

<i>Factors</i>	<i>District A: Weak Evaluation Practices</i>	<i>District B: Strong Evaluation Practices</i>
Evaluation Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● new gifted coordinator needs to know how program is functioning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● district policy to evaluate all programs</li> </ul>
Method of Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likert scale questionnaire</li> <li>● directed at parents</li> <li>● measuring satisfaction with program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● likert scale and open-ended questionnaire</li> <li>● directed at parents, students, teachers, and administrators</li> <li>● measuring satisfaction with program</li> <li>● achievement test data from students</li> <li>● focus group interviews with parents, students, and teachers</li> <li>● analysis of program documents and curriculum</li> </ul>
Data Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● tally of responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● descriptive statistics</li> <li>● content analysis</li> <li>● inferential statistics</li> <li>● document analysis</li> </ul>
Implementation Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● none exists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● recommendations provided</li> <li>● goal setting based upon recommendations</li> <li>● board action</li> <li>● policy development</li> <li>● development of a plan</li> <li>● procedures and resources for implementation</li> <li>● timeline for tasks</li> <li>● directions for further study based upon recommendations</li> </ul>
Evaluation Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● program description, questionnaire, and tally of responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● executive summary for teachers</li> <li>● formal report for administrators and school board</li> <li>● dissemination via newsletter to parents and other program stakeholders</li> </ul>
Stakeholder Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● data sources (see methods section)</li> <li>● committee consists of gifted coordinator, teachers of the gifted, building principals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● greater number of human data sources (see method and analysis section)</li> <li>● representatives from data sources participate as a member of evaluation committee: parents, program teachers, regular classroom teachers, parents of students not enrolled in program, school board members, administrators, program coordinators</li> </ul>

(continued)

(continued)

<i>Factors</i>	<i>District A: Weak Evaluation Practices</i>	<i>District B: Strong Evaluation Practices</i>
Stakeholder Participation (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● roles: data source, survey design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● roles for participants: data source, evaluation committee team member (including evaluation design, data collection, and dissemination), implementation team member (including planning, implementation, evaluation)</li> </ul>
Qualifications of Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● program coordinator has training or experience in gifted education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● staff member trained and experienced in gifted education</li> <li>● staff member trained and experienced in evaluation</li> <li>● cooperative relationship between the two fields</li> </ul>
Nature of the Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● evaluation goals not stated, therefore changes not tied to goals, "random"</li> <li>● nature of services was changed to better meet the needs of students</li> <li>● additional program resources secured staff development provided to clarify misconceptions</li> <li>● schedules and other program elements were changed to assist general instruction in the school</li> <li>● information on the program provided to parents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● goals are focused on specific program elements, "systematic"</li> <li>● results tied to evaluation goals</li> <li>● nature of services was changed to better meet the needs of identified students</li> <li>● additional staff provided to assist with meeting needs of the students and the parameters of the new program initiatives</li> <li>● additional resources provided by school board to enact those changes</li> <li>● staff development implemented to prepare for change in the services provided</li> </ul>

**Figure 2.** Factors Delineating Profiles of Weaker Evaluation Practices and Stronger Evaluation Practices

There seem to be two approaches to deciding what to do next—either “doing what they did last year,” or “winging it.” Feeling that it would be better for several individuals to be involved in the process, the coordinator “forms a committee.” “Committee members include representatives of teachers of the gifted, coordinators, principals,” and perhaps parents or school board members. After several meetings with committee members, questionnaires are developed “to address concerns.” Most are Likert-type surveys “with a few open-ended questions.” It is perceived to be advantageous if the form is short and the questions few. “Questionnaires are distributed to cooperating teachers, students, and parents.”

The coordinator herself distributes the surveys, collects them, and analyzes results by “tabulating frequencies and percentages, and noting every comment that was made.” Within a month or two of administering the survey, the coordinator shares “results with