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CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

During recent years vast financial resources have been appropriated for extensive research and development activities in education. Increased federal legislation has broadened the role of the U. S. Office of Education as a funding agency, and state and local efforts have added their share of resources in the form of both public and private funding. This combined financial effort for research and development has made possible the revision of many traditional practices and development of new ones by educators utilizing existing scientific knowledge.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 represented an important commitment by the Federal Government for improvement in education. This Act (Public Law 89-10), funded in the amount of $1 billion per year, was directed toward solving problems in the education of disadvantaged children. Increased support to education is also evidenced by the establishing of the Headstart Program, the Educational Professions Development Act, and the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.

A need for improvement in vocational and technical education brought about the appropriation and subsequently the expenditure of $1.4 million for research and $4.9 million for exemplary projects in fiscal year 1970 alone. These figures represent local, state and federal sources as reported in the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and
These examples of expansion in research and development activities, however, have not automatically led to practical application of research findings within the various settings of our complex educational system. The need still exists for better methods of putting useful research findings and developmental products into practice. The problem of how to narrow the gap between current educational practice and development and existing practices in our schools continues to be a major concern.

In order that new ideas and practices be adopted by the school systems of the United States, many educators dedicate themselves to a constant search for innovations to improve current practices. Such innovative programs, when based on existing scientific knowledge, include evaluation as an integral step in their development and adoption. Although many changes are planned and attempted in education, lack of results promised by the researcher, developer, or promoter are due in many cases to faulty or inadequate evaluation of the proposed innovation. Such results mandate evaluation activities which are better than those commonly practiced when an innovation is being considered for trial or adoption.

In an effort to assist the educator in assessing the benefit and cost aspects of an innovation, a guide to aid any program evaluator faced with this task was developed by the Diffusion Strategies Program staff (Hull & Wells, 1972) at The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. This Guide was mailed to
vocational and technical administrators and educators throughout the United States for their perusal and use. The focus of this study was to evaluate and describe the uses made of the Innovations Evaluation Guide (IEG) (Appendix A). Certain characteristics of innovations were identified in the development of the IEG to help decision makers compare costs and benefits that are important considerations in selecting appropriate innovations for adoption. The compilation of these characteristics resulted in guidelines for evaluating characteristics of innovative programs.

Procedures used by the research and development staff in developing the Guide included a search of the ERIC microfiche files and other related literature as well as interviews with innovative public school superintendents in Ohio. The investigator of the present study helped construct the first draft of the Guide, which was reviewed by an outside consultant, who recommended changes in the design. The revised copy was pilot tested by asking administrators and teachers in a local junior high school to evaluate it for clarity and readability. Based on the assistance and suggestions of these educators, several revisions were made in both the Guide and its accompanying data collection instrument.

Qualified individuals were then selected to judge the importance of the items in the Guide for evaluating an innovation in vocational and technical education. Four schools involved in implementing an exemplary project in vocational and technical education provided staff members who judged the importance of various benefits and of installation requirements. Information from these four schools were used to make additional
revisions in the Guide.

The developers of the Guide made the recommendation that the Guide should be validated with documentary studies of its application in innovative situations to determine the effectiveness of the Guide in practice. On the basis of this recommendation of a validation study of the Guide and because of a personal interest in the value of the Guide as an evaluation tool, the writer undertook to study the use made of the IEG by vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators.

**Need for the Study**

Educators are presently responding to requirements of the U. S. Office of Education, state and local boards of education, and other funding sources to evaluate current and proposed projects. Vast amounts of time, effort, and money are being expended by such educational agencies as local schools, state education departments, and regional educational laboratories to evaluate their programs and projects. The existence of an evaluation plan, however, does not always mean it is an effective one. The evaluator's information may not provide the evidence needed to support decision making related to the program or project being evaluated. Any such information should be of practical use in defending decisions made by the person requesting the evaluative information.

Whether or not to adopt an innovation to improve education depends upon a variety of decisions, and varied types of information are needed to make and support decisions. The Innovations Evaluation Guide was designed as a tool to assist the educator in analyzing the benefits and costs of an educational innovation, be it a program, a
course, a project, a new practice or a procedure. Thus, determining the extent of use of the IEG and how it was used by vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators would provide information concerning the utility of the Guide as an aid in decision making when innovations are being evaluated.

The Objective of the Study

The major objective of this study was to determine the usefulness of the Innovations Evaluation Guide to vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators. Of primary concern was the determining of the usefulness of the Guide as a tool in evaluating proposed innovations, although it might have other uses such as serving as a guide in evaluating innovations already installed or in preparing proposals for funding.

This study should provide information to research and development specialists concerning (a) the type of data needed in evaluating a document similar to the IEG and (b) steps in conducting an evaluation similar to the evaluation of the IEG. The findings of this study may provide helpful suggestions for organizing, designing, and laying out a document similar to the IEG.

The Statement of the Problem

This study was an attempt to evaluate and describe the usefulness of the Innovations Evaluation Guide to selected vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators who received a complimentary copy of it. Data were gathered to indicate the extent of its use by three categories of vocational education personnel--state and
local administrators and teacher educators. Specifically, this investigation was to determine the following information about the Innovations Evaluation Guide:

1. the extent of use made of the IEG
2. the actual uses made of it by those receiving a complimentary copy
3. opinions regarding the organization and format of the IEG, and
4. any revisions that would be an improvement in the IEG.

To evaluate the usefulness of the Guide, data were gathered to answer specific questions such as the following:

1. Was the IEG used (reviewed, read, used as an evaluation tool, used as a teaching aid, etc.)? If not, what were the reasons?
2. Who made use of the IEG?
3. Which sections of the IEG were read or used?
4. What disposition was made of the IEG?
5. For what purpose(s) was the IEG used?
6. Which benefit items were actually used by those using the IEG for a specific purpose?
7. Which benefit items were considered most helpful by the respondents in evaluating an innovation?
8. Which cost items were actually used by those using the IEG for a specific purpose?
9. Which cost items were considered most helpful by the respondents in evaluating an innovation?
10. Did the user write in the blank space provided beside the cost and benefit item questions?

11. Was the Work Sheet used?

12. Which sections of the IEG were most helpful?

Additional questions were asked to solicit users' opinions about the organization and format of the IEG, such as:

1. Were benefit and cost items effectively organized?

2. Was the Check List in the summary necessary?

3. Was the Work Sheet a useful section?

4. Did the sections follow a logical sequence?

5. Was the Objectives section in the summary needed?

6. Was the color scheme too bright?

7. Did the size of the IEG make it awkward to work with?

8. Was the blank space provided for writing in answers needed?

9. Should benefit and cost items be numbered?

10. Should Guide pages remain unnumbered?

11. Was the blank space provided adequate for writing in information?

12. Was the layout attractive?

**Basic Assumptions**

In conducting this study the assumption was made that the mailing list maintained by the Product Utilization Section of The Center for Vocational and Technical Education was one of the most comprehensive lists of vocational and technical education personnel in the United States. This population, from which the sample was drawn, was assumed to be representative of all vocational and technical administrators and
teacher educators in the nation. The individuals to whom complimentary copies of the IEG were sent were assumed to be those most likely to use it.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The study in no way attempted to identify specific innovations to which respondents were referring when they used the IEG. The investigator was interested only in identifying the general purposes for which the IEG was used.

The study likewise did not attempt to determine other possible methods of evaluation of innovations nor compare these other methods with the IEG.

**Definition of Terms**

Certain terms, which either may not be familiar to or may be interpreted differently by readers of this study, are defined as follows:

- **Research** as used in this study refers to the process of adding new knowledge through the scientific method.

- **Development** is a process by which existing knowledge is converted into useful projects or materials, such as the *Innovations Evaluation Guide*.

- **Diffusion** refers to the spread or adoption of an innovative practice or alternative among potential users.

The **Diffusion Strategies Program** is one of the five research and development program areas at The Center for Vocational and Technical Education. Their focus is on research of the diffusion process.
Innovation is defined as any idea, practice, or object perceived to be new by the individual, group, or institution adopting the innovation.

Evaluation is defined as a process through which the benefits and costs of an innovation are determined in order to provide information needed for decision making.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE RELATED TO EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION AND EVALUATION

Since the topic of this study is limited to the evaluation of the usefulness of a specific research and development document from The Center for Vocational and Technical Education; namely, the Innovations Evaluation Guide, a survey of the available literature revealed no writings related directly to the problem under study. Thus, the review of literature will focus on the theoretical framework upon which the development of the Guide was based.

Planned Change in Education

A number of articles appear in the literature concerning the process of change in education. The role of evaluation in the development of innovative educational projects or programs is a widely discussed topic within these articles. Thus, a review of the thoughts and opinions of these writers will provide a better understanding of how evaluation fits into the total picture of planned change in education. This review, then, will serve as a base to show how the Innovations Evaluation Guide fits into the evaluation of educational innovations.

In discussing interrelationships between innovation and school policy, Hencley (1968) offered some generalizations that he considered to be important in initiating change within school organizations.
Among these were the advice to "go slow" and to communicate the advantages of the innovative program. Coughenour (1965) also added a note of caution when he stated that change can as easily be detrimental as it can serve to better educational aims. He recommended that innovators proceed with due restraint, taking care that social and emotional as well as economic costs are minimized along the way.

Lin (1968) stressed the importance of an understanding of change in planning for educational innovations. He felt that the decision-making process was in great need of research attention. One of Hencley's (1968) suggestions also was that an understanding of change processes was necessary in initiating change within school organizations.

Wolf & Fiorino (1971), in a study of educational change, observed information sources, channels of communication, and characteristics of information users. They found the two most frequently offered reasons for change to be dissatisfaction with current practices and a desire to expand current practice. Although practicality was found to be of paramount importance in trying out innovations and in eventually adopting them, the decisions made by those studied were seldom based upon disciplined inquiry.

Need for Evaluation of Educational Innovations

Comprehensive evaluative studies of innovations are clearly needed according to Tyler (1969). He cited the lack of adequate appraisal as one of the reasons for the slow development and adoption of educational innovations. However, some schools adopt new ideas and devices too hastily and frequently encounter disappointing results, while other schools refrain from even considering innovations on the
basis that many of them turn out to be fads. Brickell (1961) also
described evaluation as often being haphazard, subjective, and inade­
quate. Carefully planned and impartial evaluative studies should be
made for a proposed innovation to support enthusiastic claims with ade­
quate data for decision making. Use of the IEG should help implement
the ideas expressed here for comprehensive evaluation of educational
innovations.

Scriven (1967) stressed the need for two types of evaluation,
formative and summative. Formative evaluation produces information
that is fed back during the development of a curriculum to help improve
the curriculum, while summative evaluation is done after the curriculum
building is finished. Moss (1968), too, urged educators to plan for
the periodic collection of data necessary to evaluate existing programs,
recommending that the data include measures of student and program char­
acteristics in addition to program costs. The needs of the curriculum
developer are served by the formative evaluation, and the summative
evaluation provides information to decision makers who are considering
a particular curriculum.

Although the research process takes more time and costs more
money than offhand evaluations that rely on intuition, opinion, or
trained sensibility, it provides a rigor that is particularly important
when (a) the outcomes to be evaluated are complex, hard to observe, and
made up of many elements reacting in diverse ways; (b) the decisions
that will follow are important and expensive; and (c) evidence is needed
to convince other people about the validity of the conclusions (Weiss,
1972). She further discussed the value of evaluation research for use
by a person who has decisions to make and who look to the evaluation for answers on which to base decisions.

Freeman & Sherwood (1970) indicated that evaluation, viewed broadly and to some extent ideally, provides the basis for the policy maker's decisions concerning the continuation, modification, expansion, or elimination of programs. Since educators are being challenged more and more to demonstrate the impact of programs, Freeman & Sherwood (1970) suggested that an evaluation should be made of all newly planned and developed programs. Such evaluation would be valuable in justifying the existence of innovative programs that require vast financial and human resources. The IEG is proposed as an evaluation tool which should provide evaluative criteria necessary for assessing a new program or project.

In his model of the innovation-decision process, Rogers (1971) presented five stages of the adoption process: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, and adoption. During the evaluation stage, the educator evaluates the innovation in terms of its applicability to his situation, the effect, efficiency, and/or effectiveness of the new way of doing things. The types of concerns listed in this step of the adoption process point out the importance of thoroughly assessing the benefits and costs of the innovation being considered. The IEG offers the educator such a list of criteria for use in evaluating an innovation.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

The costs involved in adopting educational innovations have also been discussed in many articles. Henley (1968) recommended that the cost of an innovation be calculated, since it is often found to be
costly when measured in terms of organizational time, risk, and demands placed on leaders and followers. Scriven (1967), too, was concerned with how little research was being done in determining the costs involved in curriculum adoption, pointing out that enthusiasts for new curricula tend to overlook a large number of secondary costs that arise, not only in the experimental situation, but in the event of large-scale adoption. By using the IEG in evaluating curricular innovations, the educator would have at hand a comprehensive list of innovation characteristics, thus eliminating the possibility of overlooking cost and benefit criteria which could affect an adoption decision.

In a more recent study Peterfreund (1970) pointed out that school systems are lacking in cost effectiveness philosophy and procedures. School administrators and program directors involved in the study were unable to document the real cost of an innovative program but could generally quote only the developer's price for just the materials. Project personnel were unable to indicate the cost for the conventional program the innovation replaced.

Simmons (1971), too, recognized the need for some type of assistance by the school administrator faced with the necessity of updating and improving the curriculum. His model includes five phases, suggesting appropriate action cues for those facing a new challenge of innovation, including evaluation. In the evaluation phase, he suggested the program be evaluated in terms of resources, expended cost and productivity.

The cost and benefit criteria within the IEG should be helpful in the evaluation phase of Simmons' model. These same criteria should
also facilitate the task of evaluating existing programs as well as provide information for comparison with an innovation.

Program Evaluation Design and Research

Stufflebeam (1968, 1970) discussed the CIPP Evaluation Model as one classification scheme of strategies for evaluating educational change. Four types of evaluation proposed in his model are context, input, process, and product. He defined educational evaluation as the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives. The IEG lists criteria which should be helpful in conducting the four types of evaluation in Stufflebeam’s model.

According to Guba (1969), many programs lack clear objectives upon which to base an evaluation design. In compiling a list of shortcomings of evaluation, he listed a lack of criteria and the lack of mechanisms for organizing, processing, and reporting evaluative information. The IEG contains a comprehensive list of criteria which should prove to be applicable in evaluating most innovative programs which an educator would want to consider for adoption. The format of the IEG should be useful in helping the educator organize the collected information in a form which would be meaningful to those persons interested in reviewing the results of the evaluation.

Cost-benefit analysis is often viewed as an alternative to evaluation research, but essentially cost-benefit analysis is a logical extension of evaluation research. In order to affix dollar values to benefits of a project or program, some evaluative evidence must exist concerning the kinds and amount of benefit that can be identified.
Much cost and benefit analysis has been done in a prospective framework, assessing the likely costs and benefits of alternative strategies being proposed for the future to reach a given end. The emphasis has been on planning—widening the range of options, estimating what each option will cost in terms of the returns it will bring, and introducing rational analysis into the decision-making process, but cost-benefit analysis has also been applied retrospectively to calculate the returns on investment in past programs (Weiss, 1972). Weiss further discussed the attempts of the cost-benefit analyst to put the tangible and intangible program costs and benefits into a monetary unit of measure. The ratio of benefits to costs is an indication of the return that society is getting from its investment in the program.

On the basis of a study of the cost-effectiveness of vocational education in senior high schools in two cities, Kaufman (1968) concluded that vocational-technical education was economically worthwhile for his study sample. Vocational educators contemplating such an evaluation of local programs should find the IEG helpful in conducting an analysis similar to the one conducted by Kaufman.

**Evaluation Guides**

Several evaluation guides have been developed in the last decade. Some of these guides contain general information which is helpful in performing a program or project evaluation while others list specific questions for evaluating particular subject-matter programs or projects.

Jacobs, Maier & Stolurow (1966) developed a guide providing a practical procedure for evaluating self-instructional programs consistent with information available from scientific research studies and
field reports. Among other procedures, they suggested comparing the net
gains (benefits minus cost) expected from using the program to the gains
from the best available alternative procedure.

Rigney & Fry (in Jacobs, Maier & Stolurow, 1961) specified a
number of cost items that may influence the cost of instruction. The
costs they listed are also included among the several cost items named
in the IEG, with the exception that the IEG does not contain an item
concerning the quality of students.

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) (1966) prepared a
guide they proposed be used in promoting informed study, analysis, and
action concerning the provisions for state programs in community-centered
post high school education in the states. The guide contains 18 ques­
tions derived from statements about those elements that authorities in
the field generally agreed to be characteristics of good programs of
community-centered post high school education. These questions concern
such things as whether or not post high school education is available,
how accessible classes are to those needing them, and what costs are
involved. The ECS Guide was not intended to provide a basis for compar­
ison between or among states, but rather to analyze the provisions in a
single state. Users of the ECS Guide rate their programs by rating the
criterion items in the Guide on a scale from 1 to 5. The sum of the
ratings provides a score for the state which may be interpreted accord­
ing to information provided in the Guide. The IEG consists of 43 eval­
uative items, each of which is composed of one or more questions to be
answered by the evaluator, rather than being a rating scale such as the
ECS Guide.
 Evaluative Study

McCaslin & Walton (1973) utilized a five-stage conceptual model based on concepts from three widely accepted models of the adoption process in their recent study of the impact of a vocational education information document. This conceptual model of the impact process included the following five stages:

1. Awareness of possible solutions
2. Interest in specific products and in obtaining additional information
3. Evaluation of the product to see if it represents a viable solution to the problem
4. Use of the product
5. Advocacy of the product

The model developed by McCaslin & Walton (1973) presumes that the impact on a targeted audience is a "multi-mediated process with cognitive, affective, and behavioral components" (p. 6). Four dependent variables identified for inclusion in this model were (a) awareness, (b) interest, (c) attitude, and (d) behavior. These variables were used in describing the impact of the information document, *The Review and Synthesis of Information on Occupational Exploration*. The IEG study was concerned with the use of the Guide only, while the McCaslin & Walton study was concerned with the five-stage model which they developed for the purpose of determining the impact of an information document. The questionnaire used in the McCaslin & Walton study provided the investigator of the IEG study with a model which was helpful in designing the IEG data-gathering instrument.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

This study was an attempt to evaluate and describe the usefulness of the Innovations Evaluation Guide (IEG) to selected vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators who received a complimentary copy of the Guide from The Center for Vocational and Technical Education. Data were gathered from a sample of vocational and technical educational administrative personnel in positions at the state and local levels and in teacher education institutions. A sample survey design utilizing mailed questionnaires was used for this study, and the responses from samples from three groups of vocational and technical educational personnel were analyzed to determine how the Guide was used as well as the extent of its use.

Since this study was nationwide in scope, personal interviews would have been impractical because of the travel time and expense involved in visiting each of the vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators in a sample of even minimum size. Consequently, the decision was made to develop an appropriate questionnaire to solicit information from the selected sample regarding the extent and uses made of the IEG.

Preparation of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire used by McCaslin & Walton (1973) served as a model in the development of the questionnaire to evaluate the Innovations
Evaluation Guide. Preliminary forms of the questionnaire prepared by the investigator were given to research specialists and graduate students in the vocational-technical education department, The Ohio State University, who were asked to critique the wording of the questions, comment on the format, indicate whether additional information should be included concerning the IEG, and to record the length of time required to complete the questionnaire. Members of the Diffusion Strategies Program, Impact Evaluation, and Product Utilization staffs at The Center for Vocational and Technical Education also critiqued the drafts of the questionnaire. Suggestions were also solicited from members of the writer's graduate committee.

From the suggestions given by these individuals, the format of the questionnaire was revised, wording was refined, and a final draft was prepared for pilot testing. Four types of information were included in the questionnaire:

1. Data concerning the respondents themselves: years of experience in education and primary job responsibility
2. General data regarding use of the IEG
3. Information regarding specific items in the Guide, and
4. Information regarding organization and format of the IEG.

Pilot Testing the Questionnaire

A pilot test of the questionnaire was conducted to determine whether it was clearly written and whether any pertinent information concerning the usefulness of the IEG had been omitted.

Administrators and educators from thirty-two vocational and technical schools, state departments, and teacher education institutions
participated in the pilot test. They were selected from the same roster used to select the sample for this study. Two names were drawn at random from each of the sixteen categories of vocational and technical education personnel listed on pages 22 and 23.

A revised questionnaire, accompanied by a cover letter and a self-addressed stamped envelope, was mailed to the pilot test sample. After two weeks, fifteen responses (46.8%) had been returned. The questionnaire was again revised on the basis of the suggestions made by the pilot test respondents concerning both questionnaire items and the instructions for recording responses. A final draft (Appendix B) was then printed by a commercial printer for mailing to the sample randomly selected for this study.

The questions were printed on 9½ X 13 cream-colored stock with one fold, making a four-page questionnaire with 32 questions printed on both front and back. Boxes were provided beside each of the questionnaire items for respondents to check the appropriate response. Space was also allowed for comments or answers to four open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire.

Determining the Population

The Center for Vocational and Technical Education maintains a very comprehensive mailing list of educators who have an interest in being kept up to date about the research and development activities conducted by The Center in vocational and technical education. This list is classified into groups of persons from different levels and functions in education in order to permit sending project reports or other information to appropriate individuals.
The investigator, along with the Director of the Diffusion Strategies Program and the Dissemination Specialist of The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, identified those individuals on the mailing list considered most likely to have an interest in and use for the IEG. On August 9, 1972, a total of 2,304 copies of the IEG was mailed to these persons.

However, since the IEG was mailed to some individuals not classified as vocational and technical educational personnel, those persons were eliminated from the original roster. Thus, the population for the present study consisted of all vocational and technical educational personnel to whom the IEG was mailed, a total of 1,967.

The population for this study was classified into three categories of vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators as follows:

State Administrator Classifications (N=245):
- State Directors of Vocational Education
- Deputy State Directors of Vocational Education
- Directors of Community-Junior Colleges
- Directors of Research Coordinating Units
- Research Coordinating Unit Staffs
- Program Planning and Evaluation

Local Administrator Classifications (N=747):
- Specialized Secondary Vocational Administrators
- Specialized Post Secondary Vocational Administrators
- Comprehensive K-12 Vocational Administrators
- Comprehensive Post Secondary Vocational Administrators

Teacher Education Classifications (N=975):
- Chairmen of Vocational-Technical Education Departments
- Chairmen of Agricultural Education Departments
- Chairmen of Business and Office Education Departments
- Chairmen of Distributive Education Departments
- Chairmen of Home Economics Education Departments
Chairmen of Technical, Trade and Industrial, and Health Education Departments

Selecting the Sample

Since the population for this study consisted of a number of subgroups or strata of individuals who differed because of the type of position or level at which they worked in vocational and technical education, the investigator stratified the sample into the three categories of state administrators, local administrators, and teacher educators. In addition to stratifying the population, the sample taken from each stratum was proportionate to the size of the stratum in the population. The state administrators represented 12.45% of the total, the local administrators represented 37.98%, and the teacher educators, 49.56%.

In their discussion of sample size, Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh (1972) indicated that no single rule prevails in determining sample size, but an estimation of required sample size can be calculated algebraically if one defines precisely the variance of the population, the expected difference, and the desired level of significance. Since the data are likely to be more accurate and precise with a large sample than with a small sample and since descriptive research typically uses larger samples, 10 to 20% of the population is sometimes suggested for the sample (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1972, p. 167).

Based on the need to select as large a sample as possible to represent the population and considering the costs involved in using a mailed questionnaire, the investigator of this study decided to use a sample size of 500 (25.4% of the population). This decision was also based on the fact that the investigator was unable to define precisely
the variance of the population to be studied, which is required in many formulas for determining sample size.

The Rand Corporation (1955) tables of random digits were used in carrying out the random selection of subjects. Since the sample size of 500 was slightly more than 25% of the population, the sample was drawn systematically by selecting every fourth name until the appropriate number had been selected. This method of systematic selection was used for each of the three subgroups of the sample after determining the starting point for each group by selecting a random digit between 1 and 4 from a table of random numbers. Table 1 indicates the number of questionnaires sent to each category of the sample and the number returned.

Table 1
Number of Questionnaires Sent and Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>37.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>49.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 374 questionnaires returned, 45 were not usable for a number of reasons (Table 2). The largest number of nonusable questionnaires (N=31) contained incomplete information on the background of the
respondent. These were not used in the analysis since most of the 31 reported the IEG had not been received. The second largest number (N=9) were returned unanswered due to the retirement of the person to whom it was sent. In other instances, unanswered questionnaires were returned because the individuals to whom they were addressed either were deceased, had moved, or failed to claim the letter. The response rate of usable questionnaires in this study was 65.8%.

Table 2
Number of Questionnaires Returned, Usable and Nonusable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Usable Returns</th>
<th>Nonusable Returns</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% of Ttl.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representativeness of the Sample

Although a large sample is recommended for descriptive research studies, size alone will not guarantee accuracy of results. West (1963) recommended that the investigator of a study examine by an appropriate statistical test the extent of discrepancy between the sample and the population.
Since all respondents in this study did not return usable questionnaires, a chi-square test for significant differences was computed to compare usable returns with the distribution of the individuals in the classifications in the population. This procedure revealed that the null hypothesis of no difference between the proportion of respondents in the usable sample and population classifications was accepted, since the $\chi^2$ value calculated was not significant at the .05 level (Table 3).

Table 3

Chi-Square Test for Significance of Difference in Proportion of Respondents in Population and Usable Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>$\frac{(f_0 - f_t)^2}{f_t}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Usable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>99.99</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square

$\chi^2 = 1.8769$

$\chi^2_{.05} = 5.991$ (df=2)

The formula for chi-square is as follows:

$\chi^2 = \frac{(f_0 - f_t)^2}{f_t}$
where
$\chi^2$ = the value of chi-square
$f_o$ = the observed frequency
$f_t$ = the theoretical or expected frequency (West, 1963)
The significance of the computed chi-square (at the .05 per cent level of confidence) was determined from the Table of $\chi^2$ in Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh's *Introduction to Research in Education* (1972). This Table of $\chi^2$ was read by entering the row with 2 degrees of freedom and the column for the .05 per cent level of significance. The observed value for $\chi^2$ must be equal to or greater than the tabled value in order to reject the null hypothesis of no difference in classification proportions between sample and population. Since the calculated value for $\chi^2$ was less than the tabled value, the null hypothesis of no significant difference was accepted.

**Collecting the Data**

The first mailing of the questionnaire was sent to the sample of 500 vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators on February 24, 1973. A cover letter (Appendix C) and a self-addressed stamped envelope accompanied each questionnaire. The number of persons responding to the first mailing was 188 or 37.6% of the total to whom questionnaires were sent.

Three weeks after the original mailing, a follow-up letter (Appendix D), another copy of the questionnaire, and a stamped envelope were sent to the 312 individuals who had not yet responded. As a result of this follow-up, 137 more questionnaires were returned, making a total return of 65%.
Three weeks after the first follow-up mailing, a second letter (Appendix E) was mailed to the 175 nonrespondents asking them to return the questionnaire. This second follow-up resulted in a return of 49 more questionnaires, making a total of 374 responses received, 74.8% of the total sample.

Sampling the Nonrespondents

In order to determine whether the nonrespondents were different from the respondents, a telephone follow-up of a sample of the nonrespondents was undertaken. The investigator arbitrarily decided to sample 5% of the nonrespondents (N=6). These six individuals were randomly selected in the same manner as the original sample was selected and were contacted by telephone.

The telephone calls revealed that three of the six nonresponding individuals were no longer with the school district or university where the questionnaire was sent. One person remembered having received the IEG but stated it had apparently been lost in a recent move into a new school, and another individual did not remember ever having received it. Only one of the six had used the IEG and indicated that it was not used for any particular purpose but that she had reviewed the evaluative criteria.

Since half of the nonrespondents were no longer with the school or university where the IEG was mailed, possibly such a turnover in personnel had resulted in the Guide not having been received and therefore not used. Information from two of the other nonrespondents indicated that nonrespondents were not aware of having received the IEG or had misplaced it. Those nonrespondents represented by the one who used
the IEG would not be a great enough number to distort the findings as reported in this study. The nonrespondents, then, were different from the respondents since 66% of the respondents answered the questionnaire in usable form with a majority reading the IEG and a large number using it for a particular purpose.

**Description of Respondents**

Respondents in each of the three categories were classified according to the number of years spent in education and also by the primary job responsibility they reported. The educational experiences included those at state and local levels in both public and private educational systems in teaching, administration, and research. Primary job responsibility included administration, teaching, and planning, research and evaluation. These classifications were useful in later comparisons among the readers and users of the IEG.

As indicated by the breakdown in Table 4, over half of the respondents in this study had more than 20 years of experience in educational positions. The state administrators tended to have fewer years experience than the other two groups. Sixty per cent of the state administrators had fewer than 20 years of experience compared with 55% of the local administrators and 39% of the teacher educators. The smallest proportion of respondents was in the classification of less than 5 years experience in educational positions.

According to the primary job responsibility, the state administrators appeared to be different from the other two groups (Table 5). Since the state administrator category included Research Coordinating Unit Staffs and vocational personnel in planning and evaluation, more
Table 4  
Total Number of Years Spent in Educational Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years in Education</th>
<th>State Admin.</th>
<th>Local Admin.</th>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5  
Primary Duty in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Planning, Res. and Eval.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than half indicated planning, research and evaluation as the primary duty. Teacher educators participating in this study were all chairmen of their respective departments; therefore, 38% indicated administration
was their primary duty. More local administrators reported administration (94%) as their main duty than any other job responsibility.

**Treatment of the Data**

Data obtained from the questionnaires were recorded on punched cards to facilitate analysis by an IBM computer, which provided frequency count distributions and cross tabulations. These data were then presented in tabular form. Respondents who read and used the IEG were compared by the number of years they had spent in educational positions and by the primary job responsibility they reported. Other questionnaire items were discussed in terms of patterns among the responses concerning how the IEG was used and the extent of use. Respondent opinions regarding the format and organization of the IEG were also presented and discussed.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The data presented in this section describe in detail the use made of the Innovations Evaluation Guide developed and published by The Center for Vocational and Technical Education for use in evaluating educational innovations. These data were collected by means of a mailed questionnaire and are the responses from 329 vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators from across the United States. Two kinds of data are used in presenting the findings: descriptive and comparative. The descriptive data are given in frequencies and percentages, and comparisons are made of these data classified by years of experience of respondents and by respondents' primary job responsibility. These data are supplemented by comments by the respondents that may shed further light on the findings.

Distribution and Receipt of the Innovations Evaluation Guide

The Innovations Evaluation Guide was first mailed to the sample of 500 vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators in August, 1972, for their use in evaluating educational innovations. The first mailing of the questionnaire designed to gather data concerning the use that had been made of the IEG was on February 24, 1973. If the respondent had not received the IEG, instructions in the questionnaire asked him to report the IEG had not been received and to return the
questionnaire with only this one response. Of the 329 usable responses in this study, the 201 (61%) who reported receiving the Innovations Evaluation Guide supplied the data for analysis. The number of respondents who received the IEG as well as those reporting not having received it or who did not remember receiving the IEG are reported in Table 6.

Table 6
Number Receiving and Not Receiving the Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Received Guide</th>
<th>Did Not Receive Guide</th>
<th>Do Not Remember Receiving Guide</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>34 69.4</td>
<td>6 12.2</td>
<td>9 18.4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>61 49.2</td>
<td>25 20.2</td>
<td>38 30.6</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>106 67.9</td>
<td>24 15.4</td>
<td>26 16.7</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>201 61.1</td>
<td>55 16.7</td>
<td>73 22.2</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readership of the Innovations Evaluation Guide

Unsolicited mail containing what looks like a brochure (or even an ad) may or may not be read by the recipient. The Innovations Evaluation Guide is no exception, since 27 of 201 reporting receipt of the IEG said they did not read it. An additional three respondents are in the figures in Table 7 due to three persons reporting having read the Guide but not having received it. A note on the questionnaires indicated these respondents read a copy belonging to another person. One reported a copy had been borrowed from the Research Coordinating Unit.
Table 7
Number of Recipients of the IEG Reading or Not Reading the Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Read the Guide</th>
<th>Did Not Read Guide</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the local administrators constitute the smallest proportion of the recipients of the Guide (Table 6), they read it in relatively greater numbers than did the other recipients. While only 49% of the local administrators reported receiving the Guide in Table 6, 95% of the recipients reported reading it. On the other hand, 69% of the state administrators reported receiving the Guide of which 71% reported reading it.

Description of readers of the Innovations Evaluation Guide

Of the 177 recipients who reported reading the Guide, over half had 20 or more years of experience in education (Table 8), and a greater proportion of these persons read the Guide than those persons with less experience. At all levels of experience except the 15-19 category for state administrators, a greater proportion of the teacher educators read the IEG than persons in the other two groups. The figures which are
shown in parentheses in Table 8 represent the total respondents who reported that amount of experience. In basing the percentages on this figure, the proportion of respondents with that particular amount of experience who read the Guide is indicated.

Table 8
Years of Experience of Readers of the IEG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years in Education</th>
<th>State Admin.</th>
<th>Local Admin.</th>
<th>Teacher Ed.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N* %</td>
<td>N* %</td>
<td>N* %</td>
<td>N* %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td>5 (10) 50</td>
<td>6 (11) 55</td>
<td>8 (11) 73</td>
<td>19 (32) 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>5 (12) 42</td>
<td>10 (21) 48</td>
<td>13 (18) 72</td>
<td>28 (51) 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>6 (8) 75</td>
<td>8 (23) 35</td>
<td>19 (33) 58</td>
<td>33 (64) 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>8 (19) 42</td>
<td>34 (69) 49</td>
<td>55 (94) 58</td>
<td>97 (182) 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24 (49)</td>
<td>58 (124)</td>
<td>95 (156)</td>
<td>177 (329) 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures in parentheses represent the number of respondents with usable questionnaires who reported that amount of experience upon which the percentages were based. Example: 5 State administrators in the 0 - 9 category are 50% of the 10 reporting this category of experience.

Recipients who read the Guide were also classified by the primary job responsibility they reported. Almost half of those who were in administration reported reading the Guide (Table 9). An equal proportion of state administrators reporting planning, research and evaluation and those reporting administration as their primary duty read the IEG.
A greater proportion of teacher educators with teaching as their primary job responsibility read the Guide than those teacher educators reporting administration.

Table 9
Primary Duty of Readers of the IEG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Plan. Res. and Eval.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(183)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures in parentheses represent the number of respondents who reported that particular category as their primary duty (Table 6). The percentages are also based on these figures. Example: 11 State administrators in the administration column are 48% of the 23 reporting this as the primary duty.

Sections of the IEG reported read

The number of respondents reported as having read all sections or just selected sections of the IEG appear in Table 10. Since the respondents were allowed to choose more than one item, the numbers across columns do not add to the total number of respondents in each job classification. The entire Guide was read by a majority of the
respondents, with 84% of them claiming to have read the whole Guide (Table 10). All of the state administrators reported having read all sections. Among the several sections of the Guide read by those who only read portions of it (N=30), the Introduction and the Benefit Items seemed to attract most readers. Most of the readers of only portions of the Guide (83%) read the Introduction and over three-fourths of these readers perused the Benefit Items. The Cost and Benefit Items seemed to hold more interest for the local administrators (83% & 67%) than for the other groups of educators (range from 0 to 72%) while more teacher educators read the other sections more than did the administrators.

Table 10

Sections of the Guide Reported Read

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>All Sections</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Benefit Items</th>
<th>Cost Items</th>
<th>Work Sheet Items</th>
<th>Check List Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>24 100</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators (N=58)</td>
<td>46 79</td>
<td>8 67</td>
<td>10 83</td>
<td>8 67</td>
<td>2 17</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators (N=95)</td>
<td>77 80</td>
<td>17 94</td>
<td>13 72</td>
<td>5 28</td>
<td>7 39</td>
<td>8 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>147 25</td>
<td>23 13</td>
<td>13 9</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uses of the Guide

Recipients and readers of the IEG shared it with others generally; they reported circulating it among staff, forwarding it to colleagues,
placing it in a library or reading room, announcing its availability in a newsletter, and recommending its use to others (Table 11).

Table 11
Number of Respondents Reporting Action Taken With Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Action Taken</th>
<th>State Admin.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Local Admin.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Educ.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (N=34)</td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>N (N=61)</td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>N (N=106)</td>
<td>% *</td>
<td>N (N=201)</td>
<td>% *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulated it among staff</td>
<td>23 67.6</td>
<td>32 52.5</td>
<td>68 62.4</td>
<td>123 60.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained it for personal use</td>
<td>17 50.0</td>
<td>40 65.6</td>
<td>51 46.8</td>
<td>108 52.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended its use to others</td>
<td>13 38.2</td>
<td>19 31.1</td>
<td>31 28.4</td>
<td>63 30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placed it in a library or reading room</td>
<td>15 44.1</td>
<td>6 9.8</td>
<td>24 22.0</td>
<td>45 22.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announced its availability in a newsletter</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>6 9.8</td>
<td>4 3.7</td>
<td>11 5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forwarded it to colleagues</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>2 3.3</td>
<td>4 3.7</td>
<td>7 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 1.6</td>
<td>5 4.6</td>
<td>6 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since more than one response could be selected by a respondent, all percentages are based on the N at the top of the columns.

Specific action taken with the Guide

Local administrators, more than the other groups, tended to retain their copy of the IEG for their own use, 65.6% compared with half or less of the other two groups. State administrators and teacher educators circulated the IEG among the staff more than did the local administrators, although more than half of the local administrators (N=32) also
reported circulating the IEG among their staff members. Very few Guides (N=7) were forwarded to colleagues, and more of the teacher educators reported forwarding the IEG than did persons in the other two groups. Twice as great a proportion of state administrators as teacher educators placed the Guide in a library or reading room for use by colleagues (44 & 22%, respectively), compared to only 9.8% of the local administrators. Local administrators announced the availability of the Guide in newsletters more than did the other two groups.

Other types of action taken by the recipients of the Guide were as follows:

1. Placed the document in department library for use by all faculty and administrators.
2. Made the Guide available to staff members.
3. Requested a copy for staff members.
4. Shared the Guide with graduate summer students (teachers) in vocational education.
5. Used the Guide as a resource in an evaluation class.
6. Gave the document to the professor in charge of evaluation.

Use of the IEG for a particular purpose

Although the recipients of the Guide may have read it, the IEG was used for some particular purpose by about half of the respondents (Table 12). Four respondents did not report whether or not the Guide was used for a particular purpose.

Of those reporting having used the IEG for a particular purpose, a slightly greater proportion of the local administrators (57%) and teacher educators (53%) reported using the Guide than did state
Table 12
Respondents Reporting Actual Use of the Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

administrators (42%). Perhaps this is an indication that local administrators and teacher educators had more opportunities to make use of the IEG. For example, persons in these two job categories probably have more and frequent contacts with local programs, projects, and the school personnel operating them than the state administrators do. Also program and project evaluation is usually a responsibility of local school personnel more than of personnel at the state level.

Of the 95 recipients who reported they did not use the Guide, the reason given by the greatest number (N=40) for not using it was that they had had no occasion to use it. Another common reason was that the respondent had not had time to use it but about one third indicated they did plan to use it. A larger proportion of teacher educators reported they had not had an occasion to use the Guide (46%) compared to the state and local administrators (42% and 35%, respectively). Reasons are listed in order of frequency of mention in Table 13.
Table 13
Number of Respondents Reporting
Reasons Guide Was Not Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Guide Was Not Used</th>
<th>State Admin.</th>
<th>Local Admin.</th>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had no occasion to use the Guide</td>
<td>8 42.1</td>
<td>9 34.6</td>
<td>23 46.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not had time to use it, but I plan to use it</td>
<td>5 26.3</td>
<td>8 30.8</td>
<td>17 34.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not had time to use it</td>
<td>3 15.8</td>
<td>7 26.9</td>
<td>9 18.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used other procedures for evaluating innovations</td>
<td>2 10.5</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not find the Guide to be an effective evaluation tool</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>1 2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 5.3</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19 26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest proportion of state administrators reporting use of the IEG for a particular purpose (36%) had spent 10 to 14 years in educational positions (Table 14). A slightly greater proportion of teacher educators (63%) had spent 20 years or more in educational positions compared with local administrators (59%). More than half the people who made use of the IEG were those with 20 years or more experience.

A greater proportion of local and state administrators who have administration as their primary duty had actually used the Guide while teacher educators whose primary duty was teaching used the Guide more
Table 14
Years of Experience of Respondents Using the Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years in Education</th>
<th>State Admin.</th>
<th>Local Admin.</th>
<th>Teacher Ed.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td>3  21.4</td>
<td>5  14.7</td>
<td>2  3.5</td>
<td>10 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>5  35.7</td>
<td>5  14.7</td>
<td>6  10.5</td>
<td>16 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>2  14.3</td>
<td>4  11.8</td>
<td>13 22.8</td>
<td>19 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>4  28.6</td>
<td>20 59.1</td>
<td>36 63.2</td>
<td>60 57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>105 99.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than teacher educators reporting administration as their main job responsibility (Table 15). Although teaching is the primary function of the largest proportion of respondents in the teacher education category, 23% reported administration as the primary duty, since all are department chairmen. Again, planning, research and evaluation was part of the state administrator sample, which accounts for slightly more than a third reporting this as the primary job responsibility.

Sixty per cent of the local administrators who reported reading the Guide used it for a particular purpose. Of 21 teacher educators in administration who read the Guide, 13 (61.9%) reported they had used it while 44 of the 74 in teaching (59.5%) reported using the Guide.
Table 15
Primary Duty of Respondents Using Guide for a Particular Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Planning, Res. &amp; Eval.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures in parentheses represent the number of respondents in each of the primary duty categories who read the Guide. The percentages are also based on these figures. Example: 9 State administrators in the administration category are 81.8% of the 11 reporting they read the Guide.

Respondents reporting who used the IEG

A greater proportion of teacher educators and local administrators made use of the Guide themselves than did the state administrators (Table 16). Those persons in the state administrator category used the Guide with someone else as much as they used it for themselves while persons in the other two groups used the Guide less with someone else than for themselves. More administrators than teacher educators said they gave the Guide to someone else to use. Almost twice as many teacher educators as local administrators used the Guide in committee
work. This could be due to the use of the IEG as a reference or as required reading in a course.

### Table 16

**Number of Respondents Reporting Who Used the Guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Using the Guide</th>
<th>State Admin.</th>
<th>Local Admin.</th>
<th>Teacher Educ.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I used the Guide</td>
<td>4 29</td>
<td>13 38</td>
<td>22 39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used the Guide with at least one other person</td>
<td>4 29</td>
<td>12 35</td>
<td>15 26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was used by a group or committee of people</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td>5 15</td>
<td>15 26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone other than myself used the Guide</td>
<td>5 36</td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>5 9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14 13</td>
<td>34 32</td>
<td>57 54</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purposes for which the IEG was used**

Almost half of the respondents using the Guide (47%) reported having used it to evaluate a new idea, product or project (Table 17). This was the main purpose for which the Guide was designed, although other uses could be made of it. The greatest proportion reporting use of the Guide to evaluate a new idea, product or project were local administrators. A greater proportion of the state administrators used the Guide to compare two or more innovations than persons in the other two groups. About one-fourth of the local administrators used the Guide
Table 17
Purposes for Which Guide Was Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes Reported</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=14)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=34)</th>
<th>Teacher Educ. (N=57)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To evaluate a new idea, product, or project (innovation)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To review evaluative criteria which are important considerations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach undergraduate or graduate students how to evaluate innovations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prepare a proposal for initial funding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To evaluate an innovation which is presently in operation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prepare a report on a program or project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide descriptive information about an innovation to interested persons who might want to try it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide a comparative evaluation of a program evaluated in a conventional manner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To write a proposal for additional funding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compare two or more innovations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach local educators how to evaluate innovations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to evaluate an innovation presently in operation compared to 18% of the teacher educators and no use by the state administrators. Approximately the same proportion of local administrators and teacher educators used the IEG to provide descriptive information about an innovation to interested persons. A larger proportion of local administrators used the IEG to prepare a proposal for initial funding, to write a proposal for additional funding, or to prepare a report on a program or project than did the other two groups. More than two-thirds of the state administrators used the Guide only to review evaluative criteria compared to less than half in the local administrator and teacher educator job categories.

The Guide was used least to teach local educators (e.g., administrators, supervisors, teachers) how to evaluate innovations. This could be due to the fact that potential users had not had enough time to plan this type of use for the Guide between the time it was received and the receipt of the questionnaire. This evaluative activity might also be best carried out as a summer activity, which would have been after this study was conducted.

State administrators had used the Guide in several other ways than the uses listed on the questionnaire:

1. To develop installation plans for new products.
2. To prepare a research paper for graduate class on Improvement of Instruction.
3. Used by committee or task force on evaluation.
4. Basically as a knowledge tool.

Teacher educators indicated they had used the Guide for these additional purposes:
1. Primarily as a model to review proposed ideas of students.
2. Research base.
3. Used as a Guide in the development of program evaluation system.
4. Used in graduate class in making evaluations.
5. Used in field testing new curriculum materials.
6. Will use summer 1973 to teach local educators (administrators and supervisors) how to evaluate innovations.

**Usefulness of the Guide**

A total of 97 respondents indicated they had used the benefit and cost items in the Guide. Only 39% of this number reported they had used the blank space and 26% reported having used the Work Sheet. A great proportion (N=53) indicated the sections of the Guide of greatest benefit to them.

**IEG benefit items used**

Of the 97 respondents reporting they used benefit items in the Guide, the greatest number from all three categories of respondents combined used *effectiveness, scope of learning, reliability, validity,* and *efficiency* items. The least used benefit items were those under the assurance contract section—*warranty* and *operational assistance*. These benefit items represent the use of items by vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators for the purposes indicated in Table 17, page 45.

Since a number of Guide recipients used the IEG for a particular purpose, those benefit items used by them are reported in Table 18.
Table 18
Number of Respondents Reporting Benefit Items Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEG Benefit Items</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=10)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=34)</th>
<th>Teacher Educ. (N=53)</th>
<th>Total (N=97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Benefit Items</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Pupil Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society and the Economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry and Advancement in an Occupation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Social Efficiencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance Contract</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual number of respondents is smaller than the number reported earlier as having used the Guide for a particular purpose because some Guides were used by a group, committee, or someone other than the person who received a copy. In these instances, although the recipient knew
the Guide was used for a particular purpose, those benefit items which had been used could not be identified. Since respondents were permitted to check as many items as they desired, the numbers in the columns do not add up to the total N nor the percentages to 100%.

Half of the state administrators used all benefit items compared to almost three-fourths of the local administrators and slightly more than two-thirds of the teacher educators. Local administrators and teacher educators tended to use more those items under individual pupil growth than did state administrators. The greatest proportion of the state administrators (90%) seemed to find efficiency and effectiveness more useful for their particular purpose than the teacher educators did. Ninety-four per cent of the local administrators were able to use scope of learning, effectiveness, and reliability more than other benefit items. Teacher educators seemed attracted to the use of such items as attitude, effectiveness, scope of learning, and community involvement. Concern for the pupil growth items by teacher educators and local administrators could be attributed to their being in closer contact with local programs and projects than the state administrators, who are highly concerned with program operations rather than with student benefits.

Those items used least by state administrators were in the sections on pupil growth and social benefits derived from the innovation by the student. Local administrators likewise were not concerned with social benefits and warranty as much as other benefit items in using the Guide.
IEG benefit items considered most helpful

Since the benefit items used by the respondents were dictated by the type of innovation they were working with, these same items may or may not have been the ones which the respondent would rate as most helpful generally in evaluating innovations. For this reason, respondents were asked to indicate those items they considered to be most helpful to them (Table 19). Again, the numbers in the columns do not add to 100% since respondents were not limited to a single response. Each respondent indicated the five items considered to be most helpful.

Although Table 18 shows that over 85% of the local administrators and teacher educators used the individual pupil growth items, half or fewer of them considered these items to be the most helpful. Items concerning the social and economic benefits derived from the innovation were likewise not considered the most helpful items although these were among the least used benefit items.

A majority of the respondents in all three categories said effectiveness was the most helpful benefit item. A large proportion of state administrators also indicated efficiency and validity were helpful, while over half of the local administrators said efficiency and rate of learning. These most helpful items coincide with the concerns of the state administrator for efficiency of program operation and the local administrator for both efficiency of operation and pupil growth. Teacher educators said attitude, validity and reliability were the most helpful items. The two benefit items considered to be least helpful by all three groups were economic and social efficiencies and warranty.
### Table 19

**Most Helpful Benefit Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEG Benefit Items</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=10)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=34)</th>
<th>Teacher Educ. (N=53)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Pupil Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Learning</td>
<td>5 50.0</td>
<td>18 52.9</td>
<td>26 49.1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Learning</td>
<td>2 20.0</td>
<td>11 32.4</td>
<td>21 39.6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>3 30.0</td>
<td>15 44.1</td>
<td>29 54.7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>8 80.0</td>
<td>19 55.9</td>
<td>18 34.0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>6 60.0</td>
<td>23 67.6</td>
<td>43 81.0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society and the Economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry and Advancement in an Occupation</td>
<td>2 20.0</td>
<td>10 29.4</td>
<td>11 20.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Social Efficiencies</td>
<td>1 10.0</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
<td>5 9.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Values</td>
<td>1 10.0</td>
<td>16 47.1</td>
<td>21 39.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>6 60.0</td>
<td>14 41.2</td>
<td>17 32.1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>7 70.0</td>
<td>11 32.4</td>
<td>27 50.9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>6 60.0</td>
<td>16 47.1</td>
<td>27 50.9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance Contract</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warranty</td>
<td>1 10.0</td>
<td>4 11.8</td>
<td>5 9.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Assistance</td>
<td>2 20.0</td>
<td>9 26.5</td>
<td>12 22.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages are based on the N's for each column.

**IEG cost items used**

Of the 97 respondents reporting they used cost items in the Guide, the greatest number from all three categories used costs, hardware, software, planning time, role change for individuals, and quantity of staff. These cost items were used by vocational and technical
administrators and teacher educators for various purposes which were reported in Table 17, page 45.

In addition to reporting the benefit items actually used, each respondent reported the cost items he used. Half of the state administrators used all cost items, while all of the state group used four specific cost items—costs, installation time, adaptability, and role change for individuals (Table 20). These represent the concerns of the state administrators for funding, installation time and installation considerations, and organizational change that is involved in being innovative. Three-fourths of the local administrators used all cost items, with 94% using hardware and software items, which indicates their concern for operational materials for an innovation. Slightly more than two-thirds of the teacher educators used all cost items, with 92% using the costs item and 88% using planning time and software. The least used cost items were cyclical consideration, degree of development, and proportion of dollars available from different sources. Perhaps those using the Guide were beyond the point of considering schedules, development of an innovation, and sources of funding.

IEG cost items considered most helpful

Since the particular innovation being considered by the respondent also dictated the cost items that were used, these same items again may or may not have been the ones which the respondent would rate as the most helpful generally in evaluating innovations. For this reason, respondents were asked to indicate those items they considered to be the most helpful to them (Table 21). Since each respondent was not limited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEG Cost Items</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=10)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=34)</th>
<th>Teacher Educ. (N=53)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cost Items</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>26  76.5</td>
<td>37  69.8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>10 100.0</td>
<td>31  91.2</td>
<td>48  90.6</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Dollars</td>
<td>6  60.0</td>
<td>30  88.2</td>
<td>46  86.8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Dollars</td>
<td>6  60.0</td>
<td>29  85.3</td>
<td>43  81.1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avail. Different Sources</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>26  76.5</td>
<td>39  73.6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of Use of Other than Local Funds</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>28  82.4</td>
<td>39  73.6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation Time</td>
<td>10 100.0</td>
<td>29  85.3</td>
<td>42  79.2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Time</td>
<td>6  60.0</td>
<td>30  88.2</td>
<td>44  83.0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Time</td>
<td>6  60.0</td>
<td>30  88.2</td>
<td>49  92.5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Time</td>
<td>9  90.0</td>
<td>26  76.5</td>
<td>41  77.4</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical Considerations</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>26  76.5</td>
<td>38  71.7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Installation Considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>7  70.0</td>
<td>30  88.2</td>
<td>46  86.8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>9  90.0</td>
<td>28  82.4</td>
<td>42  79.2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisibility</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>27  79.4</td>
<td>40  75.5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Changes</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>28  82.4</td>
<td>43  81.1</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Development</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>26  76.5</td>
<td>38  71.7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>6  60.0</td>
<td>28  82.4</td>
<td>42  79.2</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>10 100.0</td>
<td>28  82.4</td>
<td>42  79.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of Routine</td>
<td>6  60.0</td>
<td>30  88.2</td>
<td>45  84.9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Staff Organ.</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>31  91.2</td>
<td>43  81.1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Change for Individuals</td>
<td>10 100.0</td>
<td>30  88.2</td>
<td>44  83.0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Relationships</td>
<td>6  60.0</td>
<td>30  88.2</td>
<td>39  73.6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of Staff</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>31  91.2</td>
<td>48  90.6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or Other Exper.</td>
<td>5  50.0</td>
<td>29  85.3</td>
<td>46  86.8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Development</td>
<td>9  90.0</td>
<td>30  88.2</td>
<td>44  83.0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In accordance with items they had used, all three categories indicated that costs were most helpful. State administrators said that installation time was most helpful while local administrators indicated role change for individuals and planning time most frequently in that order. Teacher educators indicated that planning time, acceptance, role change for individuals, and quantity of staff were most helpful of the cost items.

Those cost items which seemed to be least helpful to all three categories were degree of development, which was used fewer times than other cost items, space (land use), acquisition of needed space, and
Table 21
Most Helpful Cost Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEG Cost Items</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=10)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=34)</th>
<th>Teacher Educ. (N=53)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Dollars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Dollars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avail. Different Sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of Use of Other than Local Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation Time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclical Considerations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Changes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of Routine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on Staff Organ.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Change for Individuals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Relationships</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or Other Exper.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space (Housing)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEG Cost Items</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=10)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=34)</th>
<th>Teacher Educ. (N=53)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space (Land Use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Space to Other Programs</td>
<td>1 10.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Needed Space</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>2 3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 10.0</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>1 10.0</td>
<td>5 14.7</td>
<td>12 22.6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2 5.9</td>
<td>4 7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

divisibility. The space items tend to indicate that this item is not a great concern to many educators who are considering an innovation. Perhaps respondents were considering carrying out the innovation in such a manner that could be accommodated by the present facilities.

Use of blank space beside Guide items

In designing the Innovations Evaluation Guide layout, blank space was provided for the evaluator to use in whatever manner he considered helpful. The evaluator could use this space to write in brief or detailed answers to questions under the benefit and cost items, sources where needed information could be obtained, or any other note or comment that would be helpful in reaching a decision about the innovation being considered. This blank space was located on the right-hand page opposite those pages containing the benefit and cost items. The amount of space provided for writing was limited to the corresponding amount of
space used to list the benefit and cost items on the left-hand page. This space limitation was in part due to the cost involved in printing and distributing a document with an excessive number of pages blank. At that time the developers did not know whether leaving blank space was a worthwhile idea.

Of the 97 respondents who used benefit and cost items, only a total of 38 (39%) said they utilized the blank space in the Guide. The use made of this blank space by these respondents in the two job categories is summarized in Table 22.

Table 22
Number of Respondents Reporting Use of the Blank Space in the Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Blank Space Was Utilized</th>
<th>Local Administrators</th>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I supplied brief answers for the item questions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrote in some answers and noted sources of information for others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I noted references and sources where information could be obtained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of teacher educators using the blank space was slightly over half (55.3%) and the remaining proportion (44.7%) was all local administrators. The greatest proportion of teacher educators
using the blank space (42.9%) said they noted references and sources where information could be obtained, while local administrators used the blank space more for writing in some answers and noting sources of information for others. Although the greatest proportions indicated one use for each of the two groups, the greatest number used the blank space to supply brief answers for the item questions.

Use of the work sheet in the IEG

A Work Sheet was included in the summary section of the Guide so that the evaluator could list the costs of a single innovation or could compare two or more innovations. These costs could be broken down into the planning, installation, and operation phases. This section was an attempt to assist the evaluator in arriving at some estimate of total cost per unit (i.e., pupil, school, state, etc.) over time (i.e., instructional hour, year, etc.). Of the 97 persons using the benefit and cost items in the Guide, only 25 (25.8%) said they used the Work Sheet. Sixteen of these 25 used the Work Sheet to list the costs for a single innovation while 8 used it to list the costs for two or more innovations. One teacher educator indicated that items were checked for reference in the future. The use of the Work Sheet is summarized in Table 23.

Sections of the IEG considered of greatest benefit

The sections containing the Benefit Items and Cost Items were considered of greatest benefit by half or more in all three groups. State administrators said the Introduction section was the least beneficial of all sections while twice as great a proportion of teacher
Table 23
Use of the Work Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Work Sheet Was Utilized</th>
<th>State Admin.</th>
<th>Local Admin.</th>
<th>Teacher Educators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I listed the costs for a single innovation</td>
<td>1 100.0</td>
<td>8 66.7</td>
<td>7 58.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I listed the costs for two or more innovations</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>4 33.3</td>
<td>4 33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

educators as administrators said the Introduction was of greatest help. This could be due to their use of this section to introduce students or others to the Guide with the idea that they would work independently after becoming familiar with the contents of the Guide. Teacher educators had the smallest proportion considering the Cost Items to be beneficial. These Guide sections are presented in Table 24.

Organization and Format of the IEG

Important considerations for any publication should be the organization and format of the final product. Since the IEG was considered an innovative item by its developers, respondents were asked for their opinions concerning the organization and format of the IEG. However, only 89 respondents elected to respond to this section (Table 25). Some noted on their questionnaire that they did not have expertise in design
Table 24
Guide Sections Reported to be of Greatest Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEG Sections</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=10)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=33)</th>
<th>Teacher Educators (N=53)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Items</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Items</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Sheet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check List</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                    | *Column figures are based on the N in each column and do not add to 100%, since each respondent could make more than one response.*

A majority of respondents from all three groups felt that (a) the Benefit and Cost Items were effectively organized, (b) the Check List in the summary was necessary, (c) the Work Sheet was a useful section, (d) the sections followed a logical sequence, and (e) the Objectives section in the summary was needed.

In expressing their opinions concerning the format of the Guide, none of the respondents felt the color scheme of the Guide was too bright. All of the state administrators and a large number of local administrators and teacher educators approved of the size of the IEG as
Table 25

Respondent Opinions About the Organization of the Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Items</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=10)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=30)</th>
<th>Teacher Educators (N=49)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit and Cost Items are effectively organized</td>
<td>10 0</td>
<td>29 1</td>
<td>48 1</td>
<td>87 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check List in summary was not necessary</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>11 19</td>
<td>10 39</td>
<td>23 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Sheet for costs was a useful section</td>
<td>9 1</td>
<td>25 5</td>
<td>47 2</td>
<td>81 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections did not follow a logical sequence</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td>4 26</td>
<td>9 40</td>
<td>13 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives section in the summary was needed</td>
<td>8 2</td>
<td>23 7</td>
<td>47 2</td>
<td>78 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All state and local administrators agreed the layout was attractive compared to 89% of the teacher educators. Half or more in all three groups felt the blank space for writing in the IEG was adequate and was needed, although a large number did not report using the blank space (Table 22). Slightly more than half of all respondents said Cost and Benefit Items need not be numbered while the majority of all three groups felt the Guide pages should be numbered (Table 26).

Additional Comments About the Guide

At the end of the questionnaire four open-ended questions were listed to solicit information in addition to the structured questions.
Table 26
Respondents Opinions About the Format of the Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEG Format Items</th>
<th>State Admin. (N=10)</th>
<th>Local Admin. (N=30)</th>
<th>Teacher Educators (N=49)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color scheme was too bright</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td>0 30</td>
<td>0 49</td>
<td>0 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size made it awkward to work with</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td>3 27</td>
<td>5 44</td>
<td>8 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank space for writing comments was not needed</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>7 23</td>
<td>13 36</td>
<td>25 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit and Cost Items should be numbered</td>
<td>4 6</td>
<td>11 19</td>
<td>28 21</td>
<td>43 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide pages should remain unnumbered</td>
<td>6 4</td>
<td>14 16</td>
<td>20 29</td>
<td>40 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank space was adequate for writing comments</td>
<td>9 1</td>
<td>25 5</td>
<td>33 16</td>
<td>67 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout is not attractive</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td>0 30</td>
<td>5 44</td>
<td>5 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These questions covered such points as the problems the users had in using the Guide, how the questions could be revised, what questions could be added or which questions could be deleted. Forty-two respondents chose to make some type of comment in this section of the questionnaire.

One respondent felt personnel needs seemed to fit more appropriately after the individual pupil growth section and also suggested that the section on funding precede program operations. Such an action, however, would cause a mixture of benefit and cost items within the
Guide. Another comment made was that the reading level of the Guide was much too academic and scholarly which contributed to a high "fog index." Another respondent felt the questions under divisibility, reliability, feasibility, adaptability, and social values should be revised but did not offer any suggestions for correcting the questions or indicate the reason for such revision. A suggestion was made to add a question dealing with the types of costs to be expected in maintaining the innovation after it has already been adopted. No deletions were recommended by any of the respondents.

More statements were made by respondents under the section soliciting "Other Comments." The Guide was described by different respondents as being well done, useful, valuable, and a good working tool. Other respondents indicated that the Objectives section should be at the beginning of the Guide, and the Guide would have been easier to work with had it been printed on 8½ X 11-inch paper. Many additional comments were made concerning the type of innovation with which the Guide was used and various plans to use the IEG in the future.
This study was an attempt to evaluate and describe the usefulness of the Innovations Evaluation Guide (IEG) to selected vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators throughout the nation who received a complimentary copy of the Guide from The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. The IEG is a 14-page evaluation document that was developed as an aid to educators who have the task of assessing the appropriateness of an educational innovation.

Summary of Procedures

In order to evaluate and describe the uses made of the Guide and the extent to which it was used, a questionnaire was developed to elicit responses from state and local administrators and teacher educators. The items in the questionnaire were developed by the investigator in an effort to determine what had happened to the Guide after it had been received by the individual to whom it was sent and the portions of the Guide they considered to be most helpful.

The questionnaire was pilot tested with 32 vocational and technical education administrators and teacher educators, and their suggestions for refining the instrument along with others made by research specialists, vocational and technical education graduate students, and
members of the investigator's graduate committee served as a basis for further refinement of the instrument.

A printed cream-colored four-page questionnaire was mailed to the sample of 500 (25.4% of population) vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators. Table 27 lists the number of questionnaires mailed in each of the subgroups of the sample and the number and percentage of the instruments returned.

Table 27
Number of Questionnaires Sent and Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Positions of Respondents</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrators</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administrators</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>37.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>49.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to fulfill the objectives of this study to provide the type of data which could be helpful in evaluating the IEG and procedures which could be used in conducting such an evaluation, analyses were made to determine:

1. the extent of use made of the IEG
2. the actual uses made of it by those receiving a complimentary copy
3. the opinions regarding the organization and format of the IEG, and

4. the revisions that would be an improvement in the IEG.

Summary of Findings

The data gathered showed that in general the Guide had relatively wide readership, and was of considerable use for specific purposes. Certain of the sections of the Guide were more widely used than others; however, responses to the items in the questionnaire are summarized as follows:

Receipt and readership of the Guide

Of the three subgroups in the sample, fewer local administrators said they had received a copy of the Guide (49%) compared to state administrators (69%) and teacher educators (68%). However, a greater proportion of those local administrators who reported receiving the Guide claimed having read it (95%) than did state administrators (71%) and teacher educators (87%).

Those persons with 20 years or more experience in educational positions represented more than half of those respondents reporting having read the IEG, while those in the classification of less than 5 years of experience made up the smallest proportion of readers. The greatest proportion of the respondents in the 20 years of experience classification were teacher educators (52%).

The entire Guide was read by a majority of the respondents, with 84% of them claiming to have read the whole Guide. All state administrators reported having read all sections of it. Most of the respondents
who reported reading only portions of the Guide (83%) said they had read the Introduction, and over three-fourths of them perused the Benefit Items. The Cost and Benefit Items seemed to hold more interest for the local administrators, while more teacher educators read the other sections more than did the administrators.

**Action taken with the Guide**

A number of different methods for disseminating the Guide were reported by the persons receiving it. Local administrators, more than the other two groups, tended to retain their copy of the IEG for their own use. Half or more of all respondents indicated that the IEG was circulated among the staff. Very few Guides (N=7) were forwarded to colleagues, but more teacher educators reported forwarding it than did administrators. Twice as great a proportion of state administrators and teacher educators reported placing the IEG in a library or reading room compared to the local administrators, who announced its availability in newsletters more than did the others. Almost one-third of the respondents recommended the use of the IEG to others.

Although the recipients of the Guide may have read it, the IEG was used for some particular purpose by about half of the readers. Of those reporting having used the Guide for a particular purpose, a slightly greater proportion of the local administrators (57%) and teacher educators (53%) reported using the Guide than did state administrators.

Of the 95 readers of the Guide who reported they did not use it, 40 said they had not had an occasion to use it, while another 30 made the same comment but also indicated they planned to use it later.
Others stated they had not had time to use it or they had used other procedures for evaluating educational innovations.

A greater proportion of teacher educators and local administrators made use of the Guide themselves than did the state administrators. More state administrators used the IEG with someone else than did those persons in the other two groups. More administrators than teacher educators gave the Guide to someone else to use, while almost twice as many teacher educators as local administrators used the Guide with a group or committee.

**Purposes for which the IEG was used**

Almost half of those persons using the Guide (47%) reported having used it for the purpose for which it was principally designed, to evaluate a new idea, product or project that was being considered for trial or adoption. The greatest proportion of the three groups reporting use of the Guide for this purpose was the local administrators (56%). The second most frequently named purpose was to review evaluative criteria which were felt to be important considerations. More than half of the teacher educators said they had used the Guide to teach undergraduates and graduates how to evaluate innovations. Twenty-one per cent of the respondents said they used the IEG to prepare a proposal for initial funding while an equal number (N=19) reported having used it to evaluate an innovation presently in operation or to prepare a report on a program or project.

**Benefit and cost items**

Respondents were asked to indicate those items which they used
in fulfilling the purpose(s) they had reported. Local administrators and teacher educators tended to use more items pertaining to individual pupil growth than did the state administrators, while the state administrators (90%) used items pertaining to program operations more than did persons in the other two groups. Ninety-four per cent of the local administrators used scope of learning, effectiveness, and reliability items more than other benefit items. Teacher educators also used effectiveness and scope of learning items along with attitude and community involvement items more than they used the other items.

The benefit items considered to be most helpful generally in evaluating innovations were different from the items they claimed they had used. Although local administrators and teacher educators used pupil growth items, half or fewer of them considered these items to be most helpful ones. A majority of the respondents in all three groups said effectiveness was the most helpful benefit item. On the other hand, state administrators reported items to be of most help were efficiency and validity, while local administrators said efficiency and rate of learning items were of most help to them. Teacher educators felt attitude, validity and reliability concerns were most helpful.

Half of the state administrators used all cost items and all of this group used four items—costs, installation time, adaptability, and role change for individuals. Three-fourths of the local administrators used all cost items, with 94% claiming to have used the hardware and software items. Slightly more than two-thirds of the teacher educators claimed to have used all cost items, with 92% using the costs item and 88% using planning time and software items.
In reporting the cost items considered most helpful, all three groups indicated the costs item. State administrators also said most frequently that installation time was of most value to them in cost analysis, while local administrators indicated role change for individuals, and planning time were helpful items. Teacher educators said planning time, acceptance, role change for individuals, and quantity of staff were the most helpful cost items.

Use of blank space and work sheet in the Guide

Blank space was provided in the Guide for an evaluator to use in whatever manner he considered to be helpful. Of the 97 respondents who used Benefit and Cost Items, only 39% utilized the blank space in the Guide. Members of only two of the sampled groups indicated use of this space, of which slightly over half were teacher educators and the balance, local administrators. The greatest number said they used the blank space to supply brief answers for the Guide item questions although the greater proportion of teacher educators said they noted references and sources where information could be obtained and local administrators said they wrote in some answers and noted sources of information for others.

Only 25 (25.8%) of the 97 respondents using Benefit and Cost Items said they used the Work Sheet. The greatest use made of it was to list the costs for a single innovation.

Sections of the Guide of greatest benefit

The sections of the Guide concerning the Benefit and Cost Items were considered to be of greatest benefit by half or more in all three
groups. Twice as great a proportion of teacher educators as administrators said the Introduction was of greatest help. A greater proportion of teacher educators considered the Work Sheet and Check List of greater benefit than did the administrators.

**Organization and format of the Guide**

A majority of the respondents from all three groups felt that (a) the Benefit and Cost Items were effectively organized, (b) the Check List in the summary section was necessary, (c) the Work Sheet was a useful section, (d) the sections followed a logical sequence, and (e) the Objectives section in the summary was needed.

All 89 respondents stating their opinions concerning color scheme for the Guide indicated their approval of it. All state administrators and a majority of the other two groups approved of the size of the IEG as a working document. All administrators said the layout was attractive compared to 89% of the teacher educators. Although few of the respondents had used the blank space, half or more of the three groups said the space was needed and was adequate for writing in information. Slightly more than half of all respondents said Benefit and Cost Items need not be numbered, while the majority of all three groups felt the Guide pages should be numbered.

**Conclusions**

The following conclusions have been made from the analyses of the data from the questionnaires sent to vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators. Generalizations are made to the population for this study since a chi-square test of significant difference
revealed that a difference did not exist between the proportion of respondents in the population to whom the IEG was sent and the usable responses received in this study.

The IEG was considered to be a useful document for evaluating educational innovations, based on the relatively wide readership and considerable use for specific purposes by vocational and technical administrators and teacher educators. The Guide was of more interest to the local administrators and teacher educators than to the state administrators, as indicated by the high proportion of readers in these groups, although the most extensive readership was held by state administrators. Those state administrators who did read the Guide read it in its entirety.

The IEG was also more useful to the local administrators in this study than it was to the other two groups, since a greater proportion of the local administrators used the IEG for specific purposes than did persons in the other two groups. Some sections of the Guide were found to be more helpful than others. The sections containing the Benefit and Cost Items were considered most frequently to be of greatest benefit to all respondents. In addition, respondents in each of the three groups used certain items more than they used other items and even reported items which had not been used as sometimes being the ones they considered to be most helpful generally in evaluating educational innovations.

More of the persons who read the Guide could have used it had there been an occasion for them to use it or had there been more time in which to use the Guide. Respondents with 20 years or more
experience in education, especially the local administrators and teacher educators, considered the Guide to be a valuable instrument. Teacher educators made up the greatest proportion of this experience category.

The IEG was used by vocational and technical education personnel for many purposes. The most frequently named was the purpose for which the Guide was designed--to evaluate a new idea, product, or project considered to be an innovation.

The number of respondents who used the blank space and Work Sheet in the Guide were not a great enough proportion to justify the existence of these sections based on usage. Respondents were very much in agreement with the present organization and format of the IEG and were not able to suggest many changes in these items. The main suggestion was to number the pages of the IEG in any future revision.

Recommendations

The investigator found evidence of needed changes as a result of this study and therefore made the following recommendations.

1. Alternative methods should be explored for disseminating research and development products in an effort to foster better usage than results from mailing out complimentary copies.

2. Because so few of the respondents in this study used the blank space and Work Sheet, excluding these two items should be considered in any revision of the Guide.

3. A revision of the IEG should contain numbered pages.

4. Other efforts should be made to replicate this evaluative
study with change agents other than vocational educators and with other educational personnel such as directors of exemplary projects, classroom teachers, and educational administrators in general.

5. Other efforts might include case studies on selected innovations and the usefulness of the IEG in evaluating them.
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WHAT IT IS

The Innovations Evaluation Guide is an instrument to help improve the decision-making ability of educators who evaluate innovations. The Guide classifies innovations by their characteristics in a manner which facilitates their evaluation by potential adopters.

WHY IT WAS DEVELOPED

Educators often lack pertinent information upon which to base their decisions. Use of this Guide will reduce the risk of failure due to an oversight in considering essential information. This aid to making a more rational decision suggests evaluative criteria for assessing an innovation.

HOW IT WORKS

The format of the Guide allows the evaluator to do a step-by-step analysis of the benefits and costs of an innovation. By providing information for the applicable characteristics, the evaluator can gain support and approval from those who are affected by his decision. Developers and promoters of exemplary innovations can use the categories in the Guide to supply consumer information on their products.

WHO CAN USE IT

The Guide can be used by any educator who has the task of evaluating innovations. Potential users include such people as classroom teachers, school administrators, state supervisors of exemplary programs, local educational agency project directors, state department personnel, teacher educators, research and development center personnel, and research coordinating unit personnel.
WHEN TO USE IT

Educators should find the Guide most helpful when an innovation needs to be considered for adoption. It can also be useful as an evaluation tool to assess an innovation which is in the trial stage of adoption.

WHAT IT IS NOT

This Guide does not attempt to assess community or organization needs for innovations. The identification of problems and the mobilization of resources are the prerogatives of decision-makers in educational agencies.

Since the purpose of this Guide is to assess innovations rather than local situations, the educator must know his needs and be able to identify problems which exist. At this point, the Guide is useful in evaluating innovations as possible solutions to the perceived problems.

Information on the development of the Innovations Evaluation Guide can be obtained from the Final Report, The Classification and Evaluation of Innovations in Vocational and Technical Education, Research Series No. 71. This research was conducted at The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, by William L. Hull, principal investigator, and Randall L. Wells, research associate.

A limited number of single copies are available upon request from the Product Utilization Specialist at The Center. Permission to duplicate this Guide will be granted by The Center upon request.
INDIVIDUAL PUPIL GROWTH

• Rate of Learning
  What effect will the innovation have on the rate of student learning?

• Scope of Learning
  How does the innovation affect the number and type of learning experiences and/or skills to which the students will be exposed?

• Attitude
  What effect on attitudes can be attributed to the innovation (i.e., community, students, teachers, administrators)? Are there any experiences which assist the students in the development of their self-concepts and their abilities to relate to other individuals?

PROGRAM OPERATIONS

• Efficiency
  What information is available which will allow a cost/benefit analysis of the innovation? How does this analysis compare to the present status or other alternatives?

• Effectiveness
  What evidence indicates the innovation can achieve the required objectives to our satisfaction?

SOCIETY AND THE ECONOMY

• Entry and Advancement in an Occupation
  What effect does the innovation have on increasing the opportunities to acquire job entry skills? Does the innovation include activities which will contribute to promotion and satisfaction on the job?

• Economic and Social Efficiencies
  What effect will the innovation have on productivity and costs to society in relation to such items as wages, occupational mobility, and school dropout rate?

• Social Values
  What attempts will be made to create an awareness of society in the students through the teaching of concepts concerning institutions, laws, cultures and social problems?

• Community Involvement
  What benefits will accrue to the school and community after installing the innovation? What effect will the innovation have on such items as school and community relations, and the public image of the school?
Evaluate Individual Pupil Growth

Evaluate Program Operations

Evaluate Society and the Economy
CREDIBILITY

• Validity
  What evidence indicates that the innovation can achieve its objectives?

• Reliability
  Where has the innovation been tested previously? How similar are these settings to our situation?

ASSURANCE CONTRACT

• Warranty
  To what extent does the developer and/or promoter warrant the soundness of the innovation? Who is responsible for assuring the services of the innovation?

OPERATIONAL ASSISTANCE

What types of consultation and services are provided by the sponsoring agency to warrant the product?

COSTS

FUNDING

• Costs
  What is the cost per unit over time? Will the innovation involve a saving?

• Sources of Dollars
  How can the innovation be funded? Must the cost be borne locally, or is assistance available wholly or in part from state, federal, or public sources such as foundations? What are the possibilities of reallocating present budget items to accommodate installation?

• Availability of Dollars
  What processes and/or procedures must be followed to acquire the necessary funding? Is the local educational agency in a position to expend its own money and be reimbursed later, or are funds from other sources available prior to expenditure?

• Proportion of Dollars Available from Different Sources
  In what proportion are funds available from other sources? Do matching funds have to be local funds?

• Limitations of Use of Other than Local Funds
  What limitations are placed on the use of other funds? Can funds be used for instruction only, equipment and instruction, or equipment, supplies and instruction? Can funds be used for items such as construction, food, transportation or consultants?
Evaluate Credibility

Evaluate Assurance

Evaluate Funding
TIME CONSIDERATIONS

- **Installation Time**
  How much time does it take to get the innovation working?

- **Lead Time**
  What deadlines are placed on activities prior to the operating date? How much time is necessary to order and receive items such as texts and materials? How much time is necessary to order, receive, and install equipment? Will the innovation require teacher orientation or advanced teacher planning time?

- **Planning Time**
  How much time must be devoted to planning by a teacher, coordinator or administrator during each week?

- **Operation Time**
  What amount of time is required by the innovation in daily preparation, classroom activities, meetings, etc.?

- **Cyclical Considerations**
  What characteristics of the innovation dictate that it be installed at a particular time during the calendar or academic year?

INSTALLATION CONSIDERATIONS

- **Acceptance**
  What barriers can be anticipated from the community, school personnel, or students concerning the installation of the innovation?

- **Complexity**
  What is the extent of involvement necessary to install the innovation? How many staff members, students, schedules, classrooms, laboratories, or schools are involved?

- **Divisibility**
  What are the requirements concerning extent of installation? Can it be trial tested by the adopting unit before complete installation of the total product?

- **Policy Changes**
  What changes in policy on the state and local level are necessary in order for the innovation to be successful? (i.e., procedure for a field trip on local level; certification changes on state level)
Evaluate Time Considerations

Evaluate Installation Considerations
INSTALLATION CONSIDERATIONS (cont.)

• Degree of Development
  Is the innovation in an installable form or does it require more development? Are additional materials or training activities necessary?

• Feasibility
  What evidence is there to indicate that the innovation will work in our situation?

• Adaptability
  What adjustments can be made to meet local conditions without damaging the authenticity of the innovation?

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

• Disruption of Routine
  What interruption of routine is required by the innovation due to rescheduling of classes, retraining of teachers, sharing of facilities, etc.?

• Effect on Staff Organization
  What effect will the innovation have on the present structure? Does it create a need for a separate division or department?

• Role Change for Individuals
  What changes in duties and/or responsibilities are necessary for successful operation of the innovation?

• New Relationships among Groups
  What new kinds of relationships among departments or grade levels will be necessary for successful operation of the innovation?

PERSONNEL NEEDS

• Quantity of Staff
  What additions to the staff are required? How many part-time or full-time people per unit are needed?

• Teaching or Other Experiences
  What staff experiences are necessary for successful operation of the innovation? Do leaders need to have a knowledge of the community?

• Personnel Development Required by the Innovation
  What requirements are necessary for the development of certain role attitudes, skills, and competencies not presently possessed by personnel? Is the present staff capable of, and willing to handle the personnel development necessary for the success of the innovation? Are consultants available?
Evaluate Installation Considerations (cont.)

Evaluate Organizational Change

Evaluate Personnel Needs
SPACE REQUIREMENTS

• Space (Housing)
  Are present facilities sufficient? If not, what physical facilities are necessary to house the innovation?

• Space (Land Use)
  What acreage is necessary for installing the innovation?

• Arrangement of Space to Other Programs
  Does the success of the innovation require close proximity to ongoing programs or present facilities? On the other hand, is a separate location desirable?

• Acquisition of Needed Space
  What are the options to acquiring needed space for the innovation? (i.e., donation, purchase, lease, rent, build)

EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS

• Hardware
  What are the major items of equipment or their components necessary for the operation and success of the innovation?

• Software
  What supplies are necessary for the operation of the innovation?
Evaluate Space Requirements

Evaluate Equipment Requirements
# WORK SHEET FOR MAJOR COST ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Costs</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Installing</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Per Unit (i.e., cost per pupil, cost per school, or cost per state, etc.)

Per Time (i.e., per instructional hour, per year, etc.)

Total Cost

*Per Unit/Per Time
### CHECK LIST

**The Innovation will benefit:**

- [ ] Students
- [ ] Teachers
- [ ] Administrators
- [ ] The School
- [ ] The Community
- [ ] The State
- [ ] The Economy
- [ ] Society
- [ ] Program Operations
- [ ] (Other) ____________

**The Innovation is:**

- [ ] Acceptable
- [ ] Feasible
- [ ] Adaptable
- [ ] Divisible
- [ ] Valid
- [ ] Reliable
- [ ] Warranted
- [ ] (Other) ____________

**The installation requirements are:**

- [ ] Funding
- [ ] Staffing
- [ ] Housing
- [ ] Equipping
- [ ] Organization Change
- [ ] Policy Change
- [ ] (Other) ____________

**THE OBJECTIVES FOR THIS INNOVATION ARE:**
APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT USED TO GATHER DATA
INNOVATIONS EVALUATION GUIDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate your answer to the items in this questionnaire by placing a check in the appropriate box on the left or by completing an appropriate response.

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Indicate the number of years spent in education (state and local, public and private, administration, teaching, research, etc.)
   □ □ □ Less than 5 years
   □ □ □ 5 - 9 years
   □ □ □ 10 - 14 years
   □ □ □ 15 - 19 years
   □ □ □ 20 years and over

2. Primary Duty (Check one)
   □ □ □ Administration
   □ □ □ Teaching
   □ □ □ Planning, Research and Evaluation
   □ □ □ Other ________________________________

3. If you did not receive the Innovations Evaluation Guide, please check one of the boxes below and return the questionnaire.
   □ □ □ I did not receive a copy of the Guide.
   □ □ □ I do not remember receiving a copy of the Guide.

If you received the Guide, please continue with the questionnaire.

II. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Did you read the Guide?
   □ □ □ Yes (Continue with this question by checking the sections you have read in the list below.)
   □ □ □ No (Proceed to question #2)

   Sections of the Guide which I have read: (Check as many as apply)
   □ □ □ All Sections
   □ □ □ Introduction
   □ □ □ Benefit Items
   □ □ □ Cost Items
   □ □ □ Work Sheet Items
   □ □ □ Check List Items

2. What did you do with your copy of the Guide? (Check as many as apply)
   □ □ □ I have retained (or will retain) it for my personal use.
   □ □ □ I circulated it among staff members.
   □ □ □ I forwarded the Guide to colleagues employed by other organizations.
   □ □ □ I placed it in a library or reading room.
   □ □ □ I announced its availability in a newsletter or similar notice.
   □ □ □ I recommended its use to others.
   □ □ □ Other ________________________________

III. SPECIFIC INFORMATION

1. Have you or another person(s) been able to use the Guide in some way?
   □ □ □ Yes (Continue with this question by checking one of the items in List A.)
   □ □ □ No (Continue with this question by checking the most appropriate item in List B.)
List A. Who used (e.g., reviewed, read, wrote in, etc.) the copy of the Guide you received? (Check one)

1. I used the Guide.
2. I used the Guide with at least one other person.
3. Someone other than myself used it.
4. It was used by a group or committee of people.
5. Other ____________________________
   (Specify)

Proceed to question #2 below.

List B. The Guide has not been used because: (Check the one response most appropriate)

1. I have not had time to use it.
2. I have not had time to use it, but I plan to use it.
3. I do not find the Guide to be an effective evaluation tool.
4. I have used other procedures for evaluating innovations.
5. I have had no occasion to use the Guide.
6. Other ____________________________
   (Specify)

If you responded to List B, please return the questionnaire.

2. For what purpose(s) has the Guide been used? (Check as many as apply)

1. To evaluate a new idea, product, project (innovation) being considered.
2. To compare two or more innovations.
3. To evaluate an innovation which is presently in operation.
4. To provide descriptive information about an innovation to interested persons who might want to try it.
5. To prepare a proposal for initial funding.
6. To prepare a report on a program or project.
7. To write a proposal for additional funding.
8. To review evaluative criteria which are important considerations for innovations.
9. To provide a comparative evaluation of a program evaluated in a conventional manner.
10. To teach undergraduate or graduate students how to evaluate innovations.
11. To teach local educators (e.g., administrators, supervisors, teachers) how to evaluate innovations.
12. Other ____________________________
    (Specify)

3. A. Check (/) the Benefit Items below which you used.

1. All Benefit Items
2. Individual Pupil Growth
   3. Rate of Learning
   4. Scope of Learning
   5. Attitude
3. Program Operations
   6. Efficiency
   7. Effectiveness
4. Society and the Economy
   8. Entry and Advancement in an Occupation
   9. Economic and Social Efficiencies
   10. Social Values
   11. Community Involvement
5. Credibility
   12. Validity
   13. Reliability
6. Assurance Contract
   14. Warranty
   15. Operational Assistance
3. B. In the preceding list, place an "X" in front of the five items you consider most helpful in evaluating an innovation.

4. A. Check (✓) the Cost Items below which you used.

☐ All Cost Items

Funding
☐ Costs
☐ Sources of Dollars
☐ Availability of Dollars
☐ Proportion of Dollars Available from Different Sources
☐ Limitations of Use of Other than Local Funds

Time Considerations
☐ Installation Time
☐ Lead Time
☐ Planning Time
☐ Operation Time
☐ Cyclical Considerations

Installation Considerations
☐ Acceptance
☐ Complexity
☐ Divisibility
☐ Policy Changes
☐ Degree of Development
☐ Feasibility
☐ Adaptability

Organizational Change
☐ Disruption of Routine
☐ Effect on Staff Organization
☐ Role Change for Individuals
☐ New Relationships among Groups

Personnel Needs
☐ Quantity of Staff
☐ Teaching or Other Experiences
☐ Personnel Development Required by the Innovation

Space Requirements
☐ Space (Housing)
☐ Space (Land Use)
☐ Arrangement of Space to Other Programs
☐ Acquisition of Needed Space

Equipment Requirements
☐ Hardware
☐ Software

4. B. In the preceding list, place an "X" in front of the five items you consider most helpful in evaluating an innovation.

5. If the blank space on the page opposite the evaluation items was used, check the item below which is the most appropriate.

☐ I supplied brief answers for the item questions.
☐ I provided detailed answers for the item questions.
☐ I noted references and sources where information could be obtained.
☐ I wrote in some answers and noted sources of information for others.
☐ Other ____________________________ (Specify)
6. **If the Work Sheet was used**, check the item below which is the most appropriate.
   - [ ] I listed the costs for a single innovation.
   - [ ] I listed the costs for two or more innovations.
   - [ ] Other __________________________________________________________________________
     (Specify)

7. Which sections of the Guide have been of greatest benefit to you?
   (Check as many as apply)
   - [ ] Introduction
   - [ ] Benefit Items
   - [ ] Cost Items
   - [ ] Work Sheet
   - [ ] Check List

IV. **OPINIONS**

Please read each of the following statements about the Guide. Place a check in the box to the right which best describes your feelings about each of the statements.

**Organization of the Guide**

- [ ] The Benefit and Cost Items are effectively organized. 56-1 2
- [ ] The Check List in the summary was not necessary. 57-1 2
- [ ] The Work Sheet for costs was a useful section. 58-1 2
- [ ] The sections did not follow a logical sequence. 59-1 2
- [ ] The Objectives section in the summary was needed. 60-1 2

**Format of the Guide**

- [ ] The color scheme was too bright. 61-1 2
- [ ] The size made it awkward to work with. 62-1 2
- [ ] The blank space for writing comments was not needed. 63-1 2
- [ ] Benefit and Cost Items should be numbered. 64-1 2
- [ ] Guide pages should remain unnumbered. 65-1 2
- [ ] The blank space was adequate for writing comments. 66-1 2
- [ ] The layout is not attractive. 67-1 2

V. **ADDITIONAL REMARKS**

1. What general problems did you have in using the Guide?

2. Which questions should be revised?

3. a. What questions would you suggest be added?

   b. Which questions would you delete?

4. Other comments you would like to make:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE USED TO SEND OUT THE
ORIGINAL QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Co-Worker:

A complimentary copy of the Innovations Evaluation Guide was mailed to you last August from The Center for Vocational and Technical Education. Since the Guide was designed for vocational education leaders like you, would you take just a few minutes to respond to the enclosed questionnaire which deals with questions concerning the usefulness of the Guide to you. How helpful has this Guide been to you in evaluation activities? In what ways has it been useful to you? Have you been able to use it to evaluate something new which you were considering?

Your response to the enclosed questionnaire will help me determine the extent to which this Guide has merit as an evaluation tool for others like yourself in vocational education. Your opinions and suggestions will help in designing future research and development projects to meet your needs.

The information you provide will not be associated with your name in any way in reporting the results. Your response will be used in an analysis of group data only. The identification number on the questionnaire is merely to permit me to contact nonrespondents.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire to me. Your professional judgments and suggestions are valued and appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Randall L. Wells

Enclosures: 2
APPENDIX D

CORRESPONDENCE USED FOR FIRST FOLLOW-UP
Dear Co-Worker:

Your views are valuable since you hold a leadership position in vocational and technical education. For this reason I am again seeking your professional judgments and suggestions concerning the Innovations Evaluation Guide.

You can help me determine the usefulness of this evaluation tool by taking just a few minutes out of your busy schedule to respond to a questionnaire. In case the previous questionnaire sent to you was lost in the mail or misplaced, another copy is enclosed. If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

Another self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire to me. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Randall L. Wells

Enclosures: 2
APPENDIX E

CORRESPONDENCE USED FOR SECOND FOLLOW-UP
Dear Co-Worker:

On March 17, a letter was sent to you requesting your professional judgments and suggestions about the Innovations Evaluation Guide.

Your opinions concerning the Guide are important in determining the usefulness of the Guide. For this reason, would you take just a few minutes to complete and return the questionnaire.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Randall L. Wells
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