

Summer 1971

## A Survey Evaluation of the 1970/71 Activities of the Consortium of Washington Education Centers

David Lloyd Kandel  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kandel, David Lloyd, "A Survey Evaluation of the 1970/71 Activities of the Consortium of Washington Education Centers" (1971). *All Master's Theses*. 1641.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1641>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@cwu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

A SURVEY EVALUATION OF THE 1970/71 ACTIVITIES OF THE  
CONSORTIUM OF WASHINGTON EDUCATION CENTERS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington State College

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Education

---

by  
David L. Kandel  
August, 1971

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

William G. Gaskell, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

James F. Parsley

---

Maurice L. Pettit

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to extend his sincere appreciation to Dr. William G. Gaskell for his helpful counseling and guidance in the development of this study.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Maurice L. Pettit and Dr. James F. Parsley for their valuable time and assistance in the completion of the study.

The writer especially wishes to thank his family for their patience and encouragement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	viii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
THE PROBLEM . . . . .	2
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	2
Purpose . . . . .	2
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	3
DEFINITION OF TERMS . . . . .	4
Consortium . . . . .	4
Consortium Coordinator . . . . .	4
Superintendents . . . . .	4
Effectiveness . . . . .	4
OVERVIEW . . . . .	4
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	6
BACKGROUND . . . . .	6
Education Systems for the 70's . . . . .	7
League of Cooperating Schools . . . . .	9
Consortium of Washington Education Centers . . . . .	10
EVALUATION . . . . .	11
Evaluation of Cooperative Improvement Strategies . . . . .	16
3. REVIEW OF THE CONSORTIUM OF WASHINGTON EDUCATION CENTERS. . . . .	18

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	18
EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES INVENTORY . . . . .	20
September Meeting on the Inventory . . . . .	20
1971 Educational Practices Inventory . . . . .	21
Inventory and Consortium Presentation . . . . .	22
Conference on Innovations and Flexibility . . . . .	22
EVALUATION . . . . .	23
August Workshop on Evaluation . . . . .	23
October Meeting on Evaluation . . . . .	23
March Meeting on Evaluation . . . . .	24
Evaluation of Teaching Model . . . . .	25
Evaluation of Program Model . . . . .	26
INSERVICE . . . . .	26
November Meeting on Inservice . . . . .	27
March Meeting on Inservice . . . . .	27
Principal Inservice Training Model . . . . .	28
OTHER ACTIVITIES . . . . .	28
Newsletter . . . . .	29
Spring Retreat . . . . .	29
4. PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY . . . . .	30
EVALUATION DESIGN . . . . .	30
QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	31
ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	33
ORGANIZING THE DATA . . . . .	34

Chapter	Page
5. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	35
PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL VALUE . . . . .	35
EFFECTIVENESS . . . . .	37
DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT . . . . .	39
PRIORITY OF CONSORTIUM . . . . .	43
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	44
SUMMARY . . . . .	44
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	44
Educational Practices Inventory . . . . .	45
Evaluation . . . . .	45
Inservice . . . . .	46
Newsletter and Principal Inservice Training Model . . . . .	46
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	49
APPENDIXES . . . . .	52
A. Bylaws of the Consortium . . . . .	53
B. Evaluation Design . . . . .	59
C. Evaluation Questionnaire . . . . .	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Ranking Level Response Percentages for Each 1970/71 Consortium Activity's Personal/Professional Value . . .	36
2. Ranking Level Response Percentages for Each 1970/71 Consortium Activity's Effectiveness in Moving the Consortium Toward Its Goals and Objectives . . . . .	38
3. Ranking Level Response Percentages for Each Goal's Degree of Accomplishment . . . . .	40
4. Ranking Level Response Percentages for Each Objective's Degree of Accomplishment . . . . .	42



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Average of the Rankings for Each 1970/71 Consortium Activity's Personal/Professional Value . . . . .	37
2. Average of the Rankings for Each 1970/71 Consortium Activity's Effectiveness in Moving the Consortium Toward Its Goals and Objectives . . . . .	39
3. Average of the Rankings for Each Goal's Degree of Accomplishment . . . . .	41
4. Average of the Rankings for Each Objective's Degree of Accomplishment . . . . .	43

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The Consortium of Washington Education Centers, a cooperative educational effort of eighteen school districts throughout the State of Washington and Central Washington State College, has been in operation for two years. During this time the Consortium has provided various activities for the member districts in an attempt to establish a means of communication and support for innovative change in education. It would therefore be valuable to determine to what extent, if any, these activities have been effective in moving the Consortium toward fulfilling its goals and objectives so that the staff and decision-makers of the Consortium will have appropriate data for planning future strategies.

Knowledge of the effectiveness of the activities of the Consortium would also be valuable so that districts can make decisions concerning their commitment of time and money to the Consortium. As a result of membership in the Consortium, districts commit both money and time to the functioning of the organization. From the daily news media, evidence is abundant that districts are feeling the effect of the financial difficulties of the State and local economy. With the financial strain, school districts will be examining their financial commitments and reevaluating the time commitments of their staff.

## THE PROBLEM

### Statement of the Problem

No systematic procedure for collection of data to evaluate the 1970/71 activities has been conducted. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the activities to accomplish the goals and objectives is needed by the Consortium of Washington Education Centers for planning of future strategies and for justifying to school districts the time and money committed to the Consortium.

### Purpose

The Consortium of Washington Education Centers conducts a planning retreat at the conclusion of each academic school year. At this time, the Consortium coordinators and superintendents, as well as the Consortium staff, meet to determine the activities and strategies for the coming year. The decision-making process used at the retreat needs data to facilitate the planning of future activities. The design of the evaluation study was intended to be used in this decision-making process.

This study was intended to answer three major questions concerning the 1970/71 activities of the Consortium as viewed by the coordinators and superintendents of member districts: (1) what personal/professional value was received from the activities as they were conducted, (2) how effective have the activities been in moving the Consortium to completion of the goals and objectives, and (3) how do the Consortium coordinators and superintendents feel about the degree of accomplishment of each of the goals and objectives of the organization.

The data collected for these three questions and the answers to

the questions serve as a basis for determining the effectiveness of the activities with respect to the goals and objectives. With information concerning the effectiveness, decision-makers in the Consortium and the member districts will have data on which to base their decisions and strategies for the coming year's activities.

#### Limitations of the Study

There are a number of limiting factors that should be considered in the study. First, the investigation is only concerned with the 1970/71 activities of the Consortium. The activities of the first year of operation, 1969/70 school year, were limited as compared with the 1970/71 activities. Therefore, the 1969/70 activities--the establishment of the Educational Practices Inventory and organization of administrative policies and procedures--are assumed to have had negligible effect on moving the Consortium toward accomplishment of its goals and objectives.

Secondly, only the Consortium coordinators and superintendents were polled during the collection of the data. By not including other people that had been involved in the Consortium activities, some valuable information about the activities may have been neglected. Their contact with the organization may have been only one, or perhaps two, meetings which was assumed by the investigator to be inadequate contact to make judgments about the above three questions. Likewise, the superintendents had limited contact with the activities of the Consortium, but in their position as superintendent of the member districts, they had a larger view of the Consortium due to their receipt of periodic correspondence from the Consortium staff and contact with their Consortium coordinator.

A third limitation to the study was the method of collecting data. Since a questionnaire was used to collect the information to answer the three questions, other pertinent feedback concerning the organization may have been missed. In addition, the inability to check responses is a serious drawback to its use.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

##### Consortium

The Consortium refers to the Consortium of Washington Education Centers which is the concern of this study.

##### Consortium Coordinator

The term Consortium coordinator is used for the person in each of the twenty educational centers who is responsible for organizing his district's participation in Consortium activities. He is the liaison between the Consortium staff and the school district personnel.

##### Superintendents

Superintendents refer only to superintendents of the Consortium school districts.

##### Effectiveness

Effectiveness as used refers to the relationship of the activities in moving the Consortium toward meeting its goals and objectives.

#### OVERVIEW

The remaining chapters deal more specifically with the study. Chapter 2 discusses the development of the cooperative education effort

and methods of evaluating. Chapter 3 discusses the Consortium and the activities of the 1970/71 school year. Chapter 4 deals with the design of the evaluation study and the development of the questionnaire. The analysis of the data is discussed in Chapter 5 followed by the summary of the results and conclusions in the final chapter, Chapter 6.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### BACKGROUND

In the past fifteen to twenty years educators have seen a tremendous concern for change in the schools and the educational process and curriculum. Given impetus by the launching of the Sputnik, educational leaders felt the need to accelerate changes in both the curriculum and the educational process. Math and science were the primary targets of the public's concern with the Russian's technological advancements. Along with this and many other factors that were impinging on education at the time, concerted efforts were made to change and improve the curriculum as it was being taught. This effort, however, was a very fragmented process involving many different groups working within separate curriculum areas. Emphasis was placed on the structural methods and elements of each discipline rather than combinations of subjects.

The advent of the "new math," "new science," and others brought new materials and, presumably, new procedures to the classroom. However, even with all these "new" programs there still seemed to be something lacking. Goodlad and Klein refer to the lack of change in the classroom in their book Behind the Classroom Door:

Many of the changes we have believed to be taking place in schooling have not been getting into classrooms: changes widely recommended for the schools over the past 15 years were blunted on school and classroom door (8:97).

Other efforts were made to bring about change in the various curriculum areas through a cooperative procedure. Groups such as the Cooperative Center for Social Science Education were formed to develop programs more consistent with the educational goals through a process of communication among school personnel and the academic specialists in the universities and colleges. Even with a cooperative effort such as this, the larger picture was being neglected and the value of a single discipline curriculum project was doubtful (18:II).

The specific area curriculum revision projects and the cooperative curriculum projects have their limitations. The limitations of this change strategy revolve around the random nature of the projects and the lack of concern for the total program of the school.

. . . One requires no great insight to realize that processes of improving schooling in the United States are haphazard if not chaotic. Millions of dollars are spent each year on consulting and a host of inservice education activities for teachers. But we seem no more capable of mounting a comprehensive change strategy than we were when all of this began (7:3).

One effort to attack the problem of change involving the total school program is Education Systems for the '70's: a project established to look at the entire educational program and also integrate the cooperative aspects of curriculum change.

#### Education Systems for the '70's

ES '70 was initiated by the U. S. Office of Education in 1966 to help organize the linkage of research and development personnel with the practitioner--the district administrative and teaching staff. This organization of nineteen school districts across the nation is committed to a particular type of instructional arrangement: the learner-centered



curriculum. As can be seen from the following objectives, ES '70 schools must work within a definite framework and predefined strategy. The objectives are:

1. A learner-centered curriculum, highly relevant to the adult roles which the student would be expected to play upon graduation.
2. Individualized or "customized" education for each student.
3. Utilization of appropriately tested and educationally oriented technology.
4. Employment of suitable organizational administrative patterns.
5. Economic practicality within available resources (3:200).

The strategy being used to bring about change in the nineteen schools is to develop behavioral or performance objectives for selected subject areas which will later be used to form learning modules, i.e., specific instructional units prepared in various audio-visual instructional forms. Each of the modules will be made a part of a data bank and made available for use through a teacher-controlled computer program (3:201).

In addition to the development and dissemination of performance objectives and learning modules, ES '70 is developing a linkage strategy or network to create a climate which encourages innovation and experimentation. The coordinators and principals of ES '70 schools reinforce each other by sharing breakthroughs and failures at their periodic meetings (13:204-205).

Like the curriculum revision project, ES '70 has advocated a specific program or procedures for improvement of the educational process. If the desire of the districts is to improve their program in a specific way, then ES '70 may have something to offer. On the other hand, a school district may desire to develop a process of internal self-renewal that will not incorporate a specific program but will develop the enthusiasm and excitement to search within, as well as without, for

educational improvement. Goodlad and Klein recommend:

. . . that each teacher-preparing college or university enter collaboratively with school districts into consortia. . . By so doing, access to all three of our critical entry points to change is achieved simultaneously; the energies of each staff are focused on school problems in a self-renewing process of reconstruction; this process lays bare the in-service training needs of the staff; and new teachers are inducted into teaching in a dynamic, changing milieu (8:111).

A system such as this, utilizing both the internal process of self-renewal and the external process of cooperation between school districts and institutions of higher education, is exemplified in organizations such as the League of Cooperating Schools and the Consortium of Washington Education Centers.

#### League of Cooperating Schools

The League of Cooperating Schools was formed in 1966 as a partnership of the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. (/I/D/E/A/), the University of California at Los Angeles, and eighteen independent school districts in Southern California to study and promote planned change in education. No specific changes were being advocated other than a group dedicated to:

- an educational laboratory for experimentation and research,
- a network for communication and dissemination,
- a facility for field testing and demonstrating innovations, and
- a setting for creative teachers to develop new instructional patterns and services (11:69).

The strategy used by the League was to select one school in each of the eighteen school districts to serve as a League school. With the principal as the key change agent in the schools, opportunities were offered for the principal to participate in various activities with other League principals to increase their leadership abilities. In addition,

the district was to give more decision-making power to the principal to make each school more autonomous. All of these activities centered around the plan to discover conditions necessary for self-renewing change (2:5-7).

#### Consortium of Washington Education Centers

The Consortium is a result of an effort to improve communications between Central Washington State College and the public schools. Eighteen districts throughout the State of Washington, plus Central's Hebel Elementary School and the Center for the Study of Migrant and Indian Education, form the partnership to aid in the identification and solution of common problems and educational concerns. Also important to the formation of the group was the development of an effective means of communication between and among the school districts and Central Washington State College. The Consortium does not advocate any particular program or strategy for educational change, but is seen as a catalytic agent in developing a cooperative and self-renewing relationship.

The seven goals of the organization serve to further explain the purpose. The goals of the Consortium are:

1. to facilitate communication between and among participating school districts and Central Washington State College;
2. to identify common concerns and problems and to share ways of meeting problems;
3. to share information about innovative and creative activities and programs;
4. to stimulate initiative in resolving common problems;
5. to provide a means by which duplication of effort may be reduced by correlating and coordinating educational endeavors;
6. to provide assistance with evaluation, including evaluation of programs and activities; and
7. to share human and physical resources whenever feasible and appropriate in the sharing, evaluation, and inservice activities (4:2).

To accomplish the goals as stated above, the Consortium has adopted three major areas of emphasis. These are the Educational Practices Inventory (a catalog of innovative and exemplary programs in the member districts),

inservice activities, and evaluation assistance to the districts in the evaluation of programs and evaluation of teaching. In addition to the three major areas, the Consortium has received U. S. Office of Education funding to develop and field-test during the 1971/72 school year, a leadership inservice training model for principals of Consortium schools.

#### EVALUATION

How does an organization, such as the League of Cooperating Schools or the Consortium of Washington Education Centers, evaluate its activities and modify its behavior? The focal point is not on the outcome or change produced, as in curriculum development projects, but on the process being used to evolve the change. What effect does the process--activities of the Consortium--have on moving the Consortium toward meeting its objectives? To examine this question closer, it is necessary to first look at some of the terminology.

The distinction must be made between research and evaluation. The crux of the difference lies in the value or utility questions involved in the study. "Educational research is to add to our knowledge of the practices and methods of education" (9:189). There is little agreement, however, whether the purpose of educational research is for its immediate usefulness or for its potential value. Evaluation studies, however, deal directly with the utility question. "Evaluation studies are made to provide a basis for making decisions about alternatives and, therefore, in undertaking an evaluation study, one at once addresses himself to questions of utility" (9:189).

From the above description of research and evaluation, the intent of the study of the Consortium activities, as outlined in Chapter 1, is to provide information on the effectiveness of the 1970/71 activities in

meeting the goals and objectives for the decision-making process. The emphasis on effectiveness and decision-making would classify this investigation as an evaluation study rather than educational research.

Alkin provides additional insight when he defines evaluation as "the process of selecting, collecting, analyzing, and reporting information in a meaningful form that will enable decision-makers to select among alternatives" (1:1). Hemphill clarifies evaluation by stating:

Evaluation studies are often undertaken in response to a need to know the usefulness of an invented alternative to an existing mode of action which has resulted from some combination of old and new knowledge, or they may be undertaken to determine how well an existing mode of action is working. . . (9:191).

Thus, in an evaluation study of the Consortium activities, the concern is with the activities and the usefulness of these activities as modes of action for accomplishing the goals and objectives of the Consortium.

. . . In order to survive at all, an organization must fulfill some useful function. The common goal set by the architects of the organization must result in some product or service which is useful to the members of the organization or to other organizations or to the public at large (15:15).

The above statement made by Edgar H. Schein appears to be supportive of both the definition of evaluation by Alkin and the distinction between research and evaluation studies made by Hemphill.

As stated earlier, this evaluation study is part of a decision-making procedure used by the Consortium to plan strategies for the coming year. At a planning retreat, Consortium coordinators and superintendents along with Consortium staff, use data to make decisions concerning the coming year's activities. What type of decisions, then, are made and what information is necessary to assist in the decision-making process?

Stufflebeam states that there are four decision areas that concern the decision-maker: (1) planning, (2) programming, (3) implementing, and (4) recycling.

. . . Planning decisions are those which focus needed improvements by specifying the domain, major goals, and specific objectives to be served. Programming decisions specify procedure, personnel, facilities, budget, and time requirements for implementing planning activities. Implementing decisions are those in directing programmed activities. Recycling decisions include terminating, continuing, evolving, or drastically modifying activities (17:61).

Of the four decision areas stated by Stufflebeam, the fourth area-- recycling decisions--best describes the intent of this evaluation study and the intent of the decision-making procedure of the Consortium.

Alkin also lists four decision areas in a paper delivered at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting in Minneapolis in March, 1970:

. . . The four decision areas deal with: (1) selection of appropriate problem or objective to be served; (2) selection and design of the program to be introduced which best fulfills the objective; (3) modifying the program in terms of field conditions; and (4) certifying the appropriateness of the program for introduction elsewhere (1:2).

According to these four decision areas, Alkin's third area which deals with program "modification" also describes the intent of the Consortium activities evaluation study and the intent of the decision-making process.

Thus, the Consortium decision-making procedure deals with both "recycling" decisions and "modification" decisions. Given these decision areas to be served, what kind of evaluation strategies are required?

Stufflebeam and Alkin again have differing terminology as it applies to the Consortium study. Stufflebeam with reference to strategies of evaluation states that "product evaluation is used to determine the effectiveness of the project after it has run full cycle. Its objective

is to relate outcomes to objectives. . ." (17:65). He continues that "in the change process, product evaluation provides information for deciding to continue, terminate, modify, or refocus a change activity, and for linking the activity to other phases of the change process" (17:65). With an analysis of the achievement of the goals and objectives of the Consortium, a product evaluation study should be achieved. Thus, the information necessary for the "recycling" phase of Stufflebeam's four decision areas will be available for Consortium decision-makers.

Using a somewhat different approach, Alkin discusses two types of evaluation strategies for "modification" decisions. Program modification decisions require two types of information. The first is information concerning the extent of implementation which he refers to as "implementation analysis evaluation." The second, "process analysis evaluation," is information on progress towards fulfilling the intended objectives (1:4).

Both "implementation analysis" and "process analysis" evaluation have meaning for the Consortium study. However, "process analysis" evaluation has more relevancy to the study since "process analysis" evaluation is objectives-oriented. The main data items obtained by the evaluator are the progress towards the achievement of the objectives and unanticipated outcomes (1:6).

Looking back over the discussion of product evaluation by Stufflebeam and process analysis evaluation by Alkin, it would seem that there is a conflict as they apply to the Consortium evaluation. Looking closer, the confusion centers around the fact that the Consortium is a continuing organization but operates on a school year cycle. Stufflebeam's

"recycle" decision area calls for a product evaluation which would be consistent with the school year operating cycle of the Consortium and the achievement of its objectives during that period. However, since the Consortium is a continuing organization, the strategies and activities for the coming year will be built on the effectiveness of past strategies and activities. Therefore, Alkin's program modification decision area using a process analysis evaluation also seems consistent. The conflict is really not a conflict, but is, in fact, a duality of interpretation due to the operational procedure of the Consortium.

The purpose of this study is not to make the decisions, but simply to provide the information for the decision-making process. Hemphill makes a point of the detachment of the evaluator from the decision-making process when he states that ". . . decision-making is not usually an integral part of the evaluation study itself, but a subsequent activity and one to be engaged in by parties not involved in the study" (9:190). Cronbach adds to this comment when he states that ". . . the greatest service evaluation can perform is to identify aspects of the course where revision is desirable" (5:236). By determining the aspects of the activities that are desirable, improvement should be made through a better understanding of the past. Again, one of the primary purposes of the Consortium evaluation is to provide feedback to facilitate decision-making for the future strategies. From the feedback, revisions can be made.

If an analysis of the extent of achievement of the goals and objectives of the Consortium is the information needed by the decision-makers, then the question of how to get this feedback still remains. It



was felt the method of investigation should be some type of survey.

Good describes the purpose of the descriptive-survey investigations as:

1. to secure evidence concerning an existing situation or current condition,
2. to identify standards or norms with which to compare present conditions, in order to plan the next step, and
3. to determine how to make the next step (having determined where we are and where we wish to go) (6:192).

The descriptive-survey investigation of this evaluation study will be confined to the first purpose--data concerning existing status. "This method attempts usually to describe a condition or to learn the status of something and, whenever possible, to draw valid general conclusions from the facts discovered" (10:187).

The need to obtain information concerning the current status can be met through two ways: an interview or questionnaire. The interview is probably the most effective means of collecting the data but time and money are two restrictions that limit its use. The questionnaire--the method selected in this study--is an easier and quicker procedure in comparison with the interview. However, there are restrictions to this also. "The disadvantages of the questionnaire lie partly in the uncertainty of obtaining replies and partly in the difficulty of extracting personal and confidential information from respondents" (10:201).

#### Evaluation of Cooperative Improvement Strategies

Both the League of Cooperating Schools and Education Systems for the '70's have been involved in some form of evaluation procedure. San Mateo Union School which is a member of ES '70 has used various intuitive methods to measure their effectiveness in the project. One method was the amount of progress in the production of curricular materials by the

staff. Likewise, the amount of commitment to action was used as evidence of the effectiveness of communication of general purposes of the project. Other than these two specific measures, no other evaluation techniques were evident (14).

The League of Cooperating Schools, however, is making an effort to develop a model for examining the decision-making process. This evaluation strategy resulted in the development of the DDA model which is being used by the schools in the League to examine their dialogue, decision, and action steps. With this instrument to measure the level of dialogue, decision, and action, the League plans to implement strategies that will move the schools to higher levels in these processes. However, in their effort to determine what factors are related to change and improvement among a group of cooperating schools, the League is using the DDA model as a dependent variable rather than an evaluation standard (12).

Even with the above mentioned evaluation strategies, it is evident from the literature that educational evaluation is at an infant stage of development.

Without question, educators are responding to requirements for evaluation. The multitude of evaluation reports now available from local schools, state education departments, regional educational laboratories, etc., demonstrates that educators are expending significant amounts of time, effort, and money to evaluate their programs. However, the increased activity alone has not met the need for effective evaluations. While educators have been busy doing evaluations, the fruits of their efforts have not provided the information needed to support decision making related to the programs being evaluated (17:43).

With the concern of improved educational evaluation for decision-making in mind, this evaluation study attempts to provide information to facilitate the decision-making procedures of the Consortium.

## CHAPTER 3

### REVIEW OF THE CONSORTIUM OF WASHINGTON EDUCATION CENTERS

#### INTRODUCTION

The Consortium of Washington Education Centers was formed in 1969 as the result of an effort to improve communication between Central Washington State College and the public schools. Eighteen of the school districts that were serving as student teaching centers for Central Washington State College responded to the invitation to form a partnership with each other, Central Washington State College's Hebel Elementary School, and the Center for the Study of Migrant and Indian Education. The association was to aid in the identification and solution of common problems and educational concerns as well as develop an effective means of communication between and among the school districts and Central Washington State College. The Consortium was not to advocate any particular program or strategy for educational change, but to serve as a catalytic agent in developing a cooperative and self-renewing relationship.

The intent of the organization is reflected in the goals and objectives as recorded in the Bylaws. (A complete copy of the Bylaws can be found in Appendix A.) The goals of the Consortium are:

1. to facilitate communication between and among participating school districts and Central Washington State College;
2. to identify common concerns and problems and to share ways of meeting problems;
3. to share information about innovative and creative activities and programs;
4. to stimulate initiative in resolving common problems;

5. to provide a means by which duplication of effort may be reduced by correlating and coordinating educational endeavors;
6. provide assistance with evaluation, including evaluation of programs and activities; and
7. to share human and physical resources whenever feasible and appropriate in the sharing, evaluation, and inservice activities (4:2).

The objectives as stated in the Bylaws are:

1. to establish an administrative structure for organizing the Consortium and implementing objectives;
2. to establish an organ of communication to include but not limited to items submitted by the participating schools;
3. to identify one person in each participating school district to act as the Coordinator of Consortium Activities and major participant in the Consortium by attending meetings, workshops, disseminating information throughout his district, etc.;
4. to establish and maintain an inventory of each participating district (and in this way the entire Consortium of schools) of innovative or unique programs presently in operation or in the process of development, and other aspects of a district's educational program which are believed to be of interest and useful to others. The inventory will be distributed to all participating school districts;
5. to secure formal approval by the Board of Directors of each school district to a commitment to the intent of the Consortium and its general operation; and
6. to seek, through cooperative efforts with the college, long-term funding for the operation of the Consortium from federal and/or private foundation funds (4:2-3).

The first year of operation, 1969/70 school year, saw progress made in establishing the Educational Practices Inventory, a listing of innovative and creative programs taking place in member districts, and in organizing administrative policies and procedures for the Consortium. At a planning retreat in June, 1970, at the end of the first year, the Consortium members adopted three major areas of emphasis to accomplish the goals and objectives stated above. These were the Educational Practices Inventory, inservice activities, and evaluation assistance to the districts. Throughout the 1970/71 school year, the Consortium was involved in activities under these three categories. Each activity had a

definite purpose as it related to the category and the goals and objectives of the organization.

The member districts for the 1970/71 school year were Bellevue, Bremerton, Camas, Cashmere, Center for the Study of Migrant and Indian Education, Central Kitsap, Central Washington State College (Hebeler), Cle Elum, Clover Park, Eastmont, Ellensburg, Federal Way, Lake Washington, Moses Lake, Selah, Tahoma, Vancouver, Wapato, West Valley, and Yakima.

The remainder of the discussion in this chapter will revolve around the three categories and the activities that were conducted by the Consortium during the 1970/71 school year.

#### EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES INVENTORY

The Educational Practices Inventory is a collection of innovative and creative programs--each program outlined on one type-written page--compiled in the form of a loose-leaf notebook. The first edition of the inventory was placed in the districts in May of 1970. Each district received one copy for each \$100 of their membership fees to the organization. Thus, the larger districts received six copies for their \$600 membership fee and the smaller districts received three copies for their \$300 membership fee.

#### September Meeting on the Inventory

The meeting scheduled at Central Washington State College in September was the first activity of the year related to the inventory. Since the Educational Practices Inventory had been placed in the districts only four months earlier in May, little use had been made of the inventory at the conclusion of the school year in May and June.

The purpose of the meeting was (1) to familiarize school district personnel with the inventory, (2) to alert them to the potential utilization of the inventory, and (3) to develop strategies for implementation and updating of district programs. To accomplish the purposes as outlined, the meeting was structured around an orientation to the Consortium and to the inventory, a period for description and explanation of inventory programs by member districts, and group discussion on strategies for updating, utilizing, and implementing the inventory.

From the meeting, a list of ideas on utilization of the inventory was sent to the coordinators of the districts. In addition, a list of suggestions on updating the inventory was used by the staff for the 1971 edition.

There were forty-one participants representing sixteen of the twenty member districts of the Consortium.

#### 1971 Educational Practices Inventory

From the suggestions received at the September meeting on updating the inventory, revisions were made in the format and in October, material was requested from the member districts. Due to the late responses from the coordinators, materials was not ready for distribution until February.

The 1971 inventory contained 335 pages which was almost double the 176 pages in the 1970 inventory. The new edition also had wider distribution in the districts than the first edition. Eighty-seven of the first edition inventories were distributed in the districts in May, 1970. After the second edition, 247 copies were distributed in the school districts. The increase was the result of offering additional copies of

the inventory for sale. Also, some increase in distribution was the result of a presentation in the districts to promote the use of the inventory.

A goal established by the Consortium staff of one inventory per building per district was met in many districts. Other districts, however, fell far short of this goal.

#### Inventory and Consortium Presentation

The purpose of the presentation of the inventory and the Consortium was (1) to help member districts update their first edition of the inventory with the new materials, (2) to provide suggestions on the utilization of the inventory, and (3) to orient those persons in member districts that had not had the opportunity to get involved with the Consortium concept.

The program was a short 20-30 minute presentation using overhead transparencies to accomplish the above three purposes. Most of the presentations in the districts were made during administrative council meetings for the principals and central administrative personnel. Approximately 220 people were involved in the presentations throughout the months of February, March, and April. Eighteen of the twenty member districts participated.

#### Conference on Innovations and Flexibility

On March 19, 1971, a Consortium conference was held during the statewide inservice day in the Vancouver School District. The intent was to expose teachers and administrators to some of the innovative and creative programs that were reported in the inventory. Brochures of the

conference were sent to all principals in the State of Washington, introducing them to the Consortium of Washington Education Centers and explaining the types of demonstrations being presented at the conference.

During the conference, two keynote speakers spoke to an audience of approximately 700. In addition, three, one-hour presentation sessions completed the agenda with various demonstrations taking place during this time. Fifty-one demonstrations from ten Consortium districts were involved during the presentation sessions.

### EVALUATION

Evaluation was another phase of the three areas of emphasis outlined at the Spring retreat in June, 1970. This area was a new area for the Consortium and had not been initiated the previous year.

#### August Workshop on Evaluation

Thirty-one people participated in the week-long workshop at Central Washington State College in early August, 1970. These people represented thirteen Consortium districts. The workshop, conducted by Dr. Mohamed Mawgood, was designed to (1) sensitize people to the concept and process of evaluation and its central function and (2) train the participants in the use of strategies and techniques of a variety of evaluation instruments.

#### October Meeting on Evaluation

In the month of October, 1970, a meeting was held in the Lake Washington School District to (1) establish types of evaluation activities in which the Consortium would be involved during the year, (2) establish



priorities for these types of evaluation, (3) establish procedures and needs for implementing the high priority decisions, and (4) determine steps needed to implement the others. Approximately thirty people attended this meeting.

Only a start was made at this meeting. The priorities were established with program evaluation the highest priority and evaluation of teaching next. Other types of evaluation were listed but these two were the major concern. As a result of the meeting, a model for evaluating teaching was distributed to coordinators. This model is discussed later in the text. Also requests were made for assistance from the coordinators to develop a model for program evaluation, but no one responded. The lack of response resulted in a model developed by the director and distributed to the coordinators for their reactions and comments. The model for program evaluation is also discussed below.

#### March Meeting on Evaluation

Although the March meeting had several points of focus, the primary concern was evaluation. The purpose of the meeting was to (1) establish evaluation teams to meet evaluation needs that had already been identified by the districts and reported to the Consortium, (2) update the coordinators and their representatives to all Consortium activities and begin planning for the Spring retreat, and (3) set plans for the Principal Inservice Training Model Projects that had been funded by the U. S. Office of Education.

During the meeting, all three purposes were touched upon. While the latter two received consideration, concern about evaluation occupied most of the time. Many of the people in attendance were not familiar

with the evaluation models for one reason or another. This required that time be taken to familiarize the participants with the models to determine if it was a feasible approach to which they would commit their district. Some persons designated as members of a team to evaluate program and teaching were identified. At the meeting, coordinators were asked to submit formal requests for evaluations to the Consortium. The Consortium would attempt to coordinate the evaluation program.

Three evaluation teams were sent into districts as a result of this meeting. One district requested help in evaluating a planning phase of a district-wide English program, another received assistance in evaluating their social studies department, and the third, an evaluation of certain aspects of a K-2 flexible space school. Several other projects were requested but had to be deferred to Fall, 1971, due to lack of time at the end of the school year.

#### Evaluation of Teaching Model

The model for evaluation of teaching evolved from the October meeting on evaluation at which time evaluation of teaching was established as the next highest priority in the districts' evaluation needs. The model was sent to the coordinators after the October meeting and then later discussed at the March meeting on evaluation.

The model consisted of an eleven task procedure that a district or building could use to develop a program to evaluate teaching. The primary approach was to establish the goals or outcomes for the students and then establish that which the teacher would do, or strategies that would be necessary for bringing about the desired outcomes. Once the strategies were identified, a feedback system or instrument was invented

to determine if the teachers were doing what they said they would be doing. The entire procedure involved the teacher's developing their own model.

#### Evaluation of Program Model

The model for evaluation of program was also an outgrowth of the October meeting on evaluation. The model, after development, was sent to the coordinators for their reaction and comment. At the March meeting on evaluation the model was discussed to determine if the districts felt the model was worthy of their commitment.

The model consisted of six decision areas that would be served by an evaluation. These areas ranged from the initiation of the needs for a new program, through the implementation of the program, and to the conclusion at which time the decision must be made to continue, revise, or halt the program. In each of the six decision areas, questions were posed concerning who participates in the phase, who decides, what are the decision-making criteria, and what are the processes used.

Knowledge of the model seemed negligible from the discussion at the March meeting.

#### INSERVICE

Like the evaluation phase of the three major emphasis areas, inservice had received little attention during the 1969/70 operating year. The decision was made at the Spring retreat to include this as one of the areas in which the Consortium would place emphasis for the 1970/71 school year.

### November Meeting on Inservice

The meeting in November at Central Washington State College was directed primarily at getting people together to share ideas on a cooperative approach to the inservice phase. The purposes of the meeting were: (1) to share current practices and list current problems, (2) to identify problems which were common to several districts, (3) to identify resources (people and things) available, and (4) to develop a cooperative inservice plan which the Consortium could coordinate or could seek outside funding.

There were thirty-eight participants in seven areas of inservice: reading, language arts, social studies, math, science, special education, and individualized instruction. These thirty-eight participants represented twelve Consortium districts.

Recommendations from the seven areas were sent to the coordinators to be distributed to the appropriate people in the district. Plans were also made to develop an inservice plan from the recommendations which would involve the Consortium coordinating the sharing of resources and people between districts for various projects.

### March Meeting on Inservice

Due to adverse weather, only twenty-five people participated in the meeting. The participants represented six school districts. The meeting was designed to (1) discuss ideas or projects that could be implemented in the Spring of 1971, (2) sharpen and modify each participant's plan, (3) plan for evaluation of the project, and (4) outline the project for the Consortium and assistance needed by the Consortium.

As a result of the meeting, assistance was given in five different programs. These included: (1) a survey of Consortium districts' criteria for selection and evaluation of math texts and programs; (2) assistance to one district in individualizing instruction; (3) help in gathering information for one district on the training of paraprofessionals; (4) assistance in sharpening plans for assessing reading needs in a district; and (5) coordination of visitations by one district to several open-concept elementary schools.

#### Principal Inservice Training Model

Though not a direct outgrowth of the inservice phase of the Consortium activities, it was felt from the previous experiences of the Consortium staff that the building principal was the key change facilitator and leader of the districts. A proposal was written and funded by the U. S. Office of Education to develop and field test a model for training principals as instructional leaders in their buildings.

The Consortium initiated the initial phase of this project with a three day workshop on organizational development held at Central Washington State College in May. More workshops were planned for the ten principals involved in the project. It was their task to develop the model for training of principals. After the model was developed, it would be field tested with more principals from Consortium districts during the 1971/72 school year.

#### OTHER ACTIVITIES

Two other activities that were not directly connected to any particular phase of the Consortium activities but related to all of

them were the newsletters and the planning retreat.

### Newsletter

Two newsletters were printed and distributed to coordinators and superintendents during the 1970/71 year. The first newsletter came out in early fall explaining the planning retreat that was held in June, 1970, and the decisions that resulted. Plans and strategies for the 1970/71 activities were explained.

The second newsletter, Winter 1971, was distributed to explain what Consortium had accomplished during the Fall and the strategies for the remainder of the year.

The newsletter was designed as a means of communication between the Consortium staff and the coordinators and superintendents in the districts. Additional copies were also sent to coordinators in hopes that they would distribute the newsletter throughout the district.

### Spring Retreat

The planning retreat was held at Camp Field, Leavenworth, for two days to review the past activities and plan for the coming year. Additional items included the approval of the bylaws, election of a new officer to the Executive Committee, and several policy decisions.

Three major areas of emphasis were outlined for the 1971/72 school year: (1) evaluation, (2) Educational Practices Inventory, and (3) teacher education (expanded from inservice to include field training, and the principal training model).

All twenty member districts were represented at the retreat which resulted in thirty-seven people participating in the two days of discussion and planning.

## CHAPTER 4

### PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

The Consortium of Washington Education Centers conducts a planning retreat at the conclusion of each academic school year. At this time the Consortium coordinators and superintendents, as well as the Consortium staff, meet to determine the activities and strategies for the coming year. The decision-making process used at the retreat needs data to facilitate the planning of future activities. The design of the evaluation study by the writer was intended to be used in this decision-making process.

### EVALUATION DESIGN

In the development of the evaluation design, the procedure reported by Stufflebeam was found to be very helpful. The procedure is outlined below:

- A. Focusing the Evaluation
  1. Identify the major level(s) of decision making to be served, i.e., local, state, and/or national.
  2. For each level of decision making, project the decision situations to be served and describe each one in terms of its locus, focus, criticality, timing, and composition of alternatives.
  3. Define criteria for each decision situation by specifying variables for measurement and standards for use in the judgment of alternatives.
  4. Define policies within which the evaluation must operate.
- B. Collection of Information
  1. Specify the source of the information to be collected.
  2. Specify the instruments and methods for collecting the needed information.
  3. Specify the sampling procedure to be employed.

4. Specify the conditions and schedule for information collection.
- C. Organization of Information
  1. Provide a format for the information which is to be collected.
  2. Design a means for coding, organizing, storing, and retrieving information.
- D. Analysis of Information
  1. Select the analytical procedures to be employed.
  2. Designate a means for performing the analysis.
- E. Reporting of Information
  1. Define the audiences for the evaluation reports.
  2. Specify means for providing information to the audiences.
  3. Specify the format for evaluation reports and/or reporting sessions.
  4. Schedule the reporting information.
- F. Administration of the Evaluation
  1. Summarize the evaluation schedule.
  2. Define staff and resource requirements and plans for meeting these requirements.
  3. Specify means for meeting policy requirements for conduct of the evaluation.
  4. Evaluate the potential of the evaluation design for providing information which is valid, reliable, credible, timely, and pervasive.
  5. Specify and schedule means for periodic updating of the evaluation design.
  6. Provide a budget for the total evaluation program (17:70).

The writer used the above procedure for evaluation design by Stufflebeam as a guide to assist in planning the evaluation. Each of the six sections was analyzed and answered accordingly. The complete evaluation design used for the Consortium evaluation study is found in Appendix B.

#### THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Looking back at the purpose of the study, three questions needed to be answered to aid in the decision-making process of the Consortium. These three major questions were: (1) what personal/professional value was received from the activities as they were conducted, (2) how effective have the activities been in moving the Consortium to completion of the goals and objectives, and (3) how do the Consortium coordinators and



superintendents feel about the degree of accomplishment of each of the goals and objectives of the organization. The questionnaire was designed to answer these three questions.

The closed-form questionnaire, a structured instrument with a list of questions and a choice of possible answers, was used for the survey. This form is easy to administer and fill out, keeps the respondent's mind on the question, and facilitates tabulation and analysis (19:302). The questionnaire used a five point scale on which the respondent was to record his ranking. This greatly facilitated the recording of responses.

The questionnaire was developed by the investigator with assistance given by his committee in revising and clarifying sections. Section I of the first draft asked respondents to rank each goal and objective of the Consortium according to their view of its importance. Section II listed the goals and objectives again and asked for a ranking according to degree of accomplishment of each. In Section III, each respondent was asked for a priority ranking of the Consortium as it competes for his time. The last two sections of the questionnaire dealt directly with the 1970/71 activities. Section IV asked for a ranking of the effectiveness of each activity in moving the Consortium toward its goals and objectives. The last section, Section V, asked the respondents for a ranking of the personal/professional value received from each of the activities.

Following the construction of the questionnaire, it was field-tested with one Consortium coordinator and two principals who had participated in several activities. All three made several suggestions for

improvement of the questionnaire. Some concern was expressed by the principals that they were not close enough to the Consortium to make judgments about effectiveness of the activities in meeting the goals and objectives. The principals felt as if they were "outsiders looking in" and could not react fairly to the questionnaire. From this feedback, the decision was made to poll only superintendents and coordinators, since they had a larger view of the Consortium and its effect on their district.

Likewise, the feedback received from the coordinator was used to make revisions in the questionnaire. His comments prompted the elimination of Section I, which dealt with the importance of each goal and objective. The feeling was that a district would not belong to Consortium if the goals and objectives were not important to them. It was also felt that Section I would "turn respondents off" by the nature of the task and discourage them from completing the questionnaire. By eliminating this section, the questionnaire was reduced from six pages to four pages which also made the instrument more manageable. The final, revised copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix C.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Copies of the final draft of the questionnaire as revised were multilithed to make a more professional-looking paper. According to the evaluation design, the questionnaires were to be returned anonymously by the respondents to facilitate open and honest replies.

A cover letter explaining the evaluation questionnaire and the purpose of the evaluation was written by the investigator and signed by Dr. William G. Gaskell, Director of the Consortium. Dr. Gaskell's signature was used to emphasize to the respondents the importance of the

evaluation in the decision-making process.

A questionnaire, the letter of explanation, and a stamped, addressed, return envelope were mailed to each intended respondent on April 16, 1971. This date was one week later than originally intended in the evaluation design. After two weeks and only 50 per cent of the questionnaires returned, a second questionnaire was mailed to those individuals who had not returned their questionnaire. The second mailing on April 29, 1971 also included a short note from Dr. Gaskell asking for a prompt return.

#### ORGANIZING THE DATA

As the returned questionnaires were received by the investigator, the rankings of each respondent were recorded on one master form. This procedure gave a composite picture of the rankings for each question.

## CHAPTER 5

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section deals with how the 1970/71 Consortium activities were ranked on a five point scale according to their personal/professional value. The second section deals with how the activities were ranked according to their effectiveness in moving the Consortium toward meeting its goals and objectives. The third section of this chapter analyzes the data with respect to the views of the coordinators and superintendents concerning the degree of accomplishment for each of the goals and objectives. Section four discusses the ranking of the Consortium with respect to other priorities in the districts.

The data was collected by the evaluation questionnaire mailed to all of the Consortium coordinators and superintendents. A copy of the questionnaire used is found in Appendix C. Of the questionnaires mailed, seventeen, or 85 per cent of the coordinator's questionnaires were returned. The seven responses from the superintendents (39 per cent) were also added to the coordinators which brought the total returned questionnaires to twenty-four.

#### PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL VALUE

The data from Section III of the questionnaire is reported in Table 1 for the personal/professional value of the various activities of

The Consortium for the 1970/71 school year. On the questionnaire each person was asked to rank on a five point scale the personal/professional value of each activity in which he participated or of which he had direct knowledge. Since several respondents had no knowledge of some activities, the number of respondents for each activity may be less than twenty-four--the total number of questionnaires returned. To facilitate the comparison of responses between activities, rankings have been reported as a per cent of the number of responses to each activity. Actual data for Table 1 and other tables in this chapter may be found in Appendix C.

Table 1

Ranking Level Response Percentages for Each 1970/71 Consortium  
Activity's Personal/Professional Value

Activity	N	Per cent				
		Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
September Meeting on the Inventory	19			47.4	42.1	10.5
1971 Educational Practices Inventory	17				47.1	52.9
Inventory and Consortium Presentation	17	5.9		11.8	35.3	47.1
Conference on Innovations & Flexibility	13			15.4	23.1	61.5
August Workshop on Evaluation	11		9.1	18.2	45.5	27.3
October Meeting on Evaluation	13		7.7	69.2	23.1	
March Meeting on Evaluation	11		9.1	45.5	45.5	
Evaluation of Teaching Model	12		8.3	66.7	25.0	
Evaluation of Program Model	11			63.6	36.4	
November Meeting on Inservice	15		6.7	53.3	40.0	
March Meeting on Inservice	17		8.3	25.0	50.0	16.7
Principal Inservice Training Model	15			13.3	60.0	26.7
Newsletter	17			17.6	58.8	23.5

Only one person ranked an activity at the "1" level. This person added a note of explanation that the low ranking of the Inventory and Consortium Presentation activity was not the fault of the Consortium, but an error on the part of the coordinator in scheduling the activity.

A clearer picture of the relationship between activities can be seen from Figure 1 which places the average of the rankings for each activity on a 1 to 5 scale.

ACTIVITY	Average Ranking				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
September meeting on the Inventory				X	
1971 Educational Practices Inventory					X
Inventory and Consortium Presentation				X	
Conference on Innovations & Flexibility					X
August Workshop on Evaluation				X	
October Meeting on Evaluation			X		
March Meeting on Evaluation			X		
Evaluation of Teaching Model			X		
Evaluation of Program Model			X		
November Meeting on Inservice			X		
March Meeting on Inservice				X	
Principal Inservice Training Model				X	
Newsletter				X	

Figure 1

Average of the Rankings for Each 1970/71 Consortium  
Activity's Personal/Professional Value

#### EFFECTIVENESS

One section of the questionnaire dealt with the degree of effectiveness of the activities in moving the Consortium toward its goals and objectives. Again, the respondents were asked to respond to those activities in which they participated or of which they had direct knowledge. The data, as a percentage of those responding to each activity, is reported in Table 2 on the following page.

Two activities received a "1" level ranking: The Inventory and Consortium presentation which had a comment that it was not the fault of the Consortium but that of the coordinator of that district and the Principal Inservice Training Model which also had a comment that it would depend on whether the project was funded or not. This person had not received word of the funding of the project.

Table 2

Ranking Level Response Percentages for Each 1970/71 Consortium  
Activity's Effectiveness in Moving the Consortium  
Toward Its Goals and Objectives

Activity	N	Per cent				
		Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
September Meeting on the Inventory	18		5.6		72.2	22.2
1971 Educational Practices Inventory	23			13.3	52.2	34.8
Inventory and Consortium Presentation	22	4.5	4.5	18.2	31.8	40.9
Conference on Innovations & Flexibility	17		5.9	5.9	41.2	47.1
August Workshop on Evaluation	14		7.1	28.6	35.7	28.6
October Meeting on Evaluation	15		6.7	66.7	26.7	
March Meeting on Evaluation	12			58.3	41.7	
Evaluation of Teaching Model	11		27.3	27.3	45.5	
Evaluation of Program Model	10		20.0	20.0	50.0	10.0
November Meeting on Inservice	19			47.4	42.1	10.5
March Meeting on Inservice	14		7.1	57.1	35.7	
Principal Inservice Training Model	18	5.6		16.7	38.9	38.9
Newsletter	22			31.8	45.5	22.7

The average of the rankings of the effectiveness of the Consortium activities in moving the Consortium toward its goals and objectives is shown in Figure 2.

ACTIVITY	Average Ranking				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
September Meeting on the Inventory				X	
1971 Educational Practices Inventory				X	
Inventory and Consortium Presentation				X	
Conf. on Innovations and Flexibility					X
August Workshop on Evaluation				X	
October Meeting on Evaluation			X		
March Meeting on Evaluation			X		
Evaluation of Teaching Model			X		
Evaluation of Program Model			X		
November Meeting on Inservice			X		
March Meeting on Inservice			X		
Principal Inservice Training Model					X
Newsletter				X	

Figure 2

Average of the Rankings for Each 1970/71 Consortium  
Activity's Effectiveness in Moving the  
Consortium Toward Its Goals  
and Objectives

#### DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

The degree of accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the Consortium as they are stated in the bylaws was dealt with in Section I of the questionnaire. Table 3 shows the data that was collected with the questionnaire with respect to the goals. The data concerning objectives is discussed later in this section.



Table 3

Ranking Level Response Percentages for Each Goal's  
Degree of Accomplishment

Goal	N	Per cent				
		Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. to facilitate communication between & among participating school districts and C.W.S.C.;	24		4.2	50.0	29.1	16.7
2. to identify common concerns and problems & to share ways of meeting problems;	24		8.3	50.0	33.3	8.3
3. to share information about innovative and creative activities and programs;	24		4.2	16.7	50.0	29.2
4. to stimulate initiative in resolving common problems;	24	4.2	16.7	54.2	16.7	8.3
5. to provide a means by which duplication of effort may be reduced by correlating and coordinating educational endeavors;	22	4.5	9.1	63.6	13.6	9.1
6. to provide assistance with evaluation, including evaluation of programs and activities; and	21		28.6	52.4	19.0	
7. to share human and physical resources whenever feasible and appropriate in the sharing, evaluation, and inservice activities.	24		20.8	45.8	33.3	

Figure 3 shows the goals and the average of the rankings for the degree of accomplishment of each.

GOAL	Average Ranking				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. facilitate communication				X	
2. identify common concerns & problems			X		
3. share innovative & creative programs				X	
4. stimulate resolution of common problems			X		
5. reduce duplication of educational effort			X		
6. provide assistance with evaluation			X		
7. share human & physical resources			X		

Figure 3

Average of the Rankings for Each Goal's  
Degree of Accomplishment

The percentages for the rankings of degree of accomplishment of the objectives of the Consortium are listed in Table 4, shown on the following page.

Table 4

Ranking Level Response Percentages for Each Objective's  
Degree of Accomplishment

Objectives	N	Per cent				
		Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. to establish an administrative structure for organizing the Consortium & implementing objectives;	22			36.4	36.4	27.3
2. to establish an organ of communication to include but not limited to items submitted by the participating schools;	23			39.1	39.1	21.7
3. to identify one person in each participating school district to act as the Coordinator of Consortium activities and major participant in the Consortium by attending meetings, workshops, disseminating information throughout his district, etc.;	24		4.2	12.5	37.5	45.8
4. to establish and maintain an inventory of each participating district (and in this way the entire Consortium of schools) of innovative or unique programs presently in operation or in the process of development, and other aspects of a district's educational program which are believed to be of interest and useful to others. The inventory will be distributed to all participating school districts;	24			4.2	20.8	75.0
5. to secure formal approval by the Board of Directors of each school district to a commitment to the intent of the Consortium and its general operation; and	22			13.6	31.8	54.5
6. to seek, through cooperative efforts with the college, long-term funding for the operation of the Consortium from federal and/or private foundation funds.	20		25.0	30.0	35.0	10.0

Figure 4 shows the relationship between the average rankings for the objectives.

OBJECTIVES	Average Ranking				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. establish an administrative structure				X	
2. establish organ of communication				X	
3. identify a Coordinator in the district					X
4. establish and maintain an inventory					X
5. secure formal approval from the Board					X
6. seek long-term funding			X		

Figure 4

Average of the Rankings for Each Objective's Degree of Accomplishment

#### PRIORITY OF CONSORTIUM

Section IV of the questionnaire was used to secure data on the priority ranking of the Consortium as it competed for the time of the Consortium coordinators and superintendents. The results showed that the average ranking was 3.1. The range of these rankings was from the "1" level to the "5" level. The percentages recorded for each ranking level were: 1 - 9.1 per cent; 2 - 18.2 per cent; 3 - 31.8 per cent; 4 - 36.4 per cent; and 5 - 4.5 per cent. This data could be used in future years as base data for comparison of the involvement and priority in the Consortium districts.

## CHAPTER 6

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### SUMMARY

The study reported by the investigator grew out of a need to know where the Consortium of Washington Education Centers was with respect to where it set out to be. The goals and objectives were used as the determinants of where it set out to be, while the Evaluation Questionnaire developed by the investigator was used to collect data on where the organization was.

The Consortium conducted various activities throughout the 1970/71 school year. The purpose of the study was to determine how effective these activities were in moving the Consortium toward its goals and objectives. With the data gathered and interpretations made, the results were used by the Consortium superintendents and coordinators in their decision-making processes at a planning retreat held in May, 1971, to determine the plans and strategies for the 1971/72 school year.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Several generalizations can be made from the data as reported and analyzed in Chapter 5. To facilitate the discussion, each of the major areas is discussed separately.

### Educational Practices Inventory

The activities involving the inventory and sharing innovative and creative programs--the September meeting on the inventory, 1971 Educational Practices Inventory, inventory and Consortium presentation, and the Conference on Innovation and Flexibility--ranked the highest as a group when compared with the other activities of the Consortium. The average rankings indicated that the group ranked high for its effectiveness in moving the Consortium toward its goals and objectives and for their personal/professional value. The degree of accomplishment of the goal that dealt with sharing innovative and creative programs ranked the highest of the goals. The objective dealing with establishing and maintaining an inventory of each district's innovative or unique programs ranked the highest of the objectives.

The above activities that have been grouped under the heading of the inventory and sharing innovative and creative programs had the most favorable response by the respondents.

### Evaluation

The goal, to provide assistance with evaluation, ranked the lowest of all the goals with respect to the degree of accomplishment. This is consistent with the average rankings of effectiveness of the evaluation activities in moving the Consortium toward its goals. All of the evaluation activities, except the evaluation workshop in August, ranked on the average low when compared with the other Consortium activities. All the evaluation activities, except the evaluation workshop, ranked the lowest for their personal/professional value received.

The evaluation workshop was the only activity in the evaluation group that received favorable results. The other activities were not as favorable in the views of the coordinators and superintendents.

### Inservice

The inservice activities ranked slightly higher than the evaluation activities. The March inservice meeting received a noticeably higher ranking than the November inservice meeting for its personal/professional value. However, the inservice activities still did not receive as high a ranking as the inventory activities.

### Newsletter and Principal Inservice Training Model

The two other activities, the newsletter and principal inservice training model, ranked on the average between the inventory activities and the evaluation activities. However, both of these activities were well above the evaluation and inservice groups.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Any recommendations that are made from the evaluation study should be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Consortium. Likewise, the recommendations should be consistent with the results of the data collected for the study and any other observations made by the investigator while researching the Consortium.

The following recommendations are proposed to make the future activities of the Consortium more effective in moving the organization toward its goals and objectives.

1. The Consortium activities should be designated as planning activities or content activities. The content meetings and activities, such as the Conference on Innovations and Flexibility, the workshop on evaluation, and the Educational Practices Inventory, received very favorable response from the respondents. The purpose of these activities was explicit and the coordinators used the activities for their content and information that could be shared with district personnel.

The planning meetings, such as the September meeting on the inventory, the November inservice meeting, and the March evaluation meeting, did not receive very favorable response. Several of these meetings were used by coordinators to involve district personnel as a means of educating them to the Consortium. These people may have been involved at the wrong time. If they were not in a decision-making position with the district, then the usefulness of the meeting to them was limited. The planning activities should not be used for something other than planning.

2. The evaluation and inservice phase should be continued through the Fall of the 1971/72 school year and then evaluated. The evaluation and inservice activities that were conducted during the year were planning meetings. Several evaluation and inservice activities were conducted after the Evaluation Questionnaire was used to collect the data reported in this paper. As a result, the full impact of the action steps of the evaluation and inservice phase was not included in the evaluation data.

The low rating given by the respondents for these two phases may have indicated their concern for the speed of the planning steps and not for the action steps that were being planned to follow. To determine the



effectiveness of the action steps for the evaluation and inservice phase in moving the Consortium toward its goals and objectives, an evaluation needs to be made after the steps have run full cycle. This evaluation could be made in late Fall of the 1971/72 school year.

3. The Educational Practices Inventory should be continued in its present form and updated in the Fall. The Educational Practices Inventory received a very favorable rating by the respondents. To continue to be current, the inventory must be updated yearly.

4. The Conference on Innovations and Flexibility should become a yearly activity of the Consortium. The response to the Conference indicated that the participants were very pleased with the activity. The Conference is an excellent method of sharing innovative programs and an excellent public relations activity.

5. A method should be developed for sharing the inventory with more district personnel. To be useful, the inventory must be used by the personnel in the districts, particularly the teachers. One possible procedure is to have Consortium staff visit the districts and give a presentation that would involve more people.

Another procedure is to prepare a slide and tape show for the coordinators to use with his personnel. Or, one person in the district, such as the coordinator, could make a presentation to each building.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alkin, Marvin C. "Objectives and Objective-Based Measures in Evaluation," Paper delivered at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 2-8, 1970.
2. Bentzen, Mary M. "Study of Educational Change and School Improvement," /I/D/E/A/ Reporter, Fall Quarter, 1969.
3. Bushnell, David S. "An Education System for the '70's," Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1969, pp. 199-203.
4. Bylaws of the Consortium of Washington Education Centers
5. Cronbach, L. J. "Evaluation for Course Improvement," New Curricula, R. Heath, Editor, New York: Harper & Row, 1964. pp. 231-248.
6. Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research: Methodology and Design. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.
7. Goodlad, John I. "Studying and Effecting Educational Change," /I/D/E/A/ Reporter, Fall, 1969, pp. 1-9.
8. Goodlad, John I. and M. Francis Klein and Associates. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.
9. Hemphill, John K. "The Relationships Between Research and Evaluation Studies," Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means, Ralph W. Tyler, Editor. Sixty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969. pp. 189-220.
10. Hillway, Tyrus. Introduction to Research. Second Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964. pp. 187-210.
11. Howes, Virgil M. "A Strategy for Research and Change: The League of Cooperating Schools," Childhood Education, September, 1967, Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 68-69.
12. /I/D/E/A/. Personal correspondence between Sam Christie, Project Coordinator, and the writer.
13. Rhodes, Lewis. "Linkage Strategies for Change: Process May Be the Product." Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1969, pp. 204-207.

14. San Mateo Union High School District, Final Report: Coordination of Organic Curriculum Development in the Public Schools of San Mateo, California.
15. Schein, Edgar H. Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
16. Scriven, Michael. "The Methodology of Evaluation," Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation, Ralph W. Tyler, Robert M. Gagné, and Michael Scriven, Editors. AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, Vol. 1. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1967. pp. 39-83.
17. Stufflebeam, Daniel L. "Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision Making," Improving Educational Assessment and An Inventory of Measures of Affective Behavior, Walcott H. Beatty, Editor. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969, pp. 41-73.
18. The Way We Saw It: A Pilot Evaluation of the 1968 Convention of the National Council for the Social Studies (Cooperative Center for Social Science Education. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University, 1969), p. II.
19. Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. Enlarged/Revised. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

APPENDIX A

## APPENDIX A

### BYLAWS OF THE CONSORTIUM

#### A. RATIONALE

In an age when educators must deal simultaneously with such concepts as creative innovation and accountability; at a time when education never has been more highly valued, or more widely challenged; in a period of unprecedented competition, not only for the direction of education, but also for the resources to support it; in such an age, at such a time, and in such a period, three over-riding aims seem to blanket the realm of the educator: (1) change must be stimulated, (2) change must be facilitated, and (3) change must be evaluated.

It is to the unflagging pursuit of these aims that the Consortium of Washington Education Centers is dedicated. This dedication rests on some rather basic assumptions:

1. It is not necessarily how many resources are committed, but rather how effectively they are used.
2. Solutions to many educational problems already have been discovered and tested.
3. School districts and colleges really never again can function in isolation.
4. All school districts and colleges have "unusual" people and experiences that are not always effectively or fully utilized.
5. Problem-solving and problem-sharing are compatible notions and imply

cooperation beyond school district and college boundaries.

6. The districts and college forming the Consortium of Washington Education Centers have people and experiences that ought to be shared.
7. The districts and college forming the Consortium of Washington Education Centers (having similar responsibilities to the public) cooperatively can solve problems and provide mutual assistance.

#### B. GOALS

The following goals, reflecting the values of the Consortium, comprise its statement of intent. The Consortium of Washington Education Centers was formed:

1. to facilitate communication between and among participating school districts and Central Washington State College;
2. to identify common concerns and problems and to share ways of meeting problems;
3. to share information about innovative and creative activities and programs;
4. to stimulate initiative in resolving common problems;
5. to provide a means by which duplication of effort may be reduced by correlating and coordinating educational endeavors;
6. to provide assistance with evaluation, including evaluation of programs and activities;
7. to share human and physical resources whenever feasible and appropriate in the sharing, evaluation, and inservice activities.

### C. OBJECTIVES

Some specific objectives of the Consortium are:

1. to establish an administrative structure for organizing the Consortium and implementing objectives;
2. to establish an organ of communication to include but not limited to items submitted by the participating schools;
3. to identify one person in each participating school district to act as the Coordinator of Consortium Activities and major participant in the Consortium by attending meetings, workshops, disseminating information throughout his district, etc.
4. to establish and maintain an inventory of each participating district (and in this way the entire Consortium of schools) of innovative or unique programs presently in operation or in the process of development, and other aspects of a district's educational program which are believed to be of interest and useful to others. The inventory will be distributed to all participating school districts;
5. to secure formal approval by the Board of Directors of each school district to a commitment to the intent of the Consortium and its general operation;
6. to seek, through cooperative efforts with the college, long-term funding for the operation of the Consortium from federal and/or private foundation funds.

### D. ORGANIZATION & ADMINISTRATION

1. Membership to Consortium



Membership to Consortium is open first to Central Washington State College student teaching centers. Membership to Consortium will be open to school districts at large based upon the following criteria: (1) written application, (2) acceptance of Executive Committee, and (3) date of application. Membership fees shall be established in accordance with a formula based upon school district average daily enrollment size, and set annually by the Consortium Board of Directors.

2. Board of Directors

The direction of the total Consortium effort will be provided by a Board of Directors comprised of the Superintendents of Consortium school districts or their designated representatives, and the Chairman of the Department of Education, Central Washington State College.

3. Executive Committee

An Executive Committee of the Board of Directors will be formed and comprised of the Chairman of the Department of Education, Central Washington State College, and Superintendents (or their designee) from various Consortium Districts. The Executive Committee will be organized as follows:

- a. The Chairman of the Executive Committee will be elected by Consortium members of the Board of Directors, or their representatives, at an annual meeting each Spring.
- b. The candidate for Chairman must be a member of the Executive Committee at the time of the election.
- c. Replacement members to the Executive Committee will be appointed for three-year terms by the Chairman of the Executive Committee,

as the vacancies arise.

- d. Only representatives from public school districts are eligible for the position of Chairman.
- e. The Chairman of the Department of Education, C.W.S.C., will have an automatic position on the Executive Committee.

#### 4. Director

The organization and operation of the Consortium is administered by a Director appointed annually by the Executive Committee based upon recommendations made by the Chairman of the Department of Education, Central Washington State College.

#### 5. Coordinators of Consortium

The activities of the Consortium will be implemented by a Committee comprised of the Director of the Consortium and the local Coordinators of Consortium Activities who are appointed by the Superintendents of member school districts. This Committee will implement the policies of operation established by the Board of Directors.

#### 6. Budget

The budget for the Consortium will be adopted annually, prepared by the Director, and approved by the Executive Committee.

APPENDIX B

## APPENDIX B

### EVALUATION DESIGN

#### A. Focusing the Evaluation

1. The level of decision making to be served by this evaluation will be local and within the Consortium itself. This would include the director and staff, superintendents, and Consortium coordinators.
2. The focus of the evaluation will be on the effectiveness of 1970/71 activities in moving the Consortium toward its goals and objectives, and its relationship to future planning. The evaluation should be made by May 20-21 at which time the Consortium coordinators, superintendents, and director meet to develop plans and strategies for the coming year. Decisions will be made to continue with the same type of activities, revise the activities but continue with the same strategy, or eliminate the activities as they have been conducted and develop a new strategy.
3. There are no standards of judgment for the various alternatives other than the judgments of the superintendents and coordinators. Basically, their satisfaction and attitudes toward the effectiveness of the activities will be the major determinants.
4. The evaluation will be a "self evaluation" by the superintendents and coordinators of the districts. Interpretations will be made by the writer and distributed to the superintendents and coordinators at the May retreat.

#### B. Collection of Information

1. The information will be collected from the Consortium coordinators and superintendents.
2. The method used for collecting the information will be an open-ended questionnaire.
3. All coordinators and superintendents will be sampled.
4. The questionnaire will be developed and distributed by April 10. All questionnaires should be returned by May 1.

#### C. Organization of Information

1. All rankings on the returned questionnaires will be recorded on one questionnaire.
2. Coding of the data is provided for by the construction of the questionnaire and the technique of ranking the responses.

#### D. Analysis of Information

1. Simple descriptive analysis will be used such as mean, frequency, and range. In addition, verbal interpretations of the data and measures will be given.
2. The analysis will be done by hand.

E. Reporting of Information

1. The audience for the evaluation report will be the Consortium coordinators, superintendents, participants of 1970/71 activities, and the director and staff.
2. The data and the analysis will be presented to the coordinators and superintendents at the May retreat. Participants' copies will be mailed.
3. The evaluation report will use a written format. A process of interaction and group decision-making for the May retreat will be designed to facilitate the development of objectives and strategies for the coming year.
4. The information will be given to coordinators and superintendents at the May retreat. Discussion and interaction will follow.

F. Administration of the Evaluation

1. By April 10, the questionnaire will be developed, field-tested, and ready for distribution by mail. By May 1, all questionnaires should be returned. May 20 is the deadline for the analysis and the written report.
2. Letters are being sent to the League of Cooperating Schools and Education Systems for the '70's for resource information on their evaluation techniques. Books on evaluation are being read for background on evaluation. The questionnaire will be field-tested to determine whether the information desired is the information received.
3. No policy requirements need to be met.
4. The information collected should be reliable if the respondents do not feel threatened by the collection method. Approximately 80-90% response is needed for validity.
5. The evaluation design will be updated at the retreat to determine if the process is useable and valuable.
6. No special funds necessary.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

CONSORTIUM OF WASHINGTON EDUCATION CENTERS  
Central Washington State College  
Ellensburg, Washington  
98926

April 12, 1971

On May 20-21, at Camp Field in Leavenworth, the Consortium of Washington Education Centers will hold a retreat for Superintendents and Coordinators, at which time decisions will be made on objectives and strategies for the next year. To facilitate the planning and decision-making process, we are seeking feedback on the activities and procedures of the Consortium. Enclosed you will find the Evaluation Questionnaire which is being used to collect the information for this decision-making process.

We are asking that you take a few minutes of your valuable time to give us feedback about the Consortium by answering the enclosed questionnaire. If you encounter questions you are unable to answer due to lack of involvement in that phase, feel free to leave them blank. To stress our interest in your reply, a stamped envelope has been enclosed to expedite the return of the questionnaire.

Thank you for the time and assistance you have given the Consortium.

Sincerely,

William G. Gaskell  
Director, Consortium

WGG/fl

Enclosure

## EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

## Consortium of Washington Education Centers

I. The following are a list of Consortium goals and objectives as stated in the Bylaws. In an effort to establish how effectively the goals and objectives have been accomplished during this past year, please rank each statement according to your perception of the degree of accomplishment. Place an X in the appropriate box from Low Degree of Accomplishment to High Degree of Accomplishment.

GOALS:- The Consortium of Washington Education Centers was formed:	Degree of Accomplishment				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. to facilitate communication between and among participating school districts and C.W.S.C.;		1	12	7	4
2. to identify common concerns and problems and to share ways of meeting problems;		2	12	8	2
3. to share information about innovative and creative activities and programs;		1	4	12	7
4. to stimulate initiative in resolving common problems;	1	4	13	4	2
5. to provide a means by which duplication of effort may be reduced by correlating and coordinating educational endeavors;	1	2	14	3	2
6. to provide assistance with evaluation, including evaluation of programs and activities;		6	11	4	
7. to share human and physical resources whenever feasible and appropriate in the sharing, evaluation, and inservice activities.		5	11	8	



OBJECTIVES:- Some specific objectives of the Consortium are:	Degree of Accomplishment				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
1. to establish an administrative structure for organizing the Consortium and implementing objectives;			8	8	6
2. to establish an organ of communication to include but not limited to items submitted by the participating schools;			9	9	5
3. to identify one person in each participating school district to act as the Coordinator of Consortium activities and major participant in the Consortium by attending meetings, workshops, disseminating information throughout his district, etc.;		1	3	9	11
4. to establish and maintain an inventory of each participating district (and in this way the entire Consortium of schools) of innovative or unique programs presently in operation or in the process of development, and other aspects of a district's educational program which are believed to be of interest and useful to others. The inventory will be distributed to all participating school districts;			1	5	18
5. to secure formal approval by the Board of Directors of each school district to a commitment to the intent of the Consortium and its general operation;			3	7	12
6. to seek, through cooperative efforts with the college, long-term funding for the operation of the Consortium from Federal and/or private foundation funds.		5	6	7	2

II. The following are Consortium activities this past year. To what degree have these activities effectively moved us toward our goals and objectives? Place an X in the appropriate box for each activity in which you participated or of which you have direct knowledge.

	Effectiveness				
	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
<u>INVENTORY</u>					
Meeting in September at C.W.S.C. at which time district personnel were familiarized with the inventory, alerted to potential utilization, and developed strategies for implementation and updating the inventory		1		13	4
Updating of the Educational Practices Inventory			3	12	8
Presentation in each district on the updating and utilization of the inventory	1	1	4	7	9
Conference on Innovation and Flexibility held in March at Vancouver to share and demonstrate programs from Consortium districts		1	1	7	8
<u>EVALUATION</u>					
Week-long workshop in August to sensitize participants from the districts to the task of evaluation		1	4	5	4
Meeting in October at Kirkland at which time priorities were established for evaluation		1	10	4	
Meeting in March at C.W.S.C. at which time teams of evaluators were to be established for present evaluation needs. In addition, evaluation "experts" from the districts were identified			7	5	
"Evaluation of Teaching" Model containing an eleven-task procedure for developing a process for evaluation		3	3	5	

## II. (CONT.)

	Effectiveness				
	Low				High
	1	2	3	4	5
"Program Evaluation" Model containing six major decision points in the evaluation of program		2	2	5	1
<u>INSERVICE</u>					
Meeting in November at C.W.S.C. at which time participants and consultants from C.W.S.C. shared current practices and problems and developed a cooperative inservice plan			9	8	2
Meeting in March at C.W.S.C. at which time participants and consultants from C.W.S.C. developed specific plans of action for inservice projects for this Spring		1	8	5	
<u>PRINCIPAL TRAINING MODEL</u>					
Development of a proposal for a Leadership Training Model for Principals	1		3	7	7
<u>NEWSLETTER</u>					
Quarterly newsletter about activities that have been held and discussing plans for the future			7	10	5

III. To establish the value received from the activities sponsored by the Consortium this past year, please rank each activity in which you participated or of which you have direct knowledge by placing an X in the appropriate box.

	Personal/Professional Value				
	Low				High
	1	2	3	4	5
<u>August workshop on evaluation</u>		1	2	5	3
<u>September meeting on the inventory</u>			9	8	2
<u>October meeting on evaluation</u>		1	9	3	
<u>November meeting on inservice</u>		1	8	6	
<u>March meeting on evaluation</u>		1	5	5	
<u>March meeting on inservice</u>		1	8	6	2
<u>1971 Educational Practices Inventory</u>				8	9
<u>Inventory and Consortium presentation in your district</u>	1		2	6	8
<u>Conference on Innovations and Flexibility in Vancouver</u>			2	3	8
<u>Evaluation of teaching model</u>		1	8	3	
<u>Evaluation of program model</u>			7	4	
<u>Principal Training Model</u>			2	9	4
<u>Newsletter</u>			3	10	4

IV. Within your total assignment of responsibilities, where on a five point priority scale would you rank the Consortium as it competes for your time?

1	2	3	4	5
2	4	7	8	1

V. Thank you for the time and assistance you have given the Consortium in completing this questionnaire. If you have any comments on the Consortium or the questionnaire, please feel free to add them.