, the total number of schools in this study, twenty, may not be truly representative of the entire population of schools that completed the guidance program evaluation in preceding school years.

Another important limitation of this study involved the varying degrees of intimacy that evaluation committee members had with each evaluation activity. The value of a particular evaluation activity was difficult to assess because in some cases the respondent was not as informed or as aware of each evaluation activity as other committee members were.

The study may also be limited by the fact that some respondents may not have remembered certain evaluation activities because of the one year interval of time between the actual evaluation and the follow-
up survey. Also, because of the one year interval of time, some schools may have been limited with respect to the number of recommendations implemented. A longer interim period between the completion of the evaluation and the follow-up study could have resulted in an increase in the recommendations implementation rate (O'Dell, 1971).

A final limitation concerned the number of completed surveys returned with this investigation. Since it was primarily left to the chairman to disseminate the surveys to the committee, the per cent of return by school was largely a reflection of his encouragement to each committee member to complete and return the instruments. It is conceivable that a larger return could have been achieved with mailings to individual committee members.

Organization of Chapters in Study

Chapter I presented the reader with an introduction to the problem, the importance of the study, the purposes of the investigation, the limitations of the study, and definitions of terms used in the research. Chapter II will provide a thorough review of literature dealing with the areas of: definitions of evaluations; the need and importance of evaluation; values accruing to evaluation; important aspects of evaluation; difficulties with evaluation; types of evaluations utilized; effect of evaluation; and important aspects of educational change. Chapter III will summarize the methodology utilized, including the sample population, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, research design, hypotheses, and any other relevant items related to
the methodology of the problem. Chapter IV will present the results of the study, both with respect to the recommendations implemented and the value of the evaluative process. Chapter V will be a summary, including a discussion of the findings with implications, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In researching the available literature relative to evaluation, the scarcity of studies dealing with guidance program evaluation becomes evident. Therefore, in the process of reviewing the mass of literature dealing with the subject of school evaluation, it was necessary to subdivide the search into several smaller, but more defined, categories which would serve to summarize the many and varied aspects of evaluation. Consequently, review of the literature will be divided into the following sections: definitions of evaluation, the need and importance of evaluation, the values resulting from evaluation, the vital components of evaluation, present difficulties with evaluation, types of evaluation strategies utilized, the effects of evaluation, and important aspects of educational change.

Definitions of Evaluation

Provus (1969) has described evaluation as the process of: (a) agreeing upon program standards, (b) determining whether a discrepancy exists between some aspects of the program and the standards governing that aspect of the program, and (c) using discrepancy information to identify the weaknesses of a program. Levine and
Williams (1971, p. 1), who constructed a guide to evaluate HEW projects, concluded that:

Evaluation, in its most general meaning, is a process of measurement designed to estimate worth. It is a process of assessment designed to provide information about past and present operations and effectiveness in order to assist in making decisions about the future.

Consistent with the above description, Guba (1970) described educational evaluation as the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives. Lee (1969) concluded that evaluation is the process of determining worth with a view to making change, and an evaluation of a guidance program is simply an effort to determine its worth. Harris (1968), commenting on the nature and function of educational evaluation, states that evaluation is the process of judging the worth, desirability, effect, or adequacy of something according to defined criteria and purposes.

It is with these practical definitions in mind, that we now probe more deeply into the need and importance of evaluation.

**Need and Importance of Evaluation**

Dyer (1972, p. 390), commenting on the utility of school evaluations as a response to the modern-day demand for accountability, wrote:

Intelligent school evaluation programs can be genuinely functional in not only showing how every school is performing on behalf of its students today but also in suggesting specific ways in which it can serve students better tomorrow, next week, next year.
In arguing for evaluation to be used as research for program improvement, Messick (1970) concluded that a major concern in society now is for the initiation and execution of programs, with little inclination to pause and inquire why or how a program works or to obtain day-to-day information on operations that could be used to modify programs when conditions change. To him, the educational researcher must look at the entire environment that surrounds a given program, and the system should carry out research and program simultaneously.

Shaw and Jordan (1971, p. 320) made an eloquent case for the importance of evaluation:

The public and professional clamor for quality education has been in the forefront of discussion for the past several years, but this worthy goal is not the automatic product of imaginative programs, bold innovations and experiments, stimulating materials, new equipment, and modern facilities. Quality education does not occur by accident; it is attained as a result of careful planning, followed by meticulous review, analysis, and evaluation.

The decade of the 60's saw a great number of grandiose schemes to revolutionize American education. Team teaching, flexible scheduling, mini-courses, continuing progress, and independent study became common terms in pedagouge. Follow-up studies, however, indicate that relatively little change has taken place as a result of millions of dollars invested in the school systems of our society during the past decade (Trump and Georgiades, 1971).

Evaluation of the guidance program is mandatory if the effects of its services are to be known or its services improved. Though it is probably true that informal evaluation is continually underway
since decisions are constantly made about personnel, time, and activities, systematic study is urgently needed as a basis for program improvement (Shertzer and Stone, 1966). Crow and Crow, in addressing themselves to the question of the importance of evaluation, state that evaluation of guidance services is an important phase of the total educational process. The appraisal of pupil behavior, of learning outcomes, and of the services that exert an impact on pupils is needed today as never before. A realistic approach must be found to discover the extent to which guidance personnel are meeting the purposes for which they are assigned and the effects of the practices used by them (Crow and Crow, 1965). Provus (1970) and Berdie (1969) agree that the purpose of evaluation is to determine whether to improve, maintain, or terminate a program, and the importance of evaluation to this function cannot be overstressed.

Lee (1969, p. 84) stated that if guidance programs are to remain in the public schools, to grow increasingly effective in serving the students, teachers, and parents; if the guidance specialist is to remain (or become) a unique and necessary professional member of the school staff, then the techniques of program evaluation must become clear, sharp, precise. Continuing, Lee wrote:

Regarding the present status of evaluation in guidance, it is not unfair to say that, generally, the chief evidence of the effect of guidance is the subjective evidence the counselor accumulates as a result of his experiences with students. This evidence has only limited value since it is likely to be colored by wishful thinking and other irrelevant factors. The majority of studies fail to provide interpretable evidence largely because they fail to control one or more important variables. Evaluation of any guidance program is a vital part of any guidance activity, for it
is only through a systematic and continual program of evaluation that the guidance services in a school system improve and grow. Effective guidance procedures literally depend upon continual objective study of the quality of its procedures and objectives.

The healthy growth and improvement of a total school program is dependent upon sound evaluation procedures in all areas of the school curriculum. The need for systematic collection of data on which to base evaluative judgments concerning educational programs and practices has been emphasized by those responsible for federally funded projects, by state departments of public instruction, and by local school districts. Many districts, recognizing the need for continual and rigorous evaluative practices, have implemented appraisal programs utilizing the resources of state department and university consultants and/or private consulting firms (Anderson, 1967). Miller (1969), commenting on the need for evaluation in our schools, identified the following forces that currently promote evaluation in education:

(1) the current cost of education is such that people are demanding some accountability,

(2) the greater complexity of schools today requires close attention to performance,

(3) the greater number of alternative ways of achieving results demands close attention to effectiveness and efficiency,

(4) the accelerating rate of obsolescence requires monitoring of all educational programs, and

(5) greater federal support of education, monetarily speaking, means evaluative steps must be present.
Richmond (1970) also underscored the importance of federal and state funding to the current status of evaluation in this country. The central question to Richmond regarding evaluation is, "Does it lead to improvement?" Brown (1970) stressed the utility of evaluation as a tool to be used to "prune away" those programs in education that are no longer relevant or productive in order to gain the most for the educational dollar. Hastings (1969, p. 6), in an article concerned with evaluating the curriculum, has stated that "Evaluation of the educational endeavor is ubiquitous."

Finally, Dancy (1970), commenting on the importance of evaluation, stated that the primary purpose of evaluation is to provide information about program effectiveness to administrators who must ultimately make the decision to keep, modify, or discard programs.

With the need and importance of evaluation clearly documented, let us now examine what the literature has to say concerning the values of evaluation.

**Values Resulting From Evaluation**

Many thoughtful educators, consciously seeking to avoid the trap of completing an evaluation for evaluation's sake, have stressed the many advantages of evaluation which are carefully planned and executed. More specifically, educators have stressed the benefits accruing from evaluation that enable decisions to be made concerning the relative effectiveness of school programs.
Bushnell (1972), arguing for a systems approach to planned change or "self-renewal," described the self-renewing school as one which has the ability to continuously sense and adapt to its external and internal environment in such a manner as to strengthen itself and ultimately fulfill its goal for providing quality education for children. Similarly, Shelton (1970) concluded that whatever the purpose of evaluation, it can and should be a learning experience.

Pyatte (1970), commenting on the functions of program evaluation and evaluation models in education, believes the primary purpose of evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of current programs, but also stated there are other values that can be realized at the same time. He identifies them as:

(1) a clarification of goals related to the program being evaluated,

(2) rallying of staff toward achievement of the stated and clarified goals,

(3) arousing of parental interest in the school program being evaluated - particularly when parents are involved in the evaluation, and

(4) the revealing of weaknesses in the entire school curriculum often results from program evaluation.

Detailing other values resulting from school evaluation, we find that:

(1) evaluation adds to the substantive knowledge of the educational process,
(2) evaluation provides information to adjust, discard, or otherwise change the appearance of an on-going educational process,

(3) evaluation can provide justification for a political-social-economic action related to education,

(4) evaluation can create a product which can move through educational bureaucratic systems and thus keep those systems operative, and

(5) evaluation can provide the instruments which may be used to carry information on the success of the process to the educational community (Finn, 1969).

Harris (1968) noted the values of evaluation to be: (1) the furnishing of feedback which is essential to improvement and progress; (2) the motivation of those involved to achieve program goals; and (3) the enabling of educators to determine the effect of their school programs. Manlove (1965), in an article dealing with the benefits of school self-study and eventual visitation by outside educators, concluded:

(1) evaluation provides an impetus for critical self-analysis and self-improvement. It motivates us to examine ourselves and our programs carefully, to recognize shortcomings and needs, and to see ways and means of bringing about improvement,

(2) evaluation helps to filter out and crystallize dissatisfactions which eventually give rise to curriculum improvement and needed organizational and educational changes,

(3) the faculty is self-energized. Faculty members are challenged to re-examine their own methods and accomplishments, to seek improve
ment through experimentation, and to search for better ways of in-
struction, and

(4) evaluation creates an esprit de corps that makes the seeking
of improvement permeate the entire administration and staff.

Finally, Irvine (1971, p. 86), summarizing the value of evalua-
tion for improving programs, wrote:

If an evaluation system is of value, it improves the quality
of information available to decision-makers. From that point
on, it is up to the decision-makers to utilize the data for
program improvement.

Vital Components of Evaluation

Ever since educational evaluators have been applying their ex-
pertise to schools and programs, they have taken note of particular
evaluative techniques and characteristics that have proven to be of
especial value in bringing about a more complete assessment of the
school or program in question. The following researchers and their
studies reflect the more important considerations in planning and
executing a thorough evaluation.

Lawson (1970), writing on guidance program failure versus success,
stressed the importance of the evaluation of services and not of indi-
viduals. Particularly important also was to make certain that results
are publicized so that a broad awareness of program needs and accom-
plishments is achieved. Lawson concluded his remarks by arguing for
an evaluative approach which would consist of the involvement of all
persons concerned with the welfare of the school. Concerning the
subject of evaluating evaluations, authors Kamii and Elliott (1971) indicated that there needs to be:

(1) a match between program objectives and content of instruction,
(2) a match between content of instruction and measuring instruments used by the evaluator(s), and
(3) a match between objectives of the program and the measuring instruments used by the evaluator(s).

To the extent that anyone of these matches is absent, curriculum evaluation can be said to have shortcomings.

Commenting on the importance of the implementation phase in the total evaluative process, North Central (1970, p. 310) warned:

This frequently is the most ignored element in the total school evaluation process, although it should represent its culmination. Too many school evaluations end with a thud upon the departure of the visiting team. Sometimes there is a hectic but momentary resurgence of interest upon the receipt of the written report; thereafter, all is dust and silence. The implementation of the findings of the school evaluation thus represents the area where we in the North Central Association must match the greatest improvement if the labor and the time invested in the process are to be vindicated by tangible results.

Consequently, North Central recommends that the principal of the evaluated school file one and three year progress reports on implementative efforts with the State North Central Association Committee. Dal Santo (1970) pointed out that, in the evaluation of a school, a wise principal will rely whenever possible upon the staff, students, and the general public to aid in developing a course of action explicity for evaluating and improving the educational experience of all the young people within the school organization. He stated that
outside consultants can be brought in to meet with particular groups and to make an impartial evaluation. They can compare observations and suggest possible avenues to take in order to improve the maximum effectiveness and efficiency within the educational organization.

Stressing the same point that North Central made above, Dal Santo (1970, p. 184) wrote:

*Strive continually to emphasize the need for follow-up study. Too many times an evaluation is made and nothing is done about it other than placing the evaluation on a closet shelf to collect dust.*

Davies (1971) felt it to be very important for educators to be open to evaluation from students, peers, administrators, and parents if our institutions and services are to be most effective for youth. Steele (1970) outline three essential elements in any comprehensive evaluation: (1) criteria; (2) evidence; and (3) judgment. Also, the evaluation must be purposeful and not just done for its own sake. It must contribute to the betterment of present programs or to the establishment of future programs. Guba (1970), writing of an aspect of evaluation that has great currency, discussed the importance of determining congruency between performance and objectives. He felt that this aspect of evaluation broadened the utility of evaluation to include not only product (student achievement) but process (means of instruction).

Gold (1971) wrote about evaluating compensatory education projects and offered four stages of evaluation: (1) ascertaining the decision areas of concern; (2) selecting instruments that measure areas of
concern; (3) collecting and analyzing the data; and (4) reporting the findings to the decision-makers. Gold continues by describing his eight steps in the evaluative process:

1. involve the total school community—lay, professional, and student,
2. develop a cohesive framework of broad goals and specific objectives,
3. translate the specific objectives into planned courses of actions,
4. select and/or construct instruments for furnishing measures allowing inferences about program effectiveness,
5. periodically administer the instruments,
6. analyze the data,
7. interpret the data, and
8. make recommendations and provide feedback.

Linder and Gunn (1963) affirmed that the criteria for an effective evaluation program are: (1) it is comprehensive—all objectives are measured; (2) the evaluation is made in light of the school's objectives and philosophy; (3) a variety of measures are utilized; (4) the evaluation is a group endeavor; (5) self-analysis is part of the process; and (6) the evaluation is used as a basis for public relations. A very important consideration to note in planning any evaluation was stated eloquently by Muessig (1969) when he charged that changes forced upon a person from the outside—through coarse or refined
coercion, indoctrination, inculcation, manipulation, or other means --
are less likely to take root and to flourish than those the individual
desires for himself.

Baker (1969, p. 354), in making the point of continual evaluation
of a program, stated:

Preparation of materials and methods that will reliably
effect student achievement of predetermined educational
outcomes requires the systematic manipulation of instruc-
tional variables and conditions as well as continual evalua-
tion of their effects.

Longenecker (1968), in studying the reactions of professional
staff and visiting team members who participated in the evaluation of
ten selected Indiana secondary schools during the 1962-1963 school
year, emphasized that the visiting team should make a direct and
thorough report to the professional staff at the end of the school
visitation period. He found their awareness of program needs to be
critical to the later implementation of recommendations.

Drummond (1966) saw the evaluative process to be composed of at
least the following essential aspects:

(1) stating values and purposes in terms of needs of individuals
and the group, the community, and an ever-changing society,

(2) securing evidence that these values and purposes are being
realized,

(3) interpreting the evidence gathered, and

(4) redefining the values and purposes, and planning in terms of
modified purposes.
Finally, Forehand (1970, p. 28) singled out the most significant aspect of evaluation when he concluded, "Evaluation leads to decision. Decision implies evaluation." However, evaluation does not always lead to change, as we shall see later. Barriers to evaluation and change constitute the next focus in the review of literature.

**Difficulties of Evaluation**

There have been several studies which have identified the critical shortcoming of all too many evaluations - they don't always lead to change. Statz (1967) delineated four important requirements to be met if innovation is to have a chance:

1. gaining commitment to a new set of goals,
2. producing the environmental conditions and mobilizing the resources necessary to attain the goals,
3. changing the value systems and re-training the staff, and
4. integrating changes in the larger system.

Prager (1971) and Frymier (1966) both emphasized the need for change to result from thorough and meaningful evaluations. The latter author, writing of the flaws in education, pointed out that there is no aspect of the system which regularly generates evaluative data, nor is there anything in the concept which requires the system to pay attention to the feedback if it should appear.

The National League for Nursing (1972), as well as Shertzer (1966), warn that there is generally not enough time to conduct a meaningful evaluation; personnel are generally not qualified to con-
duct the evaluation; currently there exists only a crude status for measuring instruments; school data are often incomplete; evaluations take a great deal of time and money; there is difficulty obtaining control groups to conduct the evaluation; and the question of standardized criteria on which to make decisions is most difficult.

Miller (1969) summarized the barriers to evaluation as:

1. judgmental opinions concerning any aspect of education is most difficult,
2. there exists a general fear of evaluation,
3. there is a tendency to often confuse action with accomplishment,
4. there are still too many crude evaluative techniques utilized,
5. teachers are inadequately prepared in evaluation, and
6. there is a shortage of qualified evaluative specialists.

Concluding on the most apparent and widespread barrier to evaluation, authors Iwamoto and Hearn (1969, p. 19) stated:

Despite the many benefits schools can gain from using good evaluation procedures, few districts have initiated sophisticated programs for that purpose. At present many schools provide no money at all for evaluation, and it would probably take at least five per cent of a typical school system's budget to do a minimal job of measuring progress.

**Types of Evaluation Strategies**

There are several types of educational evaluations in use today. The most appropriate means of evaluation for a given school depends on several variables, some of which relate to cost, comprehensiveness,
time allotment, and purposes. Petrie (1969) outlined how to improve instruction, supervision, and evaluation, and then described the process of evaluation as:

(1) mutual development of objectives (what is attempted to accomplish),
(2) development of teacher-student activities (how objectives are to be realized),
(3) data collection (what information do we need?),
(4) instrumentation (how measured?), and
(5) standards (is it significant?).

Walbesser and Carter (1968), Shertzer and Stone (1966), and Crow and Crow (1965) categorized the various types of evaluation as:
(1) survey approach; (2) experimental approach; (3) case-study approach; (4) observation approach. The survey approach is most frequently used in self-study. It is characterized by pre-determined criteria, collection of data, and making of judgments. The experimental approach generally requires both control and experimental groups, and is research-oriented. The case-study approach is very time consuming and focuses on the changes in an individual. The last method, observation, generally is not comprehensive enough and only allows for brief glimpses at the educational process.

The most common approach to curricular evaluation is through the North Central Association. Aslin (1969) wrote that the North Central Association was organized in 1895, and is a regional voluntary accrediting association of colleges and secondary schools covering nineteen states. The North Central Association: (1) provides criteria
for minimum standards for educational excellence, (2) sponsors and provides leadership to re-evaluate education in member schools, and (3) sponsors meetings and publications on current educational issues. Beginning in 1965, each member school is evaluated each seven year period. Using materials developed by North Central Association, the member school evaluates itself, and the following school year is re-evaluated by a visiting team of educators. Even though North Central Association membership is voluntary, an extremely low rating by the visitation team could result in denial of school accreditation.

Similar in some respects to the North Central Association approach to evaluation, the Ohio Department of Education, Division of Guidance and Testing, has developed and validated an evaluative program designed to assess the impact of secondary guidance programs across the State (Wysong, 1968). Also including a visiting team, the process differs most significantly from the North Central Association approach in that it includes a rather extensive student and teacher opinion survey concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the guidance program currently operating in a given school. A listing of the entire evaluative process of the Division of Guidance and Testing appears in Appendix A. The efficiency and effectiveness of this particular evaluation approach is, of course, the central focus of this dissertation.

**Effects of Evaluations**

One of the most critical aspects of evaluation is the aspect of change - does the evaluative process produce changes in curriculum,
program, facilities, and attitudes? Several studies which have emphasized the after-effects of school or program evaluation will now be examined.

Richmond (1969), examining the relationship between evaluative visits and improvement of instruction, involved a sample of one hundred schools and compared State evaluations and North Central Association evaluations in a variety of measures. His questionnaire, which was mailed to principals only, utilized a four-point scale that assessed the rate of implementation of recommendations (somewhat, about one-half, extensive, and completely). He reported that for the State evaluations, the average implementation rate was 2.4 (upper limits of about one-half). The highest rate of implementation for State evaluations came in the area of organizational matters, and the lowest rate of implementation came in the areas of facilities and materials. For the North Central Association evaluations, the average implementation rate was 2.1 (above the midpoint of about one-half). The North Central Association schools also had their highest rate of implementation in organizational matter; their lowest, however, was for the area of educational process. The author reports an average implementation rate for North Central Association evaluations over a seven year period to be about one-half.

Richmond reported also on the question of whether the evaluation led to a change in instruction. Using a three point scale (limited, moderate, extensive) he found that for State evaluations, 87% reported "yes" (26% limited, 33% moderate, 28% extensive). For North Central Association evaluations, 89% reported "yes" (25% limited,
43% moderate, 21% extensive). He concluded that a review of the average implementation rate supports the hypothesis that neither agency's recommendations receive preferential treatment by the local schools. Further, recommendations by the agencies are apparently not considered to be important for the improvement of instruction.

Boersma and Flawacki (1972) studied the North Central Association process in Iowa. Twenty-nine schools which were visited in 1967-1968 were the focus of a survey done by the authors two years later. The study did not include all recommendations previously made to the schools; only recommendations which were previously selected, based on their frequency and importance. Questionnaires were sent to 442 teachers in the twenty-nine schools, and teachers were sent only the recommendations that affected their subject-matter. The authors reported 22% of the recommendations fully implemented, 42.7% partially implemented, 27% no action taken, 6.3% considered not valid, 1.7% unsure.

Stanavage (1971) reported that the effect of the evaluation process hinges fully on the degree of its acceptance by the classroom teacher. During the 1968-1969 school year, one hundred packets were distributed to nineteen states that had undergone North Central Association evaluations. The packets focused on the rating of the instruments used in the evaluative process, and values perceived in the school evaluation. Teachers, chairmen of the evaluations, and principals reported that 72% agreed that the evaluation process helped to obtain support for additional resources in their programs, and 57% stated the process helped to unfreeze fixed practices.
Master (1970) studied the reactions of teachers, superintendents, and principals regarding North Central Association evaluations in fifty-seven schools from twelve states that completed the evaluations during the 1966-1967 school year. Principals listed cost and space as primary reasons for recommendations not implemented. Other factors that impeded full implementation were poor communication, not enough time, lack of personnel, curriculum, the system, poor visiting teams, conflicting philosophies, orderliness and continuity of the evaluation, and lack of instructional materials. Most educators rated the self-study to be the most valuable activity of the total evaluation.

Pace (1968) studied nine junior high schools in Indiana that underwent North Central Association evaluations in the three school years prior to 1966. He was primarily interested in the rate of implementation of recommendations. His questionnaires were sent to principals, where they were eventually distributed to teachers and supervisors for completion. To establish the validity of the completed questionnaire, Pace concluded with an interview with the school principal. He found that 57% of the recommendations were fully or partially implemented, 14% more will be implemented in long-range plans, 25% had no action taken, and 5% of the recommendations had not been accepted. Principals again agreed that the self-study phase of the evaluation was most valuable. Time and expense were termed the biggest impediments to implementation. Those recommendations dealing with facilities and space were most difficult to implement, and those
dealing with staff coordination and planning were least difficult to implement.

Carpenter (1970) sent questionnaires to the faculties of fifty-seven schools which had completed North Central Association evaluations two years earlier. He found that the total implementation rate was slightly over 50%. Recommendations by the visiting teams that were not also emphasized by the self-study had little chance of implementation. Attitudes of the staff and administration, but particularly the latter, were critical to the implementation of recommendations.

Shaw and Jordan (1971) analyzed the results of North Central Association evaluations from sixteen schools admitted to membership in 1968. They found that 22% of recommendations not implemented were because of the lack of money, 15% because of apathy of teachers, and 11% because of apathy of principals. They reinforced the already stated value of the self-study phase of evaluation. In general, the implementation rate was directly proportional to the principals' valuation of the recommendations. They concluded that most principals gave little leadership to the follow-up phase of the evaluation.

Stanavage (1969) secured the reactions of nearly 1400 administrators to the North Central Association evaluations completed three years earlier. Less than 7% said that the evaluation had little or no effect. Most differences (53.1%) occurred in the instructional program. On the question of whether it helped the school clarify goals, 23% said "yes" substantially, and 63% "yes" moderately.
Aslin (1969, p. 57), in commenting of the effect North Central Association has had in Missouri, stated:

(1) The evaluation has helped local faculties develop a greater unity of purpose and an awareness of the instructional needs throughout the school as well as individual departments; (2) the composition of visiting teams, representing a wide cross-section of educators and institutions, has stimulated a valuable interchange of ideas and communication among schools; (3) the faculty, administration, and board of education of schools being re-evaluated are provided with an objective written analysis of the status of their program as judged by a highly qualified team of professional educators.

Mueller (1969, p. 35) studied the effect of North Central Association evaluations in Michigan and concluded that: (1) the process results in a much better understanding of the total school program rather than seeing each department as an island to itself, (2) the process garners support that the local staff have argued for, and (3) the process generates the sharing of ideas. Mueller continued:

The evaluation process provides an ideal opportunity for change, and not just the bandwagon kind of innovation. It can be the beginning of a frank appraisal of some of the weaknesses in the school program and a consideration of alternatives. In the follow-up studies that have been made, it has been found that there is a high rate of implementation of recommendations.

Cudney (1964) investigated the counselors' perceptions of obstacles to selected guidance functions, and found that counselors identified other duties, lost of time, schedules, facilities and resources as major obstacles to performance of various guidance functions.

Sheely (1967) found that evaluation led to a large number of changes in each of the 28 Indiana high schools that participated in his study. Again, most schools saw the self-study and the visiting team efforts to be important forces in bringing about change. Holliman (1969) surveyed the principals of 189 schools that completed
evaluations in Texas during the school years 1964-1968. He reported 93% replied favorably as to improvement in the general educational program, 92% thought the self-evaluation to be worth the time required, 94% thought the process of evaluation was worth the expense, and 97% felt the self evaluation was a valid method for initiating improvement. Holliman found that on the question of the number of guidance services available, 11% reported no improvement, 20% very little improvement, 38% some improvement, 24% considerable improvement, and 7% great improvement as a result of the evaluation.

Deitrich (1965) found that the greatest benefits derived from the evaluation process resulted within two years after the formal evaluation by the visitation committee. Ricart (1956) studied 12 secondary schools in Pittsburgh which had undergone recent evaluation and reported 25% of the recommendations implemented, 46% in process, and the remainder, 29%, not implemented. He concluded that evaluation was a major force in school self-improvement.

Hoeltzel (1970) studied the effect that a summer vocational guidance seminar had upon vocational guidance program development nine months later. In his study, Hoeltzel found that 55% of the tasks which were identified by counselors at the summer seminar as needing implementation were implemented nine months later when investigated by Hoeltzel. In his study, Hoeltzel defined implemented as carried out to a "great" or "some" extent. When he inquired as to the reasons for certain other tasks being carried out to "little" or "no" extent, Hoeltzel reported that time factors accounted for nearly one-third of
all obstacles listed. Other major obstacles given were space, administrative problems, low priority, change in job duties, and shortage of staff members.

**Important Aspects of Change**

Despite the many evaluations that have been reported, not all evaluations lead to change. It is important to try to distill from successful evaluations those factors which contributed to later implementation of recommendations and change.

Nelson (1967) described change as a three-dimensional process: (1) innovation - the new idea is made available, (2) dissemination - the process whereby the innovation is shared, and (3) integration - the innovation becomes part of the system. Yates (1971) viewed change taking place through the following scheme: (1) research, (2) development, (3) diffusion, and (4) adoption.

Provus (1970) believed that the major reason for evaluation failure derives from the administrative unwillingness or inability to explicate value assumptions, define criteria models and standards, and set explicit decision rules on performance data. The Florida Department of Education (1971), in a study aimed at stimulating change in education, found that the elements of educational self-renewal require:

(1) continual evaluation of the appropriateness of established objectives,

(2) continual monitoring of the extent to which a program is achieving its objectives, and
(3) continual identification of alternative policies and practices for consideration.

Gorman (1972) believed the first requisite for change is for the purposes to be clearly stated. Once educators are convinced of the rationale for change, it has a much better chance for realization.

Orelsky and Smith (1972) studied what they have termed "macro-changes" which have occurred in the last seventy-five years, changes that have affected education nationally. They found that the number of changes that originated within the system outnumbered the changes initiated from outside the system by three and a half to one. This finding would be in agreement with several studies reported earlier in this chapter.

Goodlad (1969, p. 9) made a strong case for analyzing change when he stated:

If a fraction of the money that is currently being spent to change educational practice were spent to find out how to succeed in making such change, a great deal would thereby be saved.

The processes of change have been haphazard, and so far as knowledge about change is concerned, virtually noncumulative. We don't know much more today about how change is wrought and about how to spend our dollar resources wisely to effect change than we did twenty years ago.

Despite Goodlad's claim of little information on how to achieve educational change, Thompson (1968), in an enticing article entitled, "Preventing Guidance Changes: Games Guidance Workers Play," described various techniques that counselor-types utilized in order to avoid change in their programs. Although not particularly useful enough to summarize here, Thompson's message for the reader is simply
to be aware of the types of change-resistant behavior and not to give in to their pessimism.

Hug (1969) warned that administrators who wish to introduce new ideas and experiences within their schools must help their faculties develop a posture toward change. Sound reasons must be presented, and free flow of communication must exist between teachers, students, administrators, and parents. Crosby (1970), directing her attention to the change agents that affect the educational scene, identified six: (1) the accrediting agencies, (2) the colleges and universities, (3) the franchise industry, (4) Big Brother, (5) state legislation, and (6) dissenters in education. Her plea, however, is for the prime change-agent to be educators themselves. Dressel (1971), outlining the conditions under which self-study evaluations produce change, concluded that change depends on:

(1) the extent to which readiness has developed for the study,
(2) the clarity of the charge given to the self-study committee,
(3) the members of the committee,
(4) the tact and leadership of the chairman,
(5) the availability and quality of staff assistance,
(6) the cooperation extended through the institution in providing relevant information,
(7) the effective use of consultants, resource persons, etc., and
(8) the quality of the report in substance, logic, and format.

Concluding the remarks in this section and for the total review of literature, Combs (1962, p. 207) summarizes the single important
aspect of change for any researcher or educator who hopes to produce quality programs for students:

Change will occur in an atmosphere where change is valued, difference is warmly appreciated, and mistakes, which are the inevitable concomitant of trying, are accepted as a normal part of the price of growing.

Summary

This chapter has presented a review of selected literature in the areas of school program evaluation and the change process. Topics included were as following: (1) a general review of evaluation definitions, (2) a summary of the need and importance of evaluation, (3) the values resulting from evaluation, (4) the vital components of evaluation, (5) a review of present difficulties with evaluation, (6) a summary of the types of evaluation strategies utilized, (7) the effects of evaluation, and (8) important aspects of educational change.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will describe the methodology utilized in the execution of this study. Included will be a discussion of the sample population, instrumentation, pilot study, validity and reliability, techniques of data collection, and statistical analyses used in this study.

Sample

The potential population for this investigation were twenty-two secondary schools in Ohio that voluntarily underwent the Division of Guidance and Testing's Guidance Program Evaluation during the school year 1970-1971. Eliminated from consideration for this study were two schools that did not complete all aspects of the evaluation process. Therefore, the total number of schools that qualified for participation in the study was twenty. Figure 1, page 42, indicates the geographical location of the twenty participating schools. Table 1, page 43, outlines the breakdown of these schools by size of student population and by type of school as defined in the Directory of Ohio School Counselors. The Directory of Ohio School Counselors defines schools as city, county, or exempted village primarily on the basis of municipality population according to the latest official census.
Figure 1: Geographical location of the twenty schools.
(* indicates city schools)
TABLE 1

SIZE AND ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE
OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Student Population (nearest hundred)</th>
<th>1400 or more</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>800 900-1300 or less</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 219 different persons served on the in-school evaluation committees. A total of 155 completed the surveys sent to them, which constituted a 71% return. Twenty of the 155 persons responding were chairmen of their evaluations, and the remainder, 135, were committee members. Table 2, page 44, summarizes the rate of questionnaire return for each of the twenty schools.

The per cent of return varied from a high of 100% to a low of 42%, with an overall return of 71%. This return depended on several factors, including staff turnover, transfer, and individual interest in partici-
### TABLE 2

**RETURNS OF QUESTIONNAIRE BY SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Possible Return</th>
<th>Actual Return</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>219</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates city schools

Speaking in such a study. However, since it was primarily left to
the chairmen to disseminate the surveys to their committees, the per-
cent of return by school was largely a reflection of the chairman's
encouragement to complete and return the instruments. The inves-
tigator made five telephone calls to the chairman of schools that had a
slow survey return, and encouraged them to speak again to their com-
mittee members. The importance of the study and dependence on their
cooperation were stressed in each telephone contact.
Table 3 contains the composition of the respondents to Part III of the survey, or the make-up of the twenty committees.

**TABLE 3**

**SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS TO PART III - COMMITTEE SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers and counselors constituted a major portion of the 135 persons responding to Part III for a total of sixty-four per cent. Parents and students comprised eleven and nine per cent, respectively, with administrators totaling the remainder of the sample, sixteen per cent.

**Instrumentation**

The data were gathered through three instruments developed specifically for this study. The instruments were designed to obtain information on: (1) the current status of recommendations made by visiting teams during the evaluation, and (2) values held by the respondents concerning each evaluation activity completed and their ideas for improving the total evaluation process. Copies of each instrument used can be seen in Appendices F, G, and H. Each instrument will be described below.
Guidance Program Evaluation (G.P.E.) Follow-Up -- Part I. This questionnaire was designed to secure information on the current status of the recommendations made by the visiting team during the evaluation. Each evaluated school had received written recommendations at the end of the visitation period. The respondent, who was the chairman of the local evaluation committee, was asked to indicate beside each recommendation an I, if the recommendation was already implemented, a P, if the recommendation was in the process of being implemented, or an N, if the recommendation has not been implemented. Examples of actual recommendations made by a visiting team are as follows:

It is imperative that attention be given to the excessive student-counselor ratio of more than 800 to 1, if change and improved guidance services are to be realistically anticipated. The recommended student-counselor ratio is 400:1. If guidance services are to develop to a point of meeting desired objec-
tives, a guidance staff of two counselors merits serious con-
sideration.

It is strongly recommended that the Guidance Evaluation Committee undertake further study of the faculty and student survey results, explaining the significance and implications of the reported data. It is further recommended that these data and this report be shared with all faculty members to ensure total involvement and to have the benefit of the thinking of all teachers.

Frequency counts were used to determine the rates of recommendation implementation in the twenty participating schools.

G.P.E. Follow-Up -- Part II. This questionnaire was completed only by the committee chairman. It contained twenty-two questions concerning the perceived value of the various evaluation activities
completed during the evaluation process. An example of the type of item asked in Part II is provided below:

Has the evaluation process that you have completed been of value in initiating improvements in the guidance program?
Yes ( ) No ( )

Scoring of Part II was accomplished by keeping frequency counts of the responses for all items in the Part II survey.

G.P.E. Follow-Up -- Part III. Part III was completed only by the evaluation committee members, excluding the chairmen. It contained sixteen items, selected from the original list of twenty-two items in Part II. Those items that reflected content which only the chairman would be aware of, based on the investigator's experience in coordinating the Guidance Program Evaluations over the last three years, were omitted. For example, an item that was submitted to the chairmen but not to the committee follows:

Place in rank order the following groups according to the difficulty you encountered in securing their involvement on the evaluation committee (1-most difficult, 5-easiest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of an item that was included for the committee members is listed above in G.P.E. -- Part II. Scoring of the items was achieved by simple frequency counts by category of response.
Validity. Content validity for Part II and III items were developed by deriving the items partially from guidance literature and empirical research relevant to the guidance function. This content validation consisted essentially of judging whether the items were representative of the universe of content being measured. Careful study was made of instruments used by Holliman (1969), Richmond (1969) Boersma and Plawicki (1972), and Stanavage (1971). In addition, items were obtained from consultation with a recognized authority in the field of guidance evaluation, who reacted to the instrument.

Using the criteria referred to above, an initial pool of twenty-two items was collected. Each item was judged a priori for representativeness of the universe and a statement was formulated for inclusion in the first draft of the instrument. To further examine the items, a panel of twenty-four consultants at the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education, was asked to respond to the items in any one of three ways: (1) Indicate new items that were not included in the first draft but which are important to include; (2) Delete any items from the first draft that are not significant or valued items; and (3) Revise any items which are unclear or vague in meaning or intent.

Only six of the twenty-four consultants responded to the first draft. Interviews were then held with each of the six respondents to give full consideration to the inclusion of their suggestions. The interviews provided the consultants an opportunity to establish a rationale for their various proposed revisions of the instruments.
Advice and counsel were also secured on the design and content of the first draft from an experienced counselor educator and a specialist in educational surveys at The Ohio State University.

Reliability. Efforts to establish instrument reliability were made by initially writing, then revising, the items to establish clarity of meaning for each item, thus reducing error variance resulting from ambiguity. Secondly, actual school visitations were made by the investigator to secure evidence that reported changes had in fact been implemented. Twenty per cent of the schools in the sample were randomly selected to be visited by the investigator after the data were collected in order to assess the validity of the responses given by the chairmen and committee members on the questionnaires. None of the schools visited by the investigator had visibly misrepresented the status of their visiting team recommendations for program improvement. It was assumed then, on the basis of the findings of the schools revisited, that the responses of the other schools in this study were valid and reliable. Thirdly, to cross check answer reliability, analysis of chairman versus committee responses to identical questions were completed. Chi square tests of significance measured the degree of agreement between respondents on the same item. Results showed concensus in respondent opinion for identical questions. Also, it was assumed that clear and standard instructions would tend to reduce errors of measurement. The instructions were revised several times on the basis of suggestions from the panel of consultants and the pilot study respondents.
Pilot Study

A pilot study of the instruments was conducted at three secondary schools that had completed the evaluation during the 1969-1970 school year. The schools selected included a high school with an enrollment of 520 students, an exempted village high school with an enrollment of 360 students, and a high school with a student enrollment of 1100.

The pilot study involved asking twenty-nine teachers, administrators, counselors, parents, and students to complete the instruments, to make note of the amount of time required to complete the instruments, and also to note any difficulty with respect to item clarity. Their responses and comments were then analyzed to determine necessary instrument revision.

This approach resulted in the revision of two of the original twenty-two items of Part II of the follow-up survey. For example, it was found that item 11 listed below needed clarification because some respondents had not ranked the different groups using all the numbers 1-5. Some gave all groups the same numerical rating, i.e., 5.

Rank the following according to the difficulty you encountered in securing their involvement on the evaluation committee (1-most difficult, 5-easiest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The item was revised to read:

Place in rank order the following groups according to the difficulty you encountered in securing their involvement on the evaluation committee (1-most difficult, 5-easiest)
Part I and Part III did not require revision based on the pilot study results. It was found that Part I could be completed in approximately fifteen minutes, Part II in twenty minutes, and Part III in twenty minutes.

Data Collection

After the piloting study and subsequent revision of the survey instruments, letters were sent in April of 1972 to the principals in each of the twenty secondary schools. The letter, on official State Department of Education letterhead, was signed by the investigator and the Director of the Division of Guidance and Testing. It detailed the aspects of the follow-up, the importance of it, and assured the principals that data would be treated in summary form and not by school name. A copy of the letter to the principal can be seen in Appendix D.

A week after the letter to the principal was mailed, the investigator telephoned the committee chairman of each of the twenty school evaluations to determine the number of people who served on each evaluation committee. During the first week of May, 1972, survey forms were mailed to the twenty chairmen across the State of Ohio. Each shipment contained a letter to the chairman (similar to the letter that was mailed earlier to the principal and again on State letterhead), one Part I and Part II form for the chairman to complete, plus Part
III's and a cover letter for each person who served on the evaluation committee for that building. Copies of the cover letters to the chairman and committee members can be seen in Appendices C and E.

The chairman was asked to distribute a questionnaire to each committee member, and the committee member was instructed to return his form directly to the investigator in the enclosed, prepaid envelope. Thus, confidentiality of each committee members' responses was maintained.

**Statistical Analysis**

Both chairmen and committee member responses were tallied and summarized separately for each survey item. Both frequency and percentage were computed for all the responses to each item of the survey. For each item, the per cent was based on the number who responded to the item, and excludes those few who did not answer the particular item. Additionally, comparisons were made between the responses of chairmen and committee members' for identical items. Chi squares were computed to analyze whether significant differences existed between chairmen and committee members responses (see Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics*, page 104). The partitioning chi squares technique was utilized to determine the location of significant differences. Chi square was also utilized to determine if significant differences existed in the implementation rate among supervisors from the Division of Guidance and Testing, and among varying size and types of schools. In all chi square computations, the .05 level of significance was
used to determine consensus of opinion between respondents. Appendix I contains the critical values of chi square for the varying degrees of freedom used in this study, as well as the formula used in the calculation of chi square values.

Summary

Each evaluation committee from the twenty schools completing the Division of Guidance and Testing Program Evaluation instruments during the 1970-1971 school year constituted the population of this study. A total of 219 persons served on the committees. Surveys completed by the chairmen (Parts I, II) and the committee members (Part III) were mailed to all twenty schools in May of 1972. Seventy-one per cent, or 155 surveys were returned. The results of the data collection and the statistical analysis will be the focus of Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Chapter IV will present the results of this study in the following order: (1) findings related to hypotheses one, two and three, all of which dealt with the current status of recommendations (Part I of the questionnaire); (2) findings related to hypothesis four, which dealt with the difference in attitudes held by chairmen and committee members about various evaluation activities (Parts II-III of the questionnaire); (3) findings related to items that were asked of only chairmen, and were not related to any hypothesis (Part II of the questionnaire). Numbers two and three above will present the findings by items according to the following categories: items related to the general value of the evaluation; items related to the process of evaluation; items related to the evaluation committee; items related to the results of the evaluation; and items related to the visiting team. All of the items of Parts II and III of the questionnaire relate to one of the five categories stated above. Following the presentation of the results will be a section which will analyze the more important findings of this study.

Part I Results—Status of Recommendations Relating to Hypotheses One, Two, and Three

A major objective in this study was to determine whether the Guidance Program Evaluation, as developed by the Division of Guidance and
Testing, Ohio Department of Education, leads to change. More specifically, were the recommendations made by the visiting teams implemented one year later?

Table 4 provides a summary of the status of recommendations by school and by total. A total of 357 recommendations were made by the visiting teams in the twenty schools.

**TABLE 4**

**STATUS OF VISITING TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS BY SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>In Process of Implementation</th>
<th>Not Acted On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>357</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearly one-third of the recommendations were implemented, one-third were in the process of being implemented at the time of the survey, and the remaining one-third were not acted on.

The schools ranged from a high of 90 per cent of the recommendations either implemented or in the process of implementation, to a low of 53 per cent either implemented or in the process of implementation. The accuracy or validity of the schools' reporting relative to the status of their recommendations was checked by the investigator by visiting a random sample of the twenty schools reporting, and gathering evidence that the status of the reported recommendations were reliable. All of the schools visited provided evidence to support what had been previously reported as implemented or in process of implementation.

The results of this study suggest that the great amount of variance between schools relative to their implementation of recommendations seems to depend on a number of factors, such as staff turnover, readiness, economic feasibility, and administrative support. A very important consideration is the nature of the recommendation made by the visiting team. Therefore, the 357 recommendations were categorized into the following schema:

I. Recommendations dealing with Staff;

II. Recommendations dealing with Facilities and Equipment;

III. Recommendation dealing with the Coordination and Administration of the Program;

IV. Recommendations dealing with Guidance Program Activities;

V. Recommendations dealing with Administration and Teacher Participation in the Program.
The schema utilized was borrowed from a self-review process called PRIDE (1972) developed cooperatively by the Divisions of Vocational Education and Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education. The five categories outlined above are the areas of the guidance program studied by secondary schools in Ohio that are participating in the PRIDE (Program Review for Improvement, Development and Expansion of Vocational Education and Guidance in Ohio) process. The fourth category, Activities, was further broken down into the nine dimensions of a comprehensive guidance program described in a recent publication from the Division of Guidance and Testing entitled Guidance Services for Ohio Schools (1972). The nine dimensions under activities are as follows: information; pupil appraisal; group guidance; counseling; consultation; parent conferences; resource coordination; placement; and evaluation and planning.

By categorizing the 357 recommendations into the above schema, it was found that the rate of implementation differed according to the types of recommendations made. Among the five categories, the highest rate of implementation occurred in Coordination and Administration of the Program, and Administration and Teacher Participation, both of which received 71 per cent implemented or in process of implementation. The lowest of the five categories was the area of Staff, which received only 56 per cent implemented or in process of implementation. Within the area of activities, there was considerable variance among the nine dimensions of the guidance program. The highest success ratio was in the area of group guidance, which achieved a 92 per cent implementation or
TABLE 5
STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Recommendations</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>In Process of Implementation</th>
<th>Not Acted On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Staff</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Coordination and Administration of Program</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Activities</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Information</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pupil Appraisal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group Guidance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Counseling</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consultation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parent Conferences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Resource Coordination</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Placement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluation and Planning</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Administration and Teacher Participation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in process of being implemented. The lowest area was counseling, which only received 46 per cent either implemented or in process of implementation responses.

Three additional aspects of the status of recommendations were also studied. Hypotheses one through three were designed to test for signifi-
cant differences at the .05 level of confidence. The data are provided by hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1.** No significant difference in the rate of implementation of recommendations shall exist among the five field services staff members from the Division of Guidance and Testing who conducted the twenty evaluations.

Table 6 describes the results of the analysis.

**TABLE 6**

STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY FIELD PERSONNEL TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF THE CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Person</th>
<th>No. of Evaluations Conducted</th>
<th>No. of Recommendations Implemented or in Process of Implementation</th>
<th>No. of Recommendations not Acted on</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.8702 \quad df = 4 \]

No significant differences were found in the rate of recommendation implementation by school among field personnel who conducted the evaluations. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Hypothesis 2.** No significant difference in the rate of implementation of guidance program recommendations shall exist among various size schools. The findings are presented in Table 7, page 60.
TABLE 7
STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF THE CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of School (by students)</th>
<th>No. of Recommendations Implemented or in process of Implementation</th>
<th>No. of Recommendations Not Acted on</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 800</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-1300</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1300</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.2124 \]
\[ df = 2 \]

The chi square test again showed no significant difference with the results according to the size of school evaluated. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 3. No significant difference in the rate of implementation of recommendations shall exist between schools organized as city or local (county). Table 8, page 61, reflects again the no significant difference conclusion when using the chi square test. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Findings Related to Hypothesis Four

A second major aspect of this study was to determine the difference in attitudes held by both chairman and committee members concerning the value of each evaluation activity completed. Results of this aspect of the study are reported on page 61.
TABLE 8

STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY SCHOOL ORGANIZATION TESTED
FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF THE CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>No. of Recommendations Implemented or in Process of Implementation</th>
<th>No. of Recommendations Not Acted On</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.1718 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]

Hypothesis 4. No significant difference in the value of various evaluation activities shall exist between chairman and committee member responses to the same evaluation activity.

A total of 26 pairs of identical items were asked of both chairman and committee members (See Appendix G - items 1, 2, 7a-e, 8, 9d, 10, 12a-i, 13, 15, 16, 18a, 19a, 20a, and 21a). The results of the chi square tests showed that only two of the items had significant differences in response patterns, item 9-d and item 12-g. Item 9-d asked the respondent to rate the value of the visiting team to the evaluative process, and item 12-g asked the respondents to rate the value of the comment sheets to the evaluation. Table 9, page 62, shows the results of the chi square tests for the 26 items.

The chi square tests thus revealed no significant difference between respondent patterns in 24 of the 26 items. For nearly all cases, therefore, hypothesis four was not rejected. For items 9-d and 12-g, however, the fourth hypothesis was rejected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Chi Square Value</th>
<th>Significant at .05 Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4845</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0567</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>1.1394</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>2.4325</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>3.3143</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d</td>
<td>2.5188</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e</td>
<td>3.4300</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9d</td>
<td>8.9934</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.0899</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>.0201</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>.5114</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c</td>
<td>3.0183</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12d</td>
<td>.0637</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e</td>
<td>.5832</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12f</td>
<td>.0498</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12g</td>
<td>7.3326</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12h</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12i</td>
<td>1.2151</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.6842</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.2024</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.3965</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>.7942</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>.0765</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>.2725</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>2.4144</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In those instances where chi square tests of significance were applied to identical questions between groups of respondents, the data matrix was transformed from a 2 x 5 matrix to one of 2 x 3 dimensions. This was accomplished by combining the no value and little value areas.
into one, and by combining the considerable value and extreme value areas also into one.

Items Related to the General Value of the Evaluation

Table 10 presents a summary of the responses of both chairmen and committee members regarding the value of the evaluation.

**TABLE 10**

**ITEM 1: VALUES OF THE GUIDANCE EVALUATION AS PERCEIVED BY CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF THE CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerable value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme value</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.4845 \quad \text{df} = 2 \]

Eighty-five per cent of the chairmen reported the evaluation to be of either considerable or extreme value, while a lesser per cent, 65, of the committee answered in the same two categories. It should be noted that none of the twenty chairmen reported a no or little value for the evaluation, and only 4 per cent of the committee gave it such a low rating. Using the chi square test, no significant difference of opinion exists between chairmen and committee members relative to this item. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.
Items Related to the Process of Evaluation

Table 11 below presents a summary of the responses of chairmen and committee members, with respect to the amount of time necessary to complete the evaluation.

### Table 11

**ITEM 2: CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS FEELINGS REGARDING THE TIME COMMITMENT NECESSARY FOR THE EVALUATION AND RESULTS OF THE CHI SQUARE TEST FOR SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrealistic...</td>
<td>Adequate...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.0567 \quad \text{df} = 2 \]

None of the chairmen gave a low rating to the time commitment required of the evaluation, while 12 per cent of the committee did. The usual amount of time from beginning to end for such an evaluation is 9-10 weeks (See Appendix A). Again, no significant difference of opinion was found between chairmen and committee members responses using the chi square test. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 12, page 65, contains the chairmen and committee value rating for each of the evaluation activities that had been completed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Chairmen</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Developing</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Committee</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of</td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Student</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Teacher</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .0201 \quad df = 2 \]

\[ x^2 = .5114 \quad df = 2 \]

\[ x^2 = 3.0183 \quad df = 2 \]

\[ x^2 = .0637 \quad df = 2 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( f )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Counselor</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Analysis</td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart</td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^2 = .5832 )</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Comment Sheets</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^2 = .0498 )</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Brief Case Reports</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^2 = 7.3326^* )</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Visiting Team Pre-</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentation</td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Evaluation Com-</td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mittee</td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^2 = .1590 )</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Visiting Team Re-</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>port to</td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff</td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x^2 = 1.2151 )</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
Table 12a shows how both chairmen and committee rated the guidance activity of developing guidance objectives. Using materials furnished by the Division of Guidance and Testing, the committee was to agree on a set of objectives for their particular guidance program, against which the data generated by the evaluation process would be measured. Sixty per cent of the chairmen, and 58 per cent of the committee, reported either a considerable or extreme value rating for this activity. Ten per cent of the chairmen, and 9 per cent of the committee, gave little or no value ratings for the same activity. Overall, developing guidance objectives is seen by both groups as constituting a valued step. The chi square test showed no significant difference of opinion between groups for activity 12a. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 12b summarizes the chairmen and committee responses to the value of the evaluative criteria materials during the evaluation process. These materials were used by the committee in order to judge how satisfactorily or unsatisfactorily various guidance practices were being performed in their school. Fifty-five per cent of the chairmen, and 45 per cent of the committee rated the activity as considerable or extreme value, while ten and 14 per cent of each respective group rated the step as no or little value. The chi square analysis of the data reflected no significant difference of opinion between groups on activity 12b, therefore the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 12c details the ratings given by both chairmen and committee to the use of student surveys during the process of evaluation. Seventy-five per cent of the chairmen and 61 per cent of the committee
rated this activity as either of considerable or extreme value. None of the chairmen, and 10 per cent of the committee, gave the activity ratings of no or low value. This survey activity, as well as the teacher survey, comprise much of the data collection for the analysis of the guidance program. Chi square analysis again showed no significant difference of opinion between groups for activity 12c. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 12d details the value of the teacher survey in the evaluation process as seen by both chairmen and committee members. None of the chairmen, and only 8 per cent of the committee, gave the teacher survey a no or little value rating. Seventy-five per cent of the chairmen, and 64 per cent of the committee, reported the survey to be of considerable or extreme value. These results confirm the importance of the survey to the collection of data in order to efficiently assess the needs of the guidance program. The chi square test of significance showed no significant difference between groups of respondents on item 12d, therefore, the fourth hypothesis was again not rejected.

Table 12e reflects the attitudes of both chairmen and committee members regarding the value of the counselor time analysis charts to the evaluative process. Only 45 per cent of the chairmen, and 41 per cent of the committee, gave this activity either a considerable or extreme value rating. Ten per cent and 16 per cent of the respective groups gave the charts either a no or extreme value rating. It would appear that both groups find this activity to be of some value, but not of considerable worth.
To complete this activity during the evaluation, counselors had to complete two time charts. On one, counselors were to estimate the percentages of time they felt should be spent on various guidance activities, and on another chart counselors were to indicate actual percentages of time spent on the various guidance activities. The presence of a gap between objectives and reality then would constitute data to be analyzed by those on the evaluation committee. Chi square computations for activity 12e did not reveal any significant differences between groups. The fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 12f describes the attitudes of both chairmen and committee members regarding the value of comment sheets during the evaluation process. Comment sheets were sheets that were completed by both teachers and students. Only two questions were on the sheets, both of them open-ended in style. "How has the counselor been of help to you this year?" and "How could the counselor have been of more help to you this year?"

Seventy per cent of the chairmen and 83 per cent of the committee gave this activity some, considerable, or extreme value ratings. Chi square computations revealed no significant difference between groups for item 12f. The fourth hypothesis was therefore not rejected.

Table 12g shows the opinions of both chairmen and committee groups with respect to the value of the case reports in the evaluation process. Only 12 per cent of the chairmen and 22 per cent of the committee gave ratings of considerable or extreme value for this activity, while 39 per cent and 14 per cent of the respective groups reported no or little
value for the same activity. A relatively large per cent of each group chose not to utilize this activity in the process of evaluation.

The chi square computation did show a significant difference at the .05 level between groups of respondents for activity 12g. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was rejected.

Table 12h summarizes the opinions of both chairmen and committee members regarding the value of the visiting team presentation to the evaluation committee. Eighty-nine per cent of the chairmen and 65 per cent of the committee reported either considerable or extreme value ratings for this activity. None of the chairmen, and only 10 per cent of the committee, reported no or little value for this activity. In general, the reactions of both groups are extremely positive. Chi square computations revealed no significant difference between groups for item 12h. The fourth hypothesis was therefore not rejected.

Table 12i details the responses of both chairmen and committee members to the final activity of the evaluation process, namely the visiting team report to the total staff. Although this particular activity is very much a part of the total evaluation process, it is not rare to find that the administration has been, for one reason or another, unable to arrange for the staff to hear this final report. Consequently, the table indicates that 24 per cent of the chairmen and 25 per cent of the committee reported this activity was not applicable to their evaluation.

However, of the chairmen responding to this activity, all of them reported either some or considerable value to this report. Only 6 per cent of the committee reported either no or little value, and 45 per
cent reported considerable or extreme value. Chi square tests showed no significant difference between groups for activity 121. The fourth hypothesis was therefore not rejected.

From Table 12g, one can see that the committees reported a much more favorable attitude than the chairmen for the value of brief case reports. By partitioning chi square, Table 13 reveals the response patterns of each group that served on the various committees.

**TABLE 13**

**CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS RATINGS OF BRIEF CASE REPORTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No Value</th>
<th>Some Value</th>
<th>Extreme Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay People</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows that only students and administrators serving on the committee failed to assign a no value rating to the case report activity. They rated the activity either some or extreme value. None of the groups composing the committee came close to approximating the response pattern shown by the chairmen, which was largely no or little value in nature.

Another item related to the process of evaluation was item 22, the last item asked of both chairmen and committee members. Since this item was not a forced-choice item, but was open-ended in style, the responses
cannot be tested for significant differences between groups using the chi square technique. However, since the content of the item dealt with the important question of how the evaluation process could be improved, an analysis of the results of the item merits attention. No attempt is made here to present the total response of either group, but the following summary is indicative of the more numerous categories of responses given by both chairmen and committee members.

RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED HOW THE EVALUATION PROCESS COULD BE IMPROVED

Finding means for schools to implement recommendations of the evaluation.

Follow-up by State Department to check on implementation.

More help in the beginning stages. A larger visiting committee could have been helpful.

Probably allow more time for evaluation team to spend in building with students and staff.

More extensive report to faculty and administration.

A report should be sent to the board of education. Maybe the board of education could be surveyed to see how well they understand guidance objectives, services, and needs.

Suggest visiting exemplary guidance departments.

Possibly involve superintendent on evaluation staff.

RESPONSES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHEN ASKED HOW THE EVALUATION PROCESS COULD BE IMPROVED

Complete the work in two months at most. Done over a longer period of time, wastes time.
Inform the students and parents, not just teachers, of what happened at the committee meetings.

Involve more parents and teachers.

Improve the evaluation by using students and lay people on the guidance committee.

State follow-up on implementation.

Have more opinion questions rather than yes - no.

More communication to total staff.

Get superintendent and board involved.

Emphasize the report by the visiting team.

More time should be spent in talking with parents and teachers.

A condensed report should be sent to each person who participated.

Visitation team should make a direct report to administration and board of education to try and get funds available for implementing the program.

Need larger committee.

The man making the decisions should be on the committee, otherwise it's a waste of time.

Study other school programs.

Items Related to the Evaluation Committee

Table 14, page 74, details the relative values of those serving on the evaluation committee as seen by both chairmen and committee members.

It is important to note that the computed chi squares for each group
## TABLE 14

**ITEM 7a-7e: VALUE OF EACH GROUP SERVING ON THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE AS PERCEIVED BY CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF THE CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Lay People</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = 1.1394$</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = 2.4325$</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = 3.3143$</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Administrators</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = 2.5188$</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Counselors</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = 3.4300$</td>
<td>df = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that served on the committee do not reveal any significant differences in opinion between chairmen and committee members relative to the value of the group in question. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis, which held that there would be no significant difference in opinion between chairmen and committee members' responses to various evaluation activities, was not rejected.

Lay People. In rating the value of lay people on the committee, both groups felt they were of considerable value. Chairmen reported 45 per cent either considerable or extreme value to the evaluation process, while committee members reported 49 per cent in the same area. However, only 9 per cent of the chairmen gave either a no or little value rating to lay people, while committee members gave the group 21 per cent either little or no value.

Students. Chairmen gave students either median or high ratings, and no little or no value ratings. The committee members had only 5 per cent rate the students as little value, with the remainder of votes either in the median or high ratings.

Teachers. Teachers were rated nearly entirely (95 per cent) in the considerable or extreme value range by the chairmen, and were also given high ratings by the committee members as only 3 per cent reported in the no or little value range.

Administrators. Administrators were rated at either considerable or extreme value ranges (83 per cent) by the chairmen with no one responding in the little or no value areas. The committee members also gave high ratings to the administrators as 68 per cent chose either
considerable or extreme values for the group, but 10 per cent of the committee did rate the administration as no or little value to the process of evaluation.

Counselors. Counselors were given the highest rating of any group, 100 per cent of the chairmen responded in either the considerable or extreme value range, and 85 per cent of the committee responded in the same range.

Examination of Table 14 for all groups reveals a generally positive attitude on the part of both chairmen and committee members with respect to the values of all groups participating on the local committee. In each case, however, slightly higher ratings were given each group by the chairmen, although consensus in value direction was achieved by both groups.

Items Related to the Results of the Evaluation

Table 15, page 77, describes the intent of the evaluated schools to develop plans for implementation of the recommendations resulting from the evaluation. An analysis of both chairmen and committee members responses follow.

Three-fourths of the chairmen and nearly four-fifths of the committee members stated that plans were developed for implementation of the recommendations. Chi square computations showed no significant difference in opinion between groups with respect to this item. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 16, page 77, reports the findings of the survey with respect to whether or not the evaluation had been of value in initiating
improvements in the guidance program. Both chairmen and committee
members responses were solicited.

### TABLE 15

ITEM 8: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TESTED
FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS, WHEN ASKED
WHETHER PLANS WERE DEVELOPED EITHER DURING OR AFTER THE
EVALUATION FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th></th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = .1555$  
$df = 1$

### TABLE 16

ITEM 10: VALUES OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS IN INITIATING
IMPROVEMENTS IN THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM AS PERCEIVED BY
CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND TESTED FOR
SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th></th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = .0899$  
$df = 2$
Ninety per cent of the chairmen responded that the process had some, considerable, or extreme value in initiating improvements, while another 10 per cent indicated no or little value for the same activity. Percentages identical to the chairmen's were reported by the committee in the same, considerable, or extreme value areas, and 10 per cent voted the process as no or little value. The chi square test of significance revealed no significant differences between groups for this item. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 17 details the effect the evaluation process had on the attitude changes among the teaching staff. Chairmen and committee members responses are analyzed.

### Table 17

**ITEM 13: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THEY BELIEVED THE EVALUATION PROCESS LED TO A MORE POSITIVE CHANGE IN ATTITUDE AMONG TEACHING STAFF REGARDING THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.6842 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
An overwhelming per cent of chairmen, 90 per cent, reported that they believed the process led to a more positive change in attitude among staff regarding the guidance program. Sixty-nine per cent of the committee members responded in a similar fashion. Chi square tests did not reveal any significant differences in response between groups for this item. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 18 presents the reasons given by both chairmen and committee members with respect to why various recommendations had not been implemented. Both chairmen and committee members opinions were sought for this item.

**TABLE 18**

**ITEM 14: RESPONSES OF BOTH CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHEN ASKED WHICH FACTOR WOULD BE MOST RESPONSIBLE FOR THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE VISITING TEAM WHICH WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic considerations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff disagreement with recommendations of visiting team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to carry out</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No state follow-up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff turnover</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most frequent reason given, by both groups of respondents, was one of economics. Nearly one-half of the reasons given by chairmen included economics, while over 40 per cent of the reasons stated by committee members included the matter of economic feasibility. The next most popular reason given for not implementing most of the recommendations was the matter of time between the evaluation and the follow-up study. Although one year had elapsed between the evaluation and this study, 20 per cent of the chairmen and 24 per cent of the committee stated there had not been enough time to carry out the implementation. The third highest reason given by the chairmen had to do with staff turnover, while this reason was listed fourth by the committees.

The open-ended or "other" category was listed in 8 per cent of the chairmen's responses and 9 per cent of the time by the committee. Staff disagreement with the recommendations of the visiting team comprised only 8 per cent and 5 per cent of the chairmen's and committee's reasons, respectively.

Some of the "other" reasons given by the chairmen for not implementing a particular recommendation included "the administration," and the fact that one school was moving into a new facility the very next year. Reasons given by the committee members included lack of facilities, no leadership for guidance development within the school administration, the need for more people on staff to carry out recommendations and lack of communication.

Table 19, page 81, details the responses of both chairmen and committee groups to the question of whether the evaluation results were ever given attention in later staff meetings.
TABLE 19

ITEM 15: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THE RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS WERE EVER THE SUBJECT OF SUBSEQUENT STAFF MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairmen</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.2024 \quad df = 1 \]

Fifty-five per cent of the chairmen and 60 per cent of the committee reported that later staff meetings dealt with the findings of the evaluation process. Item 8 from the previous discussion would indicate that a number of schools did not have concrete plans for implementation of the recommendations. The fact that nearly two-thirds of the total recommendations had either been implemented or were in the process of implementation, however, would cause one to speculate that implementation came about through the committee's efforts, if not through the total staff. Chi square tests revealed no significant differences between chairmen and committee members with respect to this item. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 20, page 82, indicates that nearly four-fifths of the chairmen and over 70 per cent of the committee members felt that the teacher and student survey results were shared with the total staff.
TABLE 20

ITEM 16: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THE RESULTS OF THE TEACHER AND STUDENT SURVEYS WERE EVER SHARED WITH THE TOTAL STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairman f</th>
<th>Chairman %</th>
<th>Committee f</th>
<th>Committee %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = .3965 \quad df = 1$

This item, combined with the previous one, would suggest that although the entire evaluation findings may not have been shared formally with the entire staff, efforts were made to share much of the evaluation information with the staff at various intervals of the process. Chi square tests again showed no significant difference between the responses of chairmen and committee members on this item. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Items 18-21 are designed to measure the degree to which the four major purposes of the guidance evaluation have been achieved. The four basic purposes of the evaluation reflect the original intent of the total evaluation package as developed by Wysong (1968) and utilized by the Division of Guidance and Testing.

Table 21, page 83, reveals that 85 per cent of the chairmen and 76 per cent of the committee members felt that the evaluation process generated objective information that could be communicated to various
publics concerning the objectives, activities, and effects of the guidance program.

TABLE 21

ITEM 18a: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION GENERATED OBJECTIVE INFORMATION WHICH COULD BE COMMUNICATED TO VARIOUS PUBLICS CONCERNING THE OBJECTIVES, ACTIVITIES, AND EFFECTS OF THE SCHOOL GUIDANCE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .7942 \]

No significant difference was found between groups of respondents for this item when the chi square test was utilized. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

The logical extension of the previous item, comprising item 18b, is summarized below. It asked "If the answer to 18a was yes, how and to whom was information communicated?" The most frequent categories of responses follow:

RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED HOW AND TO WHOM WAS INFORMATION COMMUNICATED

By committee members to the general public.

To students through information sheets.
To parents who attended a meeting held by the guidance staff in the fall.

To staff and public primarily through faculty meetings and local PTA.

Through evaluation committee members to their social, professional and peer groups.

RESPONSES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHEN ASKED HOW AND TO WHOM WAS INFORMATION COMMUNICATED

To parents by the counselor and the school board report.

To faculty via staff meetings.

To parents by PTA meetings and the school newsletter.

Reports in town paper.

To students from counselor or by announcement.

By student to student.

The degree to which the evaluation achieved the second of the four major purposes is reflected in Table 22, page 85.

Two-thirds of the chairmen and slightly over half of the committee felt that the evaluation process led to an improvement of the staff's own guidance practices and techniques. Chi square tests revealed no significant differences between groups responding to this particular item. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Item 19b asked the respondents to indicate what improvements, if any, were made, and by whom, in the area of staff improvement of guid-
TABLE 22

ITEM 19a: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION ASSISTED THE TOTAL STAFF TO IMPROVE THEIR OWN GUIDANCE PRACTICES AND TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2$</td>
<td>.0765</td>
<td>$df = 1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses were varied and too numerous to itemize, but the most frequent categories of response follow:

RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED WHAT IMPROVEMENTS, IF ANY, WERE MADE, AND BY WHOM, IN THE AREA OF STAFF IMPROVEMENT OF GUIDANCE PRACTICES

A general improvement in understanding of the guidance function by the total staff is evident by more positive attitudes of both teachers and administration.

Improvements in counselor-administration rapport.

Some staff became more aware of their responsibility and became involved directly with individual students.

More attention to individual counseling.

Teachers seem to make more referrals.

More teachers are making occupations a part of their regular class assignments.
Teachers consulted with counselors regarding better in-class techniques for problem students.

RESPONSES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHEN ASKED WHAT IMPROVEMENTS, IF ANY, WERE MADE, AND BY WHOM, IN THE AREA OF STAFF IMPROVEMENT OF GUIDANCE PRACTICES

Numerous staff members took a more positive view of guidance and have helped student-teacher relationships tremendously. Teachers recognize student differences more readily.

More interest in guidance was shown by members of the staff, especially those on the evaluation team.

The evaluation committee prompted the staff members to consider their own guidance practices.

Teachers came to the counselors for vocational materials relating to their teaching areas, and some asked the counselors to make presentations to their class.

Teachers had a better concept of the role and function of counselors. Some teachers, that had not previously done so, utilized services of counselors and the department.

Units were developed stressing use of course offerings in various occupations.

Teachers were more inclined to refer problem pupils to the counselor.

More group guidance resulted.
Teachers and students began using the wealth of information available in the guidance research and information room.

A set of objectives was developed by the guidance department and a concerted effort was made to reach these objectives.

The extent to which the third purpose for the evaluation was achieved is documented in Table 23.

**TABLE 23**

ITEM 20a: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION ASSISTED THE TOTAL STAFF TO DEVELOP SHARED UNDERSTANDINGS ABOUT THE SCHOOL'S GUIDANCE OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Chairmen</th>
<th>Rater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.2725 \quad df = 1 \]

Eighty per cent of the chairmen and 60 per cent of the committee reported that the evaluation assisted the total staff to develop shared understandings about the school's guidance objectives and activities. Although the chairmen's responses were more positive than the committee's, chi square tests revealed no significant difference between groups of respondents for this item. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.
The degree to which an impact is made on the total staff is dependent upon the sharing of data generated by the evaluation. In many cases, the committee was apparently handicapped in reaching the total staff with any data from the evaluation because some schools did not formally involve total staff in the sharing of information (item 15 discussed earlier).

Item 20b, similar to the previous two items, attempted to identify where and how impact was made. It asked "What better understandings, if any, were developed and by whom?" The most frequent categories of response follow:

RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED WHAT BETTER UNDERSTANDINGS, IF ANY, WERE DEVELOPED AND BY WHOM

A better understanding of the guidance program on the part of the faculty was achieved.

The staff began to understand that the guidance function is a responsibility of everyone.

The staff became more aware of the objectives of the guidance program.

RESPONSES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHEN ASKED WHAT BETTER UNDERSTANDINGS, IF ANY, WERE DEVELOPED AND BY WHOM

Subjectively, I feel that evaluation furthered the understanding by teachers of the guidance function and role of the counselors.

A better understanding of the role of the individual teacher in the guidance program resulted.
The faculty became aware of the needs of the guidance department and are more willing to fight in the counselor's behalf.

The staff became more aware of guidance services and consequently are making more referrals.

The involved faculty members had improved outlooks toward guidance.

Staff members now recognize counselors for counseling and not discipline matters.

There is increased awareness of the objectives and goals of guidance program coupled with better understanding of present limitations imposed by inadequate physical facilities.

There is a better understanding of all guidance functions, especially vocational guidance, through a series of small group meetings.

One understanding of administration that emerged was that it is the responsibility of the total staff to educate the individual.

Each member of staff is needed in the total guidance program.

The degree to which the last of the four major purposes of the evaluation was achieved is detailed in Table 24, page 90.

Eighty-nine per cent of the chairmen and 73 per cent of the committee reported that the evaluation assisted in making decisions for future program development. Thus, the evaluation was seen as a vehicle for gathering data on which to base program direction, and the process
TABLE 24

ITEM 21a: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS, WHEN ASKED WHETHER THE GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION ASSISTED IN MAKING DECISIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.4144 \quad df = 1 \]

apparently allowed for consensus of opinion to develop in order to determine the areas for program development. The relatively high percent of positive response to this item is further supported by the earlier discussion concerning implementation of visiting team recommendations. The process led to nearly two-thirds of the recommendations being implemented or in process of implementation at the time of this follow-up study. Chi square tests for this item showed no significant differences between chairman and committee responses. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not rejected.

Item 21b attempted to obtain information on what decisions, if any, were made. The most frequent categories of response follow:

RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED WHAT DECISIONS, IF ANY, WERE MADE

To improve the program.

To add a counselor.

To establish a group guidance program.
To change counselor duties.
To improve public relations with students, parents, faculty and board of education.
To increase career awareness for each student.
To have full time counselors and get secretarial help.
To improve office facilities.
To develop a counselor budget.
To implement most recommendations for 1972-1973.

RESPONSES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHEN ASKED WHAT DECISIONS, IF ANY, WERE MADE

To establish a department head and make sure counselors are now responsible for certain children.
To obtain a more sympathetic guidance secretary.
To hire a director of guidance.
To add additional staff.
To eventually build a guidance center with a browsing area for bulletin information.
To relocate guidance office.
To study the testing program.
To establish group guidance classes.
To place more emphasis on career development.
To be sure that more individual guidance will be done.
To add guidance for lower grades.
To begin a job placement program.
To establish a guidance steering committee.
To have the counselor stay with one group of students until they graduate.

To revise counselor assignments.

To organize and implement a realistic set of objectives.

**Items Related to the Visiting Team**

Only one item dealing with the visiting team portion of the evaluation process was asked of both chairmen and committee members. Table 25 details the opinions of both the chairmen and the committee members with respect to the value of the visiting team in the evaluation process.

**TABLE 25**

**ITEM 9d: THE VALUE OF THE VISITING TEAM IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS AS PERCEIVED BY CHAIRMEN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND TESTED FOR SIGNIFICANCE BY MEANS OF CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chairmen</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerable Value</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Value</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 8.9934^* \]

\[ df = 2 \]

*Significant at the .05 level.*
All twenty chairmen gave the visiting team either considerable or extreme value ratings, while 67 per cent of the committee reported ratings in either area, 29 per cent in some value area, and 4 per cent reported a rating of little value. Overall, both chairmen and committee members felt very positive regarding the value of the visiting team, but the chi square test of significance did show a significant difference between the groups on this item. Although both groups were positive in their ratings the chairmen were significantly higher than the committee.

Table 26 shows the ratings given by each separate group of the committee when chi square is partitioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No Value</th>
<th>Some Value</th>
<th>Extreme Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>20 100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay People</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>4 25</td>
<td>11 69</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td>6 43</td>
<td>7 50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>12 32</td>
<td>24 63</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>18 86</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>13 33</td>
<td>26 65</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5 3</td>
<td>38 26</td>
<td>106 71</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closest to the chairmen ratings of the visiting team were the ratings given by administrators. Eighty-six per cent reported extreme value ratings for the visiting team, while none of the 21 administrators gave a no value rating for the group in question. Students gave the lowest rating to the visiting team, as only 50 per cent voted extreme value ratings for the group, and 7 per cent registered no value
ratings for the team. In general, however, the visiting team received very positive ratings from all groups, with chairmen registering more positive opinions than the rest of the groups.

**Items Not Related to Any Hypothesis**

All of the items reported thus far in Chapter IV were related directly to the four hypotheses stated in Chapter I. The only other items not reported as yet are those from the chairmen survey that were not included in the committee member survey. Although the items do not involve any of the hypotheses of this study, they do bear heavily on the larger purpose of this investigation, namely, the determination of the value of the guidance program evaluation process utilized by the Division of Guidance and Testing. Because of the importance of the data from the chairmen survey items, results will be presented in this section by categories of items as previously stated.

**Items Related to the General Value of the Evaluation**

Item 17 was designed to discover the primary reasons for schools undergoing the voluntary evaluation of their guidance programs. It was assumed by the investigator that the chairmen, and not the committee members, would be aware of the motivating factors of such a decision. Therefore, Table 27, page 95, reflects the responses of only chairmen.

Of the twenty-three reasons given by the chairmen, 70 per cent reported that the decision was prompted by a genuine desire to improve the guidance program. The next most popular reason given was to satisfy the state standards, which calls for an evaluation at least
TABLE 27

ITEM 17: PRIMARY REASONS FOR SCHOOLS UNDERGOING THE EVALUATION AS PERCEIVED BY CHAIRMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfy state standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandated by higher authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine desire to improve the total program</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All schools in area doing it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

every five years. One respondent reported that the evaluation was mandated from a higher authority, one reported that all schools in the area were doing it, and one concluded that the evaluation was conducted to make the administration more aware of the value of guidance in order to push for better conditions and support.

**Items Related to the Process of Evaluation**

The only group responding to item 3 was that of the chairmen of the evaluation. It was the chairmen who ordered the surveys to be used during the evaluation, and it was also the chairmen who were eventually sent the bill for scoring services later in the evaluation. The investigator concluded that the committee would generally not be knowledgeable about the cost of such an evaluation, and therefore sought only to secure the opinions of chairmen for this particular item. Generally, the costs for a system to undergo this evaluation stemmed from the cost of providing print-outs of item analyses for both the teacher and student surveys. At 25¢ per answer sheet, a school with 600 students and
30 teachers would experience a total cost of nearly $157.00. None of the 20 chairmen felt the cost to be unreasonable.

**TABLE 28**

**ITEM 3: FEELINGS OF THE CHAIRMEN REGARDING THE MONETARY COMMITMENT NECESSARY FOR THE EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Unreasonable</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Reasonable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items Related to the Evaluation Committee*

Because the selection of the local evaluation committee was generally the task of the chairmen and/or the building principal, the only respondent sought for item 4 was the chairman. It was felt by the investigator that, generally speaking, the committee would not be aware of who was sought for involvement on the committee. The intent of the question, however, was to discover which groups were approached to take part in the evaluation.

The results of Table 29, page 97, show that 55 per cent of the schools invited parents or lay people to participate, 85 per cent of the schools tried to secure students on the committee, all schools sought to involve teachers and counselors, and only one school did not attempt to involve the administration on the evaluation committee. The logical extension of this item led to the next question, were they successful in securing the personnel they sought for the committee?
ITEM 4: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED WHETHER THEY ATTEMPTED TO SECURE THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS ON THEIR IN-SCHOOL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay People</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 indicates that there is apparently no difficulty in securing personnel for the evaluation committee once it is determined which groups are desired for participation. All schools that intended to secure parents, students, teachers, and counselors for their committee were successful in doing so, and only one of the 19 schools that desired to involve administrators was unsuccessful.

ITEM 5: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED WHETHER THEY WERE SUCCESSFUL IN SECURING GROUPS THEY REQUESTED TO SERVE ON THEIR COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay People</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31 shows the reasons given by the chairmen for not attempting to involve various groups on the evaluation committee. Only 11 responses were secured for this item.

* TABLE 31

ITEM 6: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED WHY THEY DID NOT ATTEMPT TO SECURE THE FOLLOWING GROUPS ON THEIR EVALUATION COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No. 1</th>
<th>No. 2</th>
<th>No. 3</th>
<th>No. 4</th>
<th>No. 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay People</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only groups that some schools did not attempt to involve were lay people and students. Half of the chairmen that did not involve lay people reported that they simply did not think of involving them. One replied that he saw no value in their participation. Other reasons given for not seeking lay people included the following:

...lay people involved in another dimension....

...would need board approval from an uncooperative board....
The schools which did not try to involve students said that they simply did not think of it, or they felt it was asking more of their students than their experience justified.

Table 32 shows how the chairmen ranked each group that served on the local evaluation committee with respect to the difficulty in securing their participation.

TABLE 32

ITEM 11: RATINGS GIVEN BY CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED TO RANK THE DIFFICULTY THEY ENCOUNTERED IN SECURING THE INVOLVEMENT OF VARIOUS GROUPS ON THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

1 - MOST DIFFICULT, 5 - EASIEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most difficult group to secure, according to the chairmen, was parents, followed in order by administrators, teachers, students, then counselors. Despite the order of difficulty reported here in securing groups to serve on the evaluation committee, some chairmen reported that it was not difficult at all to secure the personnel they desired.

Items Related to the Visiting Team

Table 33, page 100, shows that slightly over half of the schools evaluated took the initiative in selecting the members of their visiting team. The visiting team, which is composed of individuals with expertise in guidance and counseling, is made up of personnel from
TABLE 33

ITEM 9a: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED WHETHER THEIR COMMITTEE TOOK THE INITIATIVE IN SELECTING A VISITING TEAM FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS RATHER THAN DEPENDING ON THE DIVISION OF GUIDANCE AND TESTING REPRESENTATIVE TO SECURE VISITING TEAM MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

outside the evaluated school system, and is always chaired by a member of the Division of Guidance and Testing. Nine of the twenty schools evaluated depended on the Division to obtain the entire visiting team composition.

Table 34, page 101, reveals that ten of the eleven schools that attempted to select their own visiting team were successful in doing so. It would seem from this data that schools should not have any difficulty in obtaining personnel of their choice for the visiting team.

Item 9c was designed to secure information from the chairmen as to why they were not successful in obtaining the personnel they desired for the visiting team. One reported that the desired person had other commitments, while another stated that the person felt the visiting team required too much of a time commitment. One reported that it was the county coordinator of guidance that determined the visiting team, and another indicated that their budget prohibited them from getting the person they desired.
TABLE 34

ITEM 9b: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED WHETHER THEY WERE SUCCESSFUL IN OBTAINING THE PERSONNEL THEY DESIRED FOR THE VISITING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35 details various groups which served on the visiting teams of the twenty evaluated schools.

TABLE 35

ITEM 9e: RESPONSES OF CHAIRMEN WHEN ASKED TO CHECK ALL GROUPS WHICH SERVED ON THEIR VISITING TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Educator</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please explain)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state supervisor was listed for all twenty schools, principals were listed three times, counselor educators four times, superintendent once, counselors thirteen times, and the other write-ins were made up of the following: guidance supervisor from county department of education, county supervisor, teacher and student, evaluation consultants, and parent.
Discussion

The initial purpose of this study was concerned with the status of recommendations emanating from the guidance program evaluation. As noted previously in this report, it was found that approximately one-third of the recommendations had been implemented, one-third were in the process of implementation, and the final third had not been acted upon at the time of this follow-up study. These results of the guidance evaluation compare very favorably with the results of the North Central Evaluation study reported by Richmond (1969). It will be recalled that Richmond found on the average that one-half of the recommendations over a seven year period had been implemented. The evaluation process initiated by Wysong (1968), and continued by the Division of Guidance and Testing, then, can be considered an effective procedure to bring about positive change in guidance programs in Ohio.

Further, it can be assumed that the follow-up instruments that were developed by the author specifically for this study can be used to effectively and efficiently survey the effects of the guidance evaluation process advocated by the Division of Guidance and Testing. Prior to this study, the Division had not conducted a follow-up to any of the evaluations completed in the years from 1968-1971, nor were there any instruments available to conduct such a study. No significant problems were encountered in the completion of the instruments utilized in this study by the respondents.

The results of Parts II-III of the survey show that in nearly all cases there was no significant difference of opinion between the chairmen and committee responses relative to the value of a particular
evaluation activity. There was consensus among the totality of respondents that the evaluation had been of significant help in bringing about various changes in the guidance program. Had there been differences of opinion concerning the worth of the evaluation between the groups of respondents, then serious doubt could result in the continuation of the evaluation as it is known presently. It was felt that the close agreement by the respondents concerning the evaluation activities and results is a clear indication of the reliability and validity of the instruments and processes established by Wysong (1963) and utilized by the Division of Guidance and Testing.

Just as Richmond (1969), Carpenter (1970), Aslin (1969), and others have reported on the positive effects of evaluation on improvements in total program, so did this study show overwhelming agreement between respondents that the process had been of value in initiating improvements in the guidance program. Shaw and Jordan (1971, p. 320) stated very clearly the effects of evaluation on program in the following paragraph:

The public and professional clamor for quality education has been in the forefront of discussion for the past several years, but this worthy goal is not the automatic product of imaginative programs, bold innovations and experiments, stimulating materials, new equipment, and modern facilities. Quality education does not occur by accident; it is attained as a result of careful planning, followed by meticulous review, analysis, and evaluation.

The final aspect of the study was to secure opinions concerning how the evaluation process could be improved from the point of view of the respondents. Although throughout the questionnaires the respondents were clearly positive about the total process of evaluation, some sug-
gestions did surface that would merit discussion here. Foremost of
the suggestions was the one of schools needing additional help from
the Division of Guidance and Testing concerning implementation of
the recommendations that were made by the visiting team. There was
a definite need for help beyond the simple completion of the evalu­
ration process. The utilization of the consultants of the Division in
developing strategy that would lead to realization of the recommenda­
tions is perhaps the most significant of the many suggestions made by
the respondents. The resolution of this need must be handled deli­
cately, however, because of the fine line that separates the rights
of the evaluation to suggest changes and the rights of the school
system to make the changes they feel are of priority to them.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a brief summary of the study, as well as a review of the major conclusions. The final sections deal with implications and recommendations.

SUMMARY

Introduction. This study centered on the effects of the guidance program evaluations conducted by the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education, during the 1970-1971 school year. The study focused on two elements of the total evaluation process. First, to what degree did the evaluation lead to change in the guidance programs of the schools? And secondly, what attitudes were held by the school personnel concerning the value of the various evaluation activities?

Purposes. The purposes of this study were to:

1. develop a follow-up instrument or battery of instruments that could be used effectively to assess the impact of guidance program evaluations;

2. determine to what extent the guidance program evaluation recommendations that were offered by the visiting team during the evaluation had or had not been implemented, and if not implemented, to determine why not;
3. determine the relative values of each step of the guidance evaluation as seen by counselors, teachers, administrators, students, and lay people involved in the guidance evaluation, and to determine if differences in opinion exist between them concerning the value of each evaluation step completed; and

4. gather opinions from the personnel who have utilized the evaluation process in order to focus on how the evaluation can be improved.

**Procedures.** A total of twenty secondary schools that completed the guidance evaluation in 1970-1971 constituted the population for this study. These schools represented one hundred per cent of the population of schools that completed the entire evaluation during the 1970-1971 school year. Surveys that would measure the two aspects of the evaluation process mentioned above were developed and mailed to each of the twenty local guidance evaluation chairmen and to all of the personnel serving on the evaluation committee from each school. A total of 155 persons completed the questionnaires, 20 chairmen and 135 committee members. This constituted a 71 per cent rate of return among the total possible respondents.

**FINDINGS**

Results of the surveys administered to both chairmen and committee members revealed numerous findings concerning the recommendations and the values held of various evaluation activities. Specifically, the following findings resulted from this study.
Findings Related to Hypotheses

1. No significant differences were found in the rates of implementation of recommendations according to who conducts the evaluation, the size of the school being evaluated, nor the type of school organization prevailing in a given school.

2. No significant differences in responses between chairmen and committee members were found for identical items, except in the areas of visiting team value and value of case reports.

Findings Related to Visiting Team Recommendations

3. After a one-year interim period since the evaluation, nearly one-third of the visiting team recommendations were already implemented, another one-third were in the process of implementation, and the remaining one-third had not been acted on.

4. The highest rates of recommendation implementation occurred in the areas of Guidance Coordination and Administration and Teacher Participation, while the lowest rate occurred in the area of Staff.

5. One-fifth to one-fourth of the chairmen and committee members indicated that no plans were developed for implementation of the recommendations.

6. The overwhelming reason given for those recommendations not implemented at the time of this follow-up was one of economics. The second most frequent reason given was not enough time to carry out the recommendations of the visiting team.
Findings Related to the General Value of The Evaluation

7. Both chairmen and committee members viewed the guidance evaluation to be of considerable value to their schools.

8. Both chairmen and committee members responded that the evaluation process had been of value in initiating improvements in the guidance program.

9. Both chairmen and committee members stated that the evaluation process led to a more positive change in attitude among teaching staff regarding the guidance program.

10. Respondents indicated that the evaluation generated objective information that could be communicated to various publics concerning the objectives, activities, and effects of the school guidance program.

11. Two-thirds of the chairmen and over one-half of the committee members stated that the evaluation assisted the staff to improve their own guidance practices and techniques.

12. Eighty per cent of the chairmen and sixty per cent of the committee members reported that the evaluation assisted the total staff to develop shared understandings about the schools' guidance objectives and activities.

13. Eighty-nine per cent of the chairmen and seventy-three per cent of the committee members stated that the evaluation assisted in making decisions for future program development.

Findings Related to the Process of Evaluation

14. Chairmen experienced very little difficulty in securing personnel to serve on the local guidance evaluation committee.
15. The value of the local guidance committee members to the evaluation process as perceived by both chairmen and committee members, in rank order from highest to lowest value were counselors, teachers, students, administrators, and lay people or parents.

16. In over 90 per cent of the cases, chairmen from the evaluated schools were able to obtain the personnel they desired for the visiting teams.

17. Both chairmen and committee members regarded the visiting team activity to be of considerable value to the evaluation, although chairmen gave a significantly higher rating to the visiting teams' value than did the committees.

18. Of all the guidance evaluation activities completed, the case reports completed by the counselors were considered to be the least valuable. All other activities were rated some value or higher.

19. Nearly one-half of the respondents reported that the results of the evaluation process were not discussed at subsequent staff meetings.

20. Seventy per cent of the chairmen reported that the primary reason for undergoing the guidance evaluation was a genuine desire to improve the total program.

21. Throughout the survey, results show that chairmen gave slightly higher rating to the evaluation process than did committee members, although both were extremely positive in their responses.
CONCLUSIONS

The following major conclusions are drawn from the many findings of this study:

1. The findings of the study indicate that respondents felt the evaluation process was of value to the schools, that it led to a greater awareness of the program needs and accomplishments, that school staff improved their own guidance practices, and that it led to a more positive change in attitude among teaching staff regarding the guidance programs. The fact that the evaluation process brought so much data to the attention of the school staff played no small part in the eventual implementation of recommendations that were later made to the evaluated schools. The most significant conclusion of this study, therefore, is that guidance program evaluation often leads to change.

2. A second conclusion of the study is that despite the efforts put forth during the evaluation process, there were still schools that chose to do nothing with the results. The fact that this study revealed that from 20-25 per cent of the respondents were not aware of any plans for implementation of the recommendations may come as a surprise. As Irvine (1971, p. 86) has so succinctly stated:

   If an evaluation system is of value, it improves the quality of information available to decision-makers. From that point on, it is up to the decision-makers to utilize the data for program improvement.

3. Also, an important conclusion of the study is that the process of guidance evaluation established by Wysong (1968) and carried out by the Division of Guidance and Testing in the succeeding years is ap-
parently a valid and helpful process to schools. Results of the
chairmen and committee surveys show that the only evaluation
activity given a rating lower than "some value" was the case reports
activity. All other activities were rated between "some value" and
"extreme value" by both groups. It would appear that the evaluation
process utilized by the Division would not have to undergo extensive
revision.

4. A final conclusion of this study has to do with the effect
of the evaluation process on staff understanding of the guidance pro-
gram. Four of five chairmen and three of five committee members re-
ported that the process assisted the total staff to develop shared
understandings about the school guidance objectives and activities.
Because of this fact, it would appear that the evaluation can be
utilized as a source of bringing unity of understanding among adminis-
trators, counselors, teachers, parents, and students regarding the
guidance program. This should be of major importance and interest to
those schools that do not now enjoy such unity of understanding.

IMPLICATIONS

Several of the findings of this study have important implications
for the evaluation process as currently offered by the Division of
Guidance and Testing. The following list of implications consti-
tutes the major concerns that should be studied by the Division.

1. The relationship between evaluation and program change needs
to be made more clear to the schools. Many schools fear evaluation,
and do not see the potential such a process can have for program im-
provement. The sharing of data resulting from this study could be one effective method of convincing school administrators and counselors that evaluation and program implementation are inter-related. A thorough evaluation has a rallying effect on program awareness for school staff as well as lay personnel involved in the evaluation.

2. There is great need also for a more thorough sharing of results that accrue from an evaluation. The fact that only slightly over half of the schools involved in this study even used the data generated by the study for later staff meetings would suggest that opportunities were not taken advantage of in creating greater guidance awareness and in changing attitudes of staff members toward the program. Indeed, with this evaluation there is sufficient data generated for several staff meetings.

3. The completion of case reports by the counselors is generally not seen as a valuable evaluation activity. Among all the various steps completed during the evaluation, this particular step was seen as being the least valuable by both chairmen and committee members. It is suggested that the Division consider the possibility of not utilizing this activity in future guidance evaluations.

4. It is recommended that the local guidance evaluation committees include many more students and parents than is presently the case. If we consider the students and teachers as the primary consumers of the guidance process, then it is difficult to understand why the evaluation committees were composed of only 9 per cent students and the remaining 91 per cent non-students of various sorts.
Students should be represented at least to the degree that educators are represented on the guidance committee.

5. Because of the favorable results obtained in this follow-up study, it is also highly recommended that more schools in the State of Ohio need to be made aware of the evaluation process offered by the Division. Although attempts have been made in the past to inform the schools across the State of such services, there remain many schools that simply have no knowledge of such an evaluation. In informing the schools of the evaluation process, it should be also pointed out to them that North Central will accept the Division's evaluation in lieu of their own study.

6. Another important implication of this study has to do with the awareness of the program needs and priorities on the part of the staff, or as the North Central evaluations refer to it, the self-study. This investigation concurs with the reports made by other authors cited in the review of literature chapter that unless the evaluated school has identified similar program needs, very little chance is given to later implementation of the visiting team recommendations.

7. Because of the comments offered by respondents as to how the evaluation could be improved in future years, it is recommended that more aggressive attempts be made to secure the active participation of administrators (both principals and superintendents) in the total evaluation process. As one person so succinctly stated, the evaluation does very little good if the decision-makers are not present.
8. Another major implication from this study is that the schools no longer expect the visiting teams to simply aid them in the process of evaluation, but they request help in analyzing the steps necessary in order to implement desired changes. This consultative role that is requested by the schools should be considered a natural extension of the evaluative role of the visiting team.

9. It is important that schools develop some sort of plan for later implementation of the recommendations resulting from the evaluation. It was found that from one-fifth to one-fourth of the schools apparently had not developed any workable means of implementing the needed changes in their guidance programs. In view of the immense amount of time expended by the local evaluation committees, the committees would seem to be the most logical group to bring pressure to bear upon the development of such a plan.

10. It is recommended very strongly that the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education, make the same use of this study and its data that schools make of the data generated by the guidance evaluation — namely, that the Division analyze all the results of this study in order to bring about those changes that will produce a more effective guidance evaluation procedure for schools in the future. Only through such self-study activities by the State Department of Education will true progress be made in providing better services to Ohio's schools.
RECOMMENDATIONS

A few recommendations concerning guidance program evaluation emerge from this study. The recommendations are not listed in any priority ranking, however, as each one should be considered on its own merits.

1. It is suggested that more of a longitudinal study be made with respect to the guidance evaluation process used by the Division. Although there was only a one year period between the guidance evaluations and this follow-up study, implementation results were more than encouraging, as nearly two-thirds of the recommendations had been acted on by the time of this study. It remains to be seen whether significantly higher per cents of the visiting team recommendations would be implemented with extended interim periods between evaluation and follow-up.

2. In view of the utility of this first follow-up to the guidance evaluation process of the Division, it is recommended that in the future at least a one-year follow-up be made a requirement for each guidance evaluation completed. This should help guarantee that the evaluation process will remain a positive developmental force in Ohio's schools.

3. It is recommended that the Division analyze those areas of recommendations that did not yield a satisfactory implementation rate in order to ascertain the factors that prevent various needed changes from taking place. Although the most frequent reasons given for
recommendations not being implemented were economics and lack of time, it is felt that further study would reveal more specific reasons for lack of implementation. Such attention to the areas where recommendations were not later implemented should enable the Division staff to more effectively be of service to schools in future guidance evaluations.
SELF-REVIEW PLANNING GUIDE
FOR
GUIDANCE SERVICES EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

This guide is an aid to be used in planning a school guidance services evaluation.

A. Basic purposes for conducting a guidance services evaluation

1. Assist in making decisions for future guidance services development.
2. Assist administrators, counselors, teachers, students, and parents to develop shared understandings of the school's guidance objectives and activities and their individual responsibility for implementation.
3. Assist administrators, counselors and teachers to improve their own guidance related practices and techniques.
4. Organize objective information which can be communicated to various publics concerning the objectives, activities, and results of the school guidance services.

B. Basic steps for planning and organizing a guidance services evaluation

1. Building principal and guidance staff should cooperate in planning a guidance services evaluation.
2. A guidance evaluation coordinator for the school should be assigned by the building principal.
3. A guidance evaluation committee should be organized by the building principal and evaluation coordinator. The members of this committee should represent administrators and all counselors, representatives from all the teaching areas, students, community representatives, parents and others closely related to guidance.
4. One or more purposes for conducting a guidance services evaluation should be established.
5. Decisions should be made concerning which evaluation activities will be conducted.
6. A time schedule should be established and responsibilities for carrying out the activities should be assigned.
7. An evaluation visiting team should be selected and organized by the building principal and evaluation coordinator.

C. Some possible activities for conducting a guidance services evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Primary Deadline Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meet with evaluation committee for purposes of planning and organizing the guidance services evaluation.</td>
<td>Committee: 2 hrs 1,2,3,4 (1st week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prepare a time analysis summary of counselor activities. (By guidance staff) (Materials available: Time Analysis Chart of Counselor Activities)</td>
<td>Counselor: 1 hr 1,4 (2nd week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prepare brief reports which represent examples of guidance accomplishments or needs. (By guidance staff) (Materials available: Examples of Brief Case Reports on Guidance)</td>
<td>Counselor: 1 hr 4 for each report (3rd week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establish written guidance objectives for the school. (By-evaluation committee) (Materials available: Objectives of a School Guidance Program)</td>
<td>Committee: 4-6 hrs (4th week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Primary Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Judge the adequacy of guidance services organization and activities. (By evaluation committee) (Materials available: Evaluation Criteria for a Secondary School Guidance Program or Guidance Program Inventory)</td>
<td>Committee: 4-6 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Survey students. (By coordinator) (Materials available: Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey, Survey Answer Sheet, and Comment Sheet)</td>
<td>Students: 3/4 hr Data Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Orient and survey teaching staff. (By administrator or coordinator) (Materials available: Guidance Program Evaluation Teacher Survey, Survey Answer Sheet, and Comment Sheet)</td>
<td>Teacher: 1/2 hr Data Processing and Materials Expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Visit guidance facilities and interview administrators, guidance staff, and small groups of teachers and students. (By visiting team)</td>
<td>Team: 1 day, Consultant Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prepare tentative written report on guidance program accomplishments and recommendations for future development. (By visiting team)</td>
<td>Team: 1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Discuss tentative report with evaluation committee. (By visiting team)</td>
<td>Committee and Team: 1-2 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Present a verbal summary of report to teaching staff. (By visiting team)</td>
<td>Staff and Team: 3/4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Prepare and submit to administrator and evaluation coordinator final written report. (By visiting team)</td>
<td>Team Captain: 2 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Study all data generated by evaluation, as well as the final report of visiting team, and rework goals and program in light of this new information. Decide what actions should be taken.</td>
<td>Committee: 2 hrs or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Follow up - One year later by visiting team.</td>
<td>Team Captain: 2 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

James R. O'Connor, Consultant
Guidance and Counseling Services Section
January 5, 1972

(Adapted from materials originally developed by H. Eugene Wysong)
Time Analysis Chart - Counselor's Guidance Objectives

This chart is for the purpose of estimating and summarizing the amount of time that a counselor would like to spend during one school year in giving direct services to students, teachers, administrators, and parents in trying to help them to accomplish various guidance objectives. Judgments need to be made in estimating time.

| Year's Time | Percent |

A. Assistance to Students

Assisting students to:

1. Progress toward productive and rewarding careers
2. Select and enter school courses and student activities
3. Select and enter educational opportunities beyond high school
4. Develop learning skills and values
5. Participate meaningfully in the opportunities of the school
6. Develop self-understandings and identities
7. Develop interpersonal relationships
8. __________

B. Assistance to Teachers

Assisting teachers to:

1. Understand the students for whom they are responsible
2. Participate in helping students attain their guidance objectives
3. Understand and utilize the services of the guidance program
4. __________

C. Assistance to Administrators

Assisting administrators to:

1. Understand the characteristics of the school's student population
2. Participate in helping students attain their guidance objectives
3. __________

D. Assistance to Parents

Assisting parents to:

1. Understand their children's educational progress
2. Understand the opportunities available to their children
3. Participate in helping their children attain guidance objectives
4. Understand and utilize the services of the guidance program
5. __________

Total __________

*Total time spent in percentages during normal working hours on days when total school staff is on duty. Include planning and preparation time.

James R. O'Connor, Consultant
Guidance and Counseling Services
JED:th January 28, 1972
Division of Guidance and Testing
State Department of Education
731 Northwest Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212

(Adapted from materials originally developed by H. Eugene Wysong)
Time Analysis Chart of Counselor Activities

This chart is for the purpose of estimating and summarizing the amount of time spent or expected to be spent by a counselor on various activities during this school year. Judgments need to be made in estimating time. Reference can be made to Guidance Services for Ohio Schools in order to identify various activities under each service listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance Services</th>
<th>Year's Time Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. INFORMATION SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PUPIL APPRAISAL AND RECORD SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. GROUP GUIDANCE SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COUNSELING SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CONSULTATIVE SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PARENT CONFERENCE SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. RESOURCE COORDINATION SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PLACEMENT SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. EVALUATION AND PLANNING SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total time spent in percentages in an activity during normal working hours on days when total school staff is on duty. Include planning and preparation time. The total should be 100 percent.

James R. O'Connor, Consultant
Guidance and Counseling Services
Division of Guidance and Testing
State Department of Education
751 Northwest Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212

JRO:th - 7/12/72

(Adapted from materials originally developed by H. Eugene Wysong)
Examples of Brief Case Reports on Guidance

The following case reports are examples of specific school situations which might illustrate guidance program accomplishments and needs.

Report A - Student wishing to enter nursing school

The counselor had a number of conferences with "Jane" during her four years in high school. Some of the conference topics involved course selections, low marks in Chemistry, good grooming, and truancy from school. "Jane" planned to become a nurse.

"In February, 'Jane' came in to tell me (the counselor) that she had failed the nursing test and that the Director of the School of Nursing had advised her to go into practical nursing. I explained the procedure for applying to the School of Practical Nursing. She insisted that she wanted to be an R.N. and asked me if she could be allowed to take the examination again. When I replied that she could, she said, 'It was my reading grade that brought me down. Will you help me improve my reading?' Naturally, I was delighted to help her but warned her that she did not have much time."

"I started her on Dr. Witty's books and on the Accelerator. She spent one or two hours a day reading. I suggested that she go to another hospital, tell her story, and get a card for the next examination. She did and took the examination in April. During the last week of school, she came to me smiling saying, 'I passed the test. I'm accepted at the nursing school. I told you I would do it and I did.'"

Report B - High ability student achieving low grades

This report deals with a twelve year old seventh grade boy. He is tall, well built, personable, and an only child. Both his parents have attended college. His test scores indicate ability level ranges from bright normal to very superior with a central tendency towards very superior.

The counselor initiated the first counseling session after the first marking period. The boy's marks had fallen to "U" and "H" in the junior high school. The boy was rather curious as to his relationship with the counselor, but relaxed when he accepted the idea that the purpose of the interview was to help him rather than to criticize him. He was quiet, serious, interested, and evidently quite concerned about the effect his poor marks would have on his parents.

The boy's parents contacted the school and requested an appointment with the counselor. They appeared to have a genuine concern for their son's welfare. Both proved to be intelligent and cooperative.

The boy's teachers then met with the counselor and parents. The teachers' comments were consistent in that they agreed that the boy has a good mind. However, he was inconsistent, indifferent, and careless about his work. It was agreed that the boy needed help in improving his attitude about learning, and that the assistance given begin by trying to improve his study habits.

The parents agreed to spend more time with the boy, and to be a bit more firm instead of always allowing him to have his own way. They would provide the proper "study setting" and a definite time to study at home.

The boy seemed to appreciate the counseling sessions which followed. During these sessions work was done on the improvement of study habits. The boy confessed that he really wanted to learn but wasn't sure if he knew how to go about it. During counseling the fact was discovered that the boy greatly underestimated his own mental ability. When his potential abilities were explained, his self-confidence improved. This information had a positive effect on the boy. He then realized that he could improve if he would put forth the necessary effort.

(over)
Objectives of a School Guidance Program

A General Outline

This outline is for the purpose of describing some broad objectives of a school guidance program. School personnel should establish and clarify those objectives which they desire for their own school's guidance program.

A guidance program is an integral part of a total school program and has objectives which are within the educational objectives of the total school. All school staff members including the teacher, counselor, and administrator are responsible participants in helping to attain guidance objectives.

General Purpose of Guidance

The general purpose of guidance is to assist each student to participate in his own development toward becoming purposefully self-directed in a changing society, having full respect for the worth and dignity of self and others, and becoming the person whom he desires to become.

Outline of Objectives of a School Guidance Program

The following general statements of guidance objectives have been organized into five sections. Section A, Assistance to Students, outlines the primary objectives of a school guidance program. Sections B, C, D, and E describe the supporting objectives in which assistance is received by teachers, administrators, parents, and counselors, through their own cooperative efforts, so that each can better assist students.

A. Assistance to Students

Assisting students to:
1. Progress toward productive and rewarding careers.
2. Select and enter school courses and student activities.
3. Select and enter educational opportunities beyond high school.
4. Develop learning skills and values.
5. Participate meaningfully in the opportunities of the school.
6. Develop self-understandings and identities.
7. Develop interpersonal relationships.

B. Assistance to Teachers

Assisting teachers to:
1. Understand the students for whom they are responsible.
2. Participate in helping students attain their guidance objectives.
3. Understand and utilize the services of the guidance program.

C. Assistance to Administrators

Assisting administrators to:
1. Understand the characteristics of the school's student population.
2. Participate in helping students attain their guidance objectives.

D. Assistance to Parents

Assisting parents to:
1. Understand their child's educational progress.
2. Understand the opportunities available to their children.
3. Participate in helping their children attain guidance objectives.
4. Understand and utilize the services of the guidance program.

E. Assistance to Counselors

Assisting counselors to:
1. Understand the students for whom they are responsible.
2. Understand the educational programs of the school.
3. Participate in helping students attain their guidance objectives.
The School Guidance Program

A General Outline

This outline describes the general provisions of a school guidance program. These provisions represent the staff activities, organizational structure, and administrative policies which are established for the purpose of accomplishing the objectives of a school guidance program.

A. Direct Services of Guidance Staff
   1. Individual and group counseling
   2. Group guidance instruction
   3. Assistance to staff
   4. Assistance to parents

B. Indirect Services Coordinated by Guidance Staff
   1. Student information
   2. Guidance information
   3. Guidance resources
   4. Student placement

C. Organization and Administration of Guidance Program
   1. Guidance staff
   2. Guidance facilities
   3. Guidance coordination
   4. General policies and structure

D. Staff Participation in Guidance Program
   1. Teacher participation
   2. Administrator participation

E. School Program Provisions Which Facilitate the Achievement of Guidance Objectives

Guidance and Counseling Services
Division of Guidance and Testing
State Department of Education
721 Northwest Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212

JBD:th 7/12/71
EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR A SECONDARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE PROGRAM

(A Sample Exercise)

(The following sample of evaluative criteria is provided for the purpose of describing the nature and content of the Evaluative Criteria for a Secondary School Guidance Program. Counselors, administrators, and some teachers representative of the staff might be asked to respond individually to the items using their own opinions about the school's guidance program. Read the directions and respond to the statements in a way that you think best describes your own school's guidance program.)

Directions: The following criteria are for the purpose of aiding school personnel to study and evaluate the provisions of a secondary school guidance program. Judgments on the adequacy to which a school is meeting these criteria can be described by responding with the following statements:

1. The provision is being met exceptionally well.
2. The provision is being met adequately.
3. The provision is not being met adequately and improvement is needed.
N The provision is not desirable or is not appropriate to the objectives of this school.
? Not enough information is known to make a judgment.

Circle the response which best describes the guidance program in your school.

1 2 3 N ? A1. No counselor is under pressure from others to manipulate the decisions of students.
1 2 3 N ? A2. Group guidance instruction is provided for those students who need assistance in selecting and entering school courses and student activities.
1 2 3 N ? A3. The guidance staff interprets to the building administrator information on group profiles from test results, follow-up studies, and other pertinent information.
1 2 3 N ? A4. Each counselor communicates with parents about the educational progress and needs of their children.
1 2 3 N ? B1. Observations which make test performances or other student data more meaningful are recorded on the guidance records.
1 2 3 N ? B2. A guidance staff member has the responsibility for developing and coordinating the guidance information service.
1 2 3 N ? B3. A written list has been prepared of school staff members who have special skills or understandings and who may be utilized to help students with particular guidance needs.
1 2 3 N ? B4. Written records are kept of each transaction which the school performs in processing student applications or in making student referrals.
1 2 3 N ? C1. At least one-fourth of an employed secretary is provided for each full-time counselor.
1 2 3 N ? C2. Facilities are available for the testing of student groups under good test administration conditions.

over
1 2 3 N ? C3. The director of guidance for the total school system is responsible for the development and coordination of a sequential program of guidance services among all school building units.

1 2 3 N ? C4. No counselor has any responsibility for judging, reprimanding, or controlling student behavior beyond that which is incidentally required of any staff member in the normal operation of the school.

1 2 3 N ? D1. Teachers present the future educational implications of subjects being taught.

1 2 3 N ? D2. The administrator interprets to the school staff the objectives and services of the guidance program and the procedures for utilizing these services.

(Note: The items are numbered to correspond to the outline included in the publication Evaluative Criteria for a Secondary School Guidance Program. After each individual has responded to the criteria statements, they should as a group, discuss their ideas and come to a consensus on which criteria should be described with a "1" response, "provision is being met exceptionally well," and which criteria should be described with a "3" response, "provision is not being met adequately and improvement is needed." The group could then develop answers to the following two questions.)

What provisions of the guidance program are especially effective?

What provisions of the guidance program are in most need of improvement?

Prepared by: H. Eugene Kyoung, Supervisor Measurement and Evaluation Services

EDW: th March 24, 1969

Division of Guidance and Testing
State Department of Education
751 North East Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212
GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION STUDENT SURVEY

(A Sample Exercise)

(The following sample of items is provided for the purpose of describing the nature and content of the Guidance Program Evaluation Student Survey. Read the directions and answer the questions the way that you think a 12th grade student in your school might answer them.)

Directions: This survey is for the purpose of collecting information which will be helpful to the guidance program in your school. You and other students are asked to give the information which is needed. A study will be made on how the total group answers each question. It is important that you read each question carefully and answer according to your true opinion.

Please answer the questions in the following way:

Yes No ? If "Yes" is a better answer than "No."
Yes No ? If "No" is a better answer than "Yes."
Yes No © If you don't know which is better.

Yes No ? A1. When meeting with you, does the counselor usually talk about the things you want to talk about?
Yes No ? A2. When the counselor talks with a group or class of students, is it usually interesting?
Yes No ? B1. Do you know about most of the information which is included on your own guidance record?
Yes No ? B2. Does your school have information available that tells about most of the occupations in the U.S.?
Yes No ? B3. Does the counselor know some people outside your school who would be willing to give to students information about occupations?
Yes No ? B4. Does the counselor spend too much time trying to get students into college?
Yes No ? C. Is it easy for you to get in to see a counselor if you want?
Yes No ? D1. Do most teachers take class time to discuss occupations related to their subjects?
Yes No ? A1. Do you think that you will probably have at least three different jobs in your life?
Yes No ? A2. Should a student choose those school subjects in which he can get the best grades?
Yes No ? A3. Are there any two-year technical schools in your state?
Yes No ? A4. Do you usually wait until the teacher plans to give a test before you really study?
Yes No ? A5. Are most of the school rules fair to students?
Yes No ? A6. Do you know what kind of person you would want to become?
Yes No ? A7. Do most of the students you know in this school seem to be friendly?
Yes No ? V. Do you think that a school should try to help all students to get a good education?

(Note: The above, first set of items numbered A1 to D1 are written to correspond to the outline "The School Guidance Program," the second set numbered A1 to A7 correspond to the outline "Objectives of a School Guidance Program." Item V is a verification item.)

Prepared by: H. Eugene Wysong, Supervisor
Measurement and Evaluation Services
Division of Guidance and Testing
State Department of Education
751 Northwest Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Prepared on March 24, 1969
(A Sample Exercise)

Directions: This survey is for the purpose of making a comprehensive and systematic collection of information which will be helpful to the guidance program in your school. You and other teachers are requested to give the information which is needed. A study will be made on how the total group answers each question. No scores will be produced for individuals. It is important that you give your true opinion on each question.

Please answer the questions in the following way:

Yes No If "Yes" is a better answer than "No."
Yes No If "No" is a better answer than "Yes."
Yes No If you don't know which is better.

A3. Does the counselor usually report back to you concerning a student whom you have referred to the counselor?

B1. Does the school keep records on each student's vocational and educational plans?

B2. Does the school have available materials describing occupations which are related to your teaching field?

B3. Have any students been referred to you by the counselor for any special help that you can give them?

B4. Do teachers participate in deciding how students will be placed into groups or classes?

B5. Does a counselor unnecessarily disrupt instruction time by taking students out of class?

B6. Do you believe that you are aware of all students in your classes who have special learning handicaps or needs?

B7. Have you given to the counselor information about the objectives and content of your courses?

B8. Can a good aptitude test tell a student what occupation he should enter?

V. Should a school, as much as is practically possible, try to help every student get a good education?

(Note: The above first set of items numbered A3 to C are written to correspond to the outline "The School Guidance Program." The second set numbered B1 to B3 correspond to the outline "Objectives of a School Guidance Program." Item V is a verification item.)

Prepared by: H. Eugene Kyong, Supervisor
Measurement and Evaluation Services

Division of Guidance and Testing
State Department of Education
751 Northwest Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212
COMMENT SHEET

This sheet is for the purpose of collecting information about the services of the counselor. Please answer the following two questions. Do not place your name on this sheet.

1. In what way has the counselor been of most help to you?

2. In what way could the counselor be of more help to you?

James K. O'Connor, Consultant
Guidance and Counseling Services
February 9, 1972

Division of Guidance and Testing
State Department of Education
751 Northwest Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43212

(Adapted from materials originally developed by H. Eugene Wysong)
APPENDIX B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Big Walnut High School</td>
<td>Sunbury, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Butler High School</td>
<td>Vandalis, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dunbar High School</td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Evergreen High School</td>
<td>Latamora, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fairless High School</td>
<td>Nварre, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Garfield High School</td>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hudson High School</td>
<td>Hudson, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kiser High School</td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maple Heights High School</td>
<td>Maple Heights, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medina High School</td>
<td>Medina, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mt. Vernon High School</td>
<td>Mt. Vernon, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pettisville High School</td>
<td>Pettisville, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Purcell High School</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Roth High School</td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sauder Junior High School</td>
<td>Massillon, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Troy High School</td>
<td>Troy, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Van Cleve Junior High School</td>
<td>Troy, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Walnut High School</td>
<td>Millersport, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Warren High School</td>
<td>Vincent, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>West Geauga High School</td>
<td>Chesterland, Ohio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear,

As you are well aware, last year your school completed a guidance program evaluation using the materials and processes developed by the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education. We sincerely hope that the evaluation proved to be of significant help to you as you attempted to make decisions as to program direction and improvement.

Of significant concern to us at the Division of Guidance and Testing is the fact that we have never known exactly what impact the guidance evaluation has made in schools. We intend, therefore, starting this year, to follow-up all of the schools which completed our evaluation during the past school year. The follow-up is made up of three parts, each very brief in length:

Part I - to be completed by the chairman of your evaluation committee. It deals only with the current status of recommendations from the visiting team.
Estimated Time for Completion - 5 minutes

Part II - to be completed also by the chairman of your evaluation committee. It deals with the relative value of various steps in the evaluation process.
Estimated Time for Completion - 15 to 20 minutes

Part III - to be completed by members of your evaluation committee. It deals also with the relative value of various steps in the evaluation process.
Estimated Time for Completion - 10 to 15 minutes.
At all stages of the follow-up, data from any of the schools will be held confidential and no reference will be made to results from individual schools. All data will be analyzed on a group basis only, so there should be no anxiety concerning identity of participants.

We have informed your principal of the follow-up survey, and the importance of your evaluation committee completing the instruments. According to the information you recently supplied us with via the phone call earlier this month, there should be sufficient copies of the survey for each of your committee members. A letter of explanation is attached to each of the committee members' surveys, but a brief explanation to the committee on your part may enable us to have a complete reporting of attitudes held about our evaluation. We very much would like to have 100% or near 100% return. You again, as was the case during the evaluation, are the key to a successful follow-up.

If you have any questions concerning this follow-up, please do not hesitate to contact us. We would be more than happy to answer any concerns you may have.

We would appreciate the cooperation of your school staff members who may have had a part in the guidance evaluation to take time from their busy schedules to complete the follow-up questionnaire. Your support in this project will help considerably in making the evaluation a better and more comprehensive process in the future.

Sincerely,

Kenneth W. Richards, Director
Division of Guidance & Testing

James R. O'Connor
Guidance Evaluation Consultant
Guidance & Counseling Service
Dear

As you are well aware, last year your school completed a guidance program evaluation using the materials and processes developed by the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education. We sincerely hope that the evaluation proved to be of significant help to you as you attempted to make decisions as to program direction and improvement.

Of significant concern to us at the Division of Guidance and Testing is the fact that we have never known exactly what impact the guidance evaluation has made in schools. We intend, therefore, starting this year, to follow-up all of the schools which completed our evaluation during the past school year. The follow-up is made up of three parts, each very brief in length:

Part I - to be completed by the chairman of your evaluation committee. It deals only with the current status of recommendations from the visiting team. 
Estimated Time for Completion - 5 minutes

Part II - to be completed also by the chairman of your evaluation committee. It deals with the relative value of various steps in the evaluation process. 
Estimated Time for Completion - 15 to 20 minutes

Part III - to be completed by members of your evaluation committee. It deals also with the relative value of various steps in the evaluation process. 
Estimated Time for Completion - 10 to 15 minutes
At all stages of the follow-up, data from any of the schools will be held confidential and no reference will be made to results from individual schools. All data will be analyzed on a group basis only, so there should be no anxiety concerning identity of participants.

We will be contacting the chairman of your guidance evaluation committee in the near future in order to supply him with the proper number of questionnaires for his committee. We are asking also that all questionnaires be returned to the chairman so that he can make one shipment back to us in Columbus. A prepaid envelope will be enclosed for the return mailing.

If you have any questions concerning this follow-up, please do not hesitate to contact us. We would be more than happy to answer any concerns you may have.

We would appreciate the cooperation of your school staff members who may have had a part in the guidance evaluation to take time from their busy schedules to complete the follow-up questionnaire. Your support in this project will help considerably in making the evaluation a better and more comprehensive process in the future.

Sincerely,

Kenneth W. Richards, Director
Division of Guidance & Testing

James R. O'Connor
Guidance Evaluation Consultant
Guidance & Counseling Service

KWR:JRO:acb
Dear Committee Member:

As you are well aware, last year your school completed a guidance program evaluation using the materials and processes developed by the Division of Guidance and Testing, Ohio Department of Education. We sincerely hope that the evaluation proved to be of significant help to you as you attempted to make decisions as to program direction and improvement.

Of significant concern to us at the Division of Guidance and Testing is the fact that we have never known exactly what impact the guidance evaluation has made in schools. We intend, therefore, starting this year, to follow-up all of the schools which completed our evaluation during the past school year. The follow-up is made up of three parts, each very brief in length:

**Part I** - to be completed by the chairman of your evaluation committee. It deals only with the current status of recommendations from the visiting team.
*Estimated Time for Completion - 5 minutes*

**Part II** - to be completed also by the chairman of your evaluation committee. It deals with the relative value of various steps in the evaluation process.
*Estimated Time for Completion - 15 to 20 minutes*

**Part III** - to be completed by members of your evaluation committee. It deals also with the relative value of various steps in the evaluation process.
*Estimated Time for Completion - 10 to 15 minutes*
At all stages of the follow-up, data from any of the schools will be held confidential and no reference will be made to results from individual schools. All data will be analyzed on a group basis only, so there should be no anxiety concerning identity of participants.

It is very important for us to know your feelings regarding the value of certain steps in the evaluation process that your committee completed last year. We are asking, therefore, that you take the 10 or 15 minutes necessary to complete the attached survey.

Upon completion of the survey, please return it in the enclosed pre-paid envelope directly to us in Columbus. Do not return it to the evaluation chairman.

If you have any questions concerning this follow-up, please do not hesitate to contact us. We would be more than happy to answer any concerns you may have.

Sincerely,

Kenneth W. Richards

James R. O'Connor
Guidance Evaluation Consultant
Guidance & Counseling Service

KWR/JRO:acb
GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP - PART I

(to be completed only by the evaluation chairman)

IMPORTANT: The person responding to this form should complete all areas listed below:

Name of School ________________________________
Year of Guidance Evaluation ______________________
Name of State Representative Coordinating Evaluation ________________
Type of School (check one) ( ) city ( ) county ( ) exempted village
Grade Level of Students in School ______________________
Number of Students at your School _______________________
Your Position or Title ________________________________

PRESENT STATUS OF VISITING TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

Of the attached list of recommendations that were made as a result of the Guidance Evaluation conducted last year using materials developed by the Division of Guidance and Testing, please indicate by listing the appropriate letter (I) which ones have already been implemented, (P) are now in process of being implemented, or (N) have not been implemented.
GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP — PART II

(to be completed only by the evaluation chairman)

REPORT OF EVALUATION PROCESS ACTIVITIES

DIRECTIONS: Unless otherwise directed, complete each item by placing a check mark (✓) beside the most appropriate response to each question.

1. What are your feelings regarding the value of the guidance evaluation for your school?

   ( ) no value
   ( ) little value
   ( ) some value
   ( ) considerable value
   ( ) extreme value

2. What are your feelings regarding the time commitment necessary for the evaluation?

   unrealistic..........................adequate..........................ideal
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

3. What are your feelings regarding the monetary commitment necessary for the evaluation?

   unreasonable.......................average.........................reasonable
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

4. Did you attempt to secure the involvement of the following groups on your in-school evaluation committee?

   Yes No
   a. Lay People ( ) ( )
   b. Students ( ) ( )
   c. Teachers ( ) ( )
   d. Administrators ( ) ( )
   e. Counselors ( ) ( )

5. For those groups in #4 where you answered yes, did you secure their involvement?

   Yes No
   a. Lay People ( ) ( )
   b. Students ( ) ( )
   c. Teachers ( ) ( )
   d. Administrators ( ) ( )
   e. Counselors ( ) ( )
6. For only those groups in #4 where you answered no, indicate why you didn't attempt to secure their involvement by placing the respective number (1-5) from the list below, beside the appropriate group.

1. Saw no value in their involvement
2. School policy prohibited this
3. Did not think of it
4. Knew in advance that they would not have time
5. Other (please explain)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. For those groups in #5 where you answered yes, what are your feelings regarding their value to your committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No Value</th>
<th>Little Value</th>
<th>Some Value</th>
<th>Considerable Value</th>
<th>Extreme Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay People</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Were plans developed either during or after the evaluation for implementing the recommendations of the study?

( ) yes
( ) no

9. Visiting Team

a. Did your committee take the initiative in selecting a visiting team for the evaluation process rather than depending on the Division of Guidance and Testing representative to secure visiting team members?

( ) yes
( ) no

b. If you answered yes to 9a, were you successful in obtaining the personnel you desired for the visiting team?

( ) yes
( ) no
c. If you answered no to 9b, why weren't you successful in obtaining the personnel you desired for the visiting team?

( ) they had other commitments
( ) they felt they didn't have the expertise necessary
( ) visiting team required too much of a time commitment
( ) other (please explain)

d. What are your feelings regarding the value of the visiting team in the evaluation process?

( ) no value
( ) little value
( ) some value
( ) considerable value
( ) extreme value

e. Please check all groups which served on your visiting team.

( ) State Supervisor
( ) Principal
( ) Counselor Educator
( ) Superintendent
( ) Counselor
( ) Other (please explain)

10. Has the evaluation process that you have completed been of value in initiating improvements in the guidance program?

( ) no value
( ) little value
( ) some value
( ) considerable value
( ) extreme value

11. Place in rank order the following groups according to the difficulty you encountered in securing their involvement on the evaluation committee (1 = most difficult, 5 = easiest).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Please rate each of the following evaluation activities using the following numbering scheme:

(1) no value (2) little value (3) some value (4) considerable value
(5) extreme value (6) not applicable or was not completed

- developing guidance objectives
- committee use of evaluative criteria
- student survey
- teacher survey
- counselor time analysis chart
- comment sheets
- brief case reports
- visiting team presentation to evaluation committee
- visiting team report to total staff

Number Ranking

13. Do you believe the evaluation process led to a more positive change in attitude among teaching staff regarding the guidance program?

( ) yes
( ) no

14. In your opinion, which factor below would be most responsible for those recommendations of the visiting team which were not implemented?

( ) economic considerations
( ) staff disagreement with recommendations of visiting team
( ) apathy
( ) not enough time to carry out
( ) no state follow-up
( ) staff turnover
( ) other (please explain)

15. Were the results of the evaluation process ever the subject of subsequent staff meetings?

( ) yes
( ) no

16. Were the results of the teacher and student surveys ever shared with the total staff?

( ) yes
( ) no

17. What was the primary reason for your school undergoing the evaluation?

( ) satisfy state standards
( ) mandated by higher authority
( ) genuine desire to improve the total program
( ) all schools in area doing it
( ) other (please explain)
18. a. Did the Guidance Program Evaluation generate objective information which could be communicated to various publics concerning the objectives, activities and effects of the school guidance program?
   {} yes
   {} no

   b. If yes, how and to whom was the information communicated?

19. a. Did the Guidance Program Evaluation assist the total staff to improve their own guidance practices and techniques?
   {} yes
   {} no

   b. If yes, what improvements were made and by whom?

20. a. Did the Guidance Program Evaluation assist the total staff to develop shared understandings about the school's guidance objectives and activities?
   {} yes
   {} no

   b. If yes, what better understandings were developed and by whom?

21. a. Did the Guidance Program Evaluation assist in making decisions for future program development?
   {} yes
   {} no

   b. If yes, what decisions were made?

22. What suggestions do you have for improving the Guidance Evaluation?
GUIDANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP – PART III

(to be completed only by evaluation committee members other than the chairman)

IMPORTANT: The person responding to this form should complete both blanks listed below:

Name of School _______________________________________
Your Position or Title ___________________________________

REPORT OF EVALUATION PROCESS ACTIVITIES

DIRECTIONS: Unless otherwise directed, complete each item by placing a check mark (✓) beside the most appropriate response to each question.

1. What are your feelings regarding the value of the guidance evaluation for your school?

✓ no value
✓ little value
✓ some value
✓ considerable value
✓ extreme value.

2. What are your feelings regarding the time commitment necessary for the evaluation?

unrealistic ................. adequate ..................... ideal
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

3. For each group listed below that served on your committee, please rate their relative value to the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No Value</th>
<th>Little Value</th>
<th>Some Value</th>
<th>Considerable Value</th>
<th>Extreme Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lay People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Were plans developed either during or after the evaluation for implementing the recommendations of the study?

✓ yes
✓ no

5. What are your feelings regarding the value of the visiting team in the evaluation process?

✓ no value
✓ little value
✓ some value
✓ considerable value
✓ extreme value
6. Has the evaluation process that you have completed been of value in initiating improvements in the guidance program?

   ( ) no value
   ( ) little value
   ( ) some value
   ( ) considerable value
   ( ) extreme value

7. Please rate each of the following evaluation activities using the following numbering scheme:

   (1) no value (2) little value (3) some value (4) considerable value
   (5) extreme value (6) not applicable or was not completed

   a. developing guidance objectives
   b. committee use of evaluative criteria
   c. student survey
   d. teacher survey
   e. counselor time analysis chart
   f. comment sheets
   g. brief case reports
   h. visiting team presentation to evaluation committee
   i. visiting team report to total staff

   Number Ranking

8. Do you believe the evaluation process led to a more positive change in attitude among teaching staff regarding the guidance program?

   ( ) yes
   ( ) no

9. In your opinion, which factor below would be most responsible for those recommendations of the visiting team which were not implemented?

   ( ) economic considerations
   ( ) staff disagreement with recommendations of visiting team
   ( ) apathy
   ( ) not enough time to carry out
   ( ) no state follow-up
   ( ) staff turnover
   ( ) other (please explain)

10. Were the results of the evaluation process ever the subject of subsequent staff meetings?

    ( ) yes
    ( ) no

11. Were the results of the teacher and student surveys ever shared with the total staff?

    ( ) yes
    ( ) no
12. a. Did the Guidance Program Evaluation generate objective information which could be communicated to various publics concerning the objectives, activities and effects of the school guidance program?
   ( ) yes
   ( ) no

   b. If yes, how and to whom was the information communicated?

13. a. Did the Guidance Program Evaluation assist the total staff to improve their own guidance practices and techniques?
   ( ) yes
   ( ) no

   b. If yes, what improvements were made and by whom?

14. a. Did the Guidance Program Evaluation assist the total staff to develop shared understandings about the school's guidance objectives and activities?
   ( ) yes
   ( ) no

   b. If yes, what better understandings were developed and by whom?

15. a. Did the Guidance Program Evaluation assist in making decisions for future program development?
   ( ) yes
   ( ) no

   b. If yes, what decisions were made?

16. What suggestions do you have for improving the Guidance Evaluation?
The following formula for computation of chi square values is taken from Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics*, page 104.

\[ x^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}} \]

where \( O_{ij} \) = observed number of cases categorized in \( i^{th} \) row of the \( j^{th} \) column.

\( E_{ij} \) = number of cases expected under \( H_0 \) to be categorized in the \( i^{th} \) row of the \( j^{th} \) column.

and \( \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \) directs one to sum over all \( (r) \) rows and all \( (k) \) columns.

The following partial list of critical values of chi square is taken from Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics*, page 249.

Probability under \( H_0 \) that \( x^2 \geq \) chi square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>.05</th>
<th>.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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