Title  TEACHERS AS EVALUATORS:
       A Grounded Approach to Project Evaluation

Name  Marilyn Leask

This is a digitised version of a dissertation submitted to the University of Bedfordshire.
It is available to view only.
This item is subject to copyright.
TEACHERS AS EVALUATORS:

A Grounded Approach to Project Evaluation

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Philosophy.

Marilyn Leask
April 1988

Cambridge Institute of Education

Centre for Applied Research in Education
School of Education
University of East Anglia
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to recognise the contribution of those educational evaluators whose ideas and debates over many years stimulated the development of the teacher-evaluator approach. They are identified throughout the text and many of them contributed directly to the research.

My special thanks go to those colleagues in schools, in the local education authority and in universities, who willingly gave their time to help me in this research and provided documents, interviews, comments and encouragement. The process of doing the research has left me with a particularly deep respect for the teacher-evaluators whose unselfish commitment and dedication to the improvement of education has made this thesis possible.

I would also like to thank my tutors, David Hopkins and Glenda Jones, for their support and encouragement; and my family, without whose patience I could never have completed this work.
ABSTRACT

The aim of the research is to establish the potential of an approach to formative evaluation which utilizes and develops the skills of teachers. This 'teacher-evaluator' approach depends on teachers planning, directing, controlling and carrying out evaluations. A detailed case study of the practice as it developed in one LEA over a three year period was undertaken.

The research contributes to the debate about educational evaluation practice in five areas:

- It advances theory of educational evaluative practices with particular reference to the UK.
- It identifies an approach to evaluation which enhances the professionalism of teachers.
- Through the publication of a detailed case study it promotes the development of theory from the reality of practice.
- It provides the groundwork for forging new links between professional educational evaluators and the teaching profession.
- It defines an approach to evaluation which has the potential to provide timely, relevant, and effective, formative evaluation.

The teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation can be seen as a natural extension of the developing research tradition in the UK which was stimulated by the work of Stenhouse. In the UK, particularly since Stenhouse published his seminal work in 1975, there have been a number of developments in educational evaluation practices particularly in the area of qualitative evaluation through action-research and school self-evaluation. It is the contention of this thesis that the teacher-evaluator
approach fills a gap in this developing teacher-researcher tradition - that of LEA-wide project evaluation by teachers.

Through careful examination of the evidence collected, the significance of this development in the teacher-based research tradition, was analysed and subsequently confirmed. An approach such as this, which hands over the power of evaluation to teachers, is especially relevant in the light of current demands for accountability in education. However, the success and effectiveness of the approach was found to be affected by a variety of issues. These issues are covered in detail in the text and relate to three key areas:

- the framework established for the evaluation which depends on the local context
- the role and responsibilities of the teacher-evaluators
- the methodology and practices adopted

It is considered that this approach provides the framework for a new model of educational evaluation which combines the strengths of professional external evaluation with the knowledge and expertise of teachers, and which provides long term benefits for the LEA.

This case study is presented as a contribution to the development of an educational research tradition which Stenhouse (1975) identifies as essential to the improvement of education. Publication of this research may further stimulate work in this area and thus contribute to the advancement of theories relating to teacher-led evaluation.
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INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The principal aim of the research is to establish the potential of an approach to project evaluation which depends on teachers planning, directing, and carrying out evaluation involving institutions across an LEA. The incipient role of these 'teacher-evaluators' will be defined as will their relationship to professional evaluators and their LEA. Their work will be analysed as will documentary evidence relating to the development of this approach and interviews will be carried out with professional evaluators and staff at all levels of the LEA.

The term 'teacher-evaluator' is used to describe teachers involved in a form of research which is carried out to satisfy the demands of organisations providing funding for education (such as the Manpower Services Commission) and who work outside the framework of their own institutions. The work of teachers researching (for their own interests) in their own classrooms and institutions is already well documented and good practices are established. (Biott and Storey, 1986; Davis, 1981; Elliott J., 1982, 1978a,b; Holly, 1986c,1984; Hopkins, 1985c; Nixon, 1981a,b). The distinction between the role of a teacher as action-researcher and that of teacher-evaluator will be explored in chapter three.
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With the exception perhaps of the USA, writers from a number of countries acknowledge the potential for involving teachers more fundamentally in evaluation: Lewy, Tamir (Israel); Kemmis, Davis, Russell, Fraser, Groundwater-Smith (Australia); Munro (New Zealand); Stenhouse, Simons, McCabe, MacDonald, Burgess, Elliott, Hopkins and Holly (U.K) among others.

However although these writers have recognised the potential for involving teachers in research and evaluation a clear definition of the appropriate methodology and outline of the role of teachers working outside their own classrooms and institutions is yet to emerge. In the thesis, the subject is explored in relation to the history of evaluation and existing models of evaluation with a particular emphasis on the appropriateness of this approach to the British context. Criteria established from the literature and the research is used to assess the strengths and shortcomings of the approach.

FORMAT OF THE THESIS

In chapter two, the national and local context which led to the development of the approach and its adoption in one LEA is outlined. In the seventies, Stenhouse (1975) developed the concept of the 'teacher as researcher' and much developmental work in educational evaluation stems from his writings. However, the educational scene has changed considerably from the seventies when Stenhouse wrote his
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seminal work. Education in Britain is facing demands for more accountability, and funding is given for specific curriculum projects which must, as part of a contract, be evaluated. The specific conditions leading to the development of the approach in one local authority are examined in this chapter and the characteristics of the teacher-evaluator approach are defined.

Chapter three contains a review of the literature available to the researcher. The purpose of this chapter is to establish the importance of the research in relation to present knowledge. The history of the development of evaluation practices is outlined, the teacher-evaluator approach is set in the context of recognised models of evaluation, the role of the teacher in evaluation and research is explored and criteria for good practice in evaluation are established.

The methodology relating to data collection for the research is detailed in chapter four. A case study approach has been adopted and the limitations of the research methodology will be explored. Individual interviews, questionnaires and document analysis feature as the principal methods by which data for the research was collected. Educationalists with an interest in evaluation but from different backgrounds were interviewed in order to establish their views of the validity and effectiveness of the teacher-evaluator approach. Questionnaires were administered to those who received the teacher-evaluators' reports and these reports were analysed to reveal limitations of the approach.
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Chapter five contains a detailed explanation of the process followed during the research. The development of the research design from the initial hypotheses and the subsequent modification of both the design and the hypotheses are described. This is followed by an outline of the steps taken to reduce, categorise and organise the data and the processes followed for the drawing and verification of conclusions.

Chapters six, seven and eight present the research findings and the conclusions drawn. The findings are organised under three headings which emerged during the analysis of the data:

- The local context in which the teacher-evaluator approach has developed
- The emerging role of the teacher-evaluator
- Issues relating to practice

The final chapter, chapter nine, summarises the work in the thesis. Development and implementation issues relating to the teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation are outlined followed by an analysis of the significance of this research for educational evaluation practice. In order to provide this information, the strengths, difficulties, complexities and inadequacies of the teacher-evaluator approach have been investigated during the research using data collected from as wide a variety of sources as possible and using criteria for judging the approach which have been published in evaluation literature and obtained from the research. In this way, the contribution which this approach to educational evaluation can make to current practice has been investigated.
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As a result of the research it was found that the teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation had a far wider impact than had been initially thought. As an approach to evaluation it was found to have the potential of providing valid, effective, timely, and relevant evaluation; to enhance the expertise of teachers; and to improve and develop working relationships and communication within an LEA. However, problems and pitfalls have not been ignored and are documented throughout.

It is the contention of this thesis that this approach heralds the growth of a significant new branch of educational evaluation which builds on the traditions established since Stenhouse wrote, in 1975, of the importance of developing a tradition of teacher-based research. The following chapters outline the foundation on which these claims are based.
Chapter 2

CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH CONTEXT

INTRODUCTION

The approach to evaluation addressed by this thesis has been developed in response to national demands for local evaluation of the Technical Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) - a curriculum development project funded by the Manpower Services Commission (MSC). There have been strong political and economic pressures on education in the UK in the nineteen eighties of which the TVEI development has been a part and an understanding of the UK context is necessary to an understanding of the significance of the teacher-evaluator approach to project evaluation.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the reader with a general overview of the national and local context and a brief description of the role and work of teacher-evaluators. These topics are then the subject of detailed analysis in the chapters to follow.

A) NATIONAL CONTEXT

In this section some aspects of the educational scene in the UK in the eighties are considered to show the extent of changes in methods of curriculum development introduced during the past few years and their effect on evaluative practice.
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In 1980, in the Department of Education and Science publication 'The Educational System of England and Wales' (p.11), the mechanism of control of British Education was described thus:

"A distinctive feature of the British Education Service is that responsibility is distributed between Central Government, the local education authorities and the teaching profession."

Two years later, on the twelfth of November 1982, the delicate balance of these three forces was radically altered by the announcement in the House of Commons by the Prime Minister, Mrs Thatcher of the setting up of the Technical Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI). The other parties who shared responsibility for the Education Service were not involved in the decision. This was seen as a challenging departure from tradition.

"...neither teachers nor Local Authorities were consulted before the announcement..."

Times Educational Supplement, 14/10/83, p.12

The Financial Times (12/3/84, p.1) described TVEI as:

"An experiment which could precipitate the greatest change in British Secondary Education since comprehensive reorganisation."

Fennel (1984, p.3) called it 'possibly the biggest change since RSLA or the 1944 Education Act'. With the benefit of a few years hindsight, Fiddy and Stronach (1986a, p.13) claimed TVEI to be:
"One of the most radical endeavours in curriculum development in Great Britain in recent years."

Thus a new era of curriculum development began in the UK. 'Centre-periphery' curriculum development had been the model used for the Nuffield and Schools' Council curriculum innovations of the sixties and seventies. The new model was more complex. Funding was provided from Central Government through the Manpower Services Commission (MSC) a 'quango' which had not previously been involved in secondary education. The usual structures were bypassed. Schemes were to be funded which were developed by the local authorities within criteria set by the MSC. Fiddy and Stronach (1986c, p.ii) attempt to categorise the change:

"It is difficult to know what to call this mixture of centralisation and devolution - perhaps 'participative centralism' will do for the moment."

Without further explanation, it would be difficult to understand why the initiative gained any support at all amongst educationalists as they had been ignored and bypassed. The economic climate was the key factor. The late seventies and early eighties were a time of 'unprecedented cuts' (Fiddy and Stronach, 1986a, p.13). The incentive this provided for LEAs to apply for TVEI funding was acknowledged in the Times Educational Supplement (14/10/83, p.12):

"Most authorities showed interest not least because of the large sums of money the Manpower services Commission was offering to set the projects up."
This change in the mechanics of curriculum innovation was to have a profound effect on evaluation in this country. In response to the climate of accountability in education, evaluation was made an integral part of the scheme.

This evaluation was planned to take place on two levels - national and local. The national evaluation was to comprise a summative evaluation and special studies which were to be formative. The local evaluations were meant to be formative and to particularly aid dissemination across an LEA. Tenne (1985, p.131) writing for the MSC describes the evaluation plans:

"...an initiative-wide programme of evaluation directly mounted and funded by the MSC over the lifetime of the Initiative and addressing broad themes. This evaluation will offer summative assessment of the scheme and of its impact on the school curriculum and students' achievements.

Special studies addressing specific issues of general interest. In the main, these studies will be action-led aiming to influence developments and promote good practice on the scheme.

Local evaluation of individual LEA projects, aiming to aid the development of TVEI at local level and to help in dissemination of the scheme across the LEA."

At national level, the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) and Leeds University were involved. Although the impact of this work was not a focus of this research the comments made by interviewees indicated that there had been no formative effect on the practice in schools. The effect on planning and decision making at authority level was not investigated.
Fiddy and Stronach (1986a, p. 14) comment on the contractual nature of the local evaluation:

"Part of the contractual obligation for each participant LEA was that they should engage in some form of local independent evaluation - paid for out of their MSC funds. The recommendation from the MSC was that a minimum of 1% of the annual budget should be allocated to local evaluation."

Hamilton (1976, p. 89) had predicted just such a change in evaluation and curriculum development as early as 1976 foreseeing that if the centre-periphery model of curriculum development was abandoned and curriculum development should 'go local':

"... then many of the operating assumptions used by evaluators would need to be revised .... Given the diversity that grass-roots schemes promote, it would also be much more difficult to use postal questionnaires and standardised tests - both of which presume a relatively undifferentiated target population."

Hamilton's work suggests then, that there is a need for a fundamental change in approaches to evaluation in the present educational scene.

At the local level the response to the demand for evaluation has been varied. Baines (1986) identifies three common responses which LEAs have made to this demand:

- The appointment of a full-time researcher (only part of this funding is provided by the project)
- An LEA employee (or former employee) given a part-time or short term evaluation brief.
- A researcher or team from an institution of higher education
The teacher-evaluator approach is a fourth, as yet unrecognised and unpublicised response to the demand for local evaluation.

As part of the research, evaluators for more than half of the TVEI schemes in England, Scotland and Wales were contacted to find out how they were carrying out these evaluations and if they were involving teachers in the process of evaluation. There appeared to widespread but random use of teachers. Some reported the use of B.Ed. and M.A. students; a number had teacher-fellows seconded from the authority carrying out work under their supervision; some were teachers working completely on their own and some were researchers with no real contact with the teachers in the authority except as objects of the evaluation. There was much dissatisfaction over the level of funding, the expectations of the LEAs and equally the resistance of LEAs to use evaluation findings. As one evaluator commented:

"The TVEI evaluation is seen as a ritual with no real function."

There was a high level of interest in the teacher-evaluator approach and a number of evaluators mentioned either that they had been considering a similar approach or that they would like to involve teachers in a more formal way.
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Conclusions

There have been radical changes in British State Education in the eighties and the forces for change are as yet still gathering strength. Political and economic pressures have brought about changes in methods of curriculum development which in turn have required the development of different approaches to evaluation. These two factors have particularly influenced the evolution of the teacher-evaluator approach and will be examined in more detail in chapter three.

B) LOCAL CONTEXT

The local authority in which the teacher-evaluator approach was adopted and is still being developed is the London Borough of Enfield. This authority pre-empted the MSC insistence that one per cent of the project budget was to be spent on evaluation by instigating negotiations in the first year of the scheme for the funding of an evaluation. This indicates an pre-existing innovative attitude within the LEA.

The LEA's initial application was for a MSC funded evaluation to be carried out by a full-time evaluator from an institute of higher education over the remaining four years of the project. However this plan 'had to be revised in accordance with the reduced level of funding now available' (London Borough of Enfield, 20/7/84, p.1) and a second application was submitted. This was jointly devised by a professional evaluator and the LEA Secondary Adviser.
This second plan was for an evaluation consisting of two parts: an eighteen month 'external evaluation' using a full-time evaluator who was to prepare staff (teacher-evaluators) to carry out an 'Internal Evaluation'. When the eighteen month period expired, this 'Internal Evaluation' was to continue for the duration of the project and was to be done by teachers in the LEA with the support of an institute of higher education and a seconded teacher. This plan was put together in a brief space of time but was based on the professional evaluator's experience of supporting teacher-research in schools. This flexibility in negotiations with the MSC was made possible by the supportive devolution of power within the LEA. Decisions of this nature did not have to go through several committees but could be made by the adviser in the knowledge that the decisions would be supported at a higher level.

The existing climate in the LEA was also conducive to the establishing of a teacher-based approach to evaluation. Since the early eighties, within the LEA, an 'increasing emphasis had been placed on cross-school and cross-curricular group formation as a strategy of staff and curriculum development' (Gill, 1984, p.86). Gill (1984, p.87) goes on to say:

"The Authority had examined the feasibility of officer-led teacher working groups. It recognised the potential of a cross-institutional group acting at Authority level for creating new curriculum initiatives and facilitating staff and organisational development."
This willingness to try new methods of working was not limited to the LEA officers and advisers. Gill notes 'a willingness of many teachers to be involved in staff development' (ibid., p.87). It was within this supportive and open framework that the teacher-evaluator approach was to operate.

The ethics and methodology of the external evaluation were also adopted for the internal evaluation and were set out clearly in the contract which the LEA made with the MSC:

"The evaluation will be formative (in the sense of informing both the development programme and future policy) and responsive to the needs and issues of the programme, these to be identified by participating personnel and other groups who can be said to have a legitimate interest in the programme such as parents, employers and educators in the field. ....

Data and evidence will be obtained through a variety of methods both qualitative and quantitative where appropriate and will include interview, meetings, analysis of pupils' work and progress and questionnaire.

Sources will include meetings, documents, conferences, workshops, participating and non-participating institutions and personnel.

Access to and release of information for reporting the evaluation will be governed by the principles of independence, confidentiality, impartiality and negotiation ...

Reporting is likely to take a number of forms.....

The range of audiences the evaluation will serve is a matter for negotiation between the evaluator, the TVEI evaluation working party and the LEA administration ...."

London Borough of Enfield, 20/7/84, p.2
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Structures were set up within the LEA to support the evaluation. Initially an evaluation working party was set up. The supporting structures were more formally developed by the beginning of the second internal phase. This was due principally to the increase in evaluation in the LEA with TRIST and GRIST evaluation also taking place. Three structures were set up: a Borough Evaluation Steering Group, a TVEI Evaluation Advisory Group, a teacher secondment.

The Borough Evaluation Steering Group was set up in the Autumn 1986 with a membership consisting of LEA officers, advisers, and representatives from secondary schools and further education. Their terms of reference are to oversee all evaluation initiatives within the LEA, to ensure the schools are not overburdened with evaluations and that ethical guidelines are adhered to. Details of the role are included in the next section.

The TVEI Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG) is more directly involved with the teacher-evaluators' work. This group has the authority to:

"act with the delegated power of the local authority to
a) make recommendations to the seconded teacher about
issues to be researched and b) approve/validate pieces
of completed research"

extract from a letter from the Secondary Adviser
to the seconded teacher, 8/4/86
Its membership is made up of the Secondary Adviser, Secondary Advisory Teacher, a TVEI school co-ordinator, a head teacher, a representative from further education, teacher-evaluators, the teacher seconded to support the evaluation and a member of the TVEI Central Support Team. This group also takes decisions about the distribution of reports and supports the organisation of training sessions.

The role of the teacher seconded to support the teacher-evaluators' work is flexible to allow for an academic course of study to be pursued but the principal features are those of providing support for and organising the selection and training of teacher-evaluators together with the production and distribution of reports. Clerical support for this work is provided by the LEA although there have been practical problems in allocating staff which have delayed production of evaluation reports.

Conclusions

The supportive devolution of decision making within the LEA has been one of the features producing a climate where change, development and experimentation with new approaches can take place. It allowed speed of response in negotiations with the MSC where rapid decision taking was essential if funding was to be obtained. Other aspects of the working atmosphere within the LEA e.g. the use of cross-institutional working groups in developing the curriculum were also supportive of the development of the teacher-evaluator approach. Given that
not all LEAs have engendered such a supportive atmosphere the question of the replicability of the approach to other LEAs is an important one and will be explored in chapter six where the detailed research findings on the local context are presented.

C) CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TEACHER-EVALUATOR APPROACH

Important characteristics of the local context have been touched on in the previous section. The purpose of this section is to provide a general outline of the work and role of the teacher evaluators. Detailed research findings relating to these two aspects of the approach are presented in chapters seven and eight.

Teacher-evaluators are practising teachers who work together in cross-institutional teams on evaluative investigations. They are of varied status and have carried out the work voluntarily and to a large extent in their spare time.

There are four levels of involvement and teachers can be involved in all or any of the stages:

- planning an investigation
- collecting data
- writing up the report (usually a team effort)
- leading a team of teacher-evaluators working on an investigation

Initial training in evaluation techniques has been usually provided by external consultants and repeated at intervals for those newly involved. As the teachers have become more
experienced through having completed investigations they have taken on more responsibility.

The teachers work within agreed ethical guidelines but have considerable control over the scope of the investigation and in choosing appropriate methods for carrying it out. It is recognised that they undertake areas of work which are achievable given the constraints on their time.

To date, November 1987, the teacher-evaluators have produced the following reports:

- In-service training
- Profiling
- Recruitment
- Work Experience
- Gender Issues No.1
- Recruitment (for September 1986)
- The Assignment-Based Curriculum
- TVEI: A wider curriculum
- The Residential Experience
- Introduction of New Schemes
- Technical/Vocational Options: some issues

and three investigations are in progress:

- Technical/Vocational Options: the experience of pupils from a Special Needs School
- TVEI and the special needs of mainstream pupils
- Gender Issues No.2

one investigation was abandoned because of poor planning:

- The Sixth Form Extension Programme

These reports are confidential to the LEA but are usually widely circulated with over one hundred and fifty copies being produced. Issues relating to the circulation of reports and dissemination of findings will be raised in chapter eight.
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CONCLUSIONS

The teacher-evaluator approach was a response by one LEA to the demands for the evaluation of a particular curriculum innovation at a particular point in the history of the Education Service in the UK.

In the next chapter, evaluation literature will be reviewed so that the approach may be located in its historical context. Generally accepted criteria for good practice in evaluation will be identified so that the contribution that this approach can make to knowledge of evaluative practice can be fully examined.
CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW
CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the potential of the teacher-evaluator approach will be examined by reference to evaluation literature informing present practices and evaluative techniques.

In the introductory chapter four main issues relevant to the research were identified:

A) the historical context which led to the development of the teacher-evaluator approach.

B) the relationship of this approach to existing models of evaluation.

C) the role of the teacher in evaluation and research.

D) the establishing of criteria for good practice in evaluation.

This chapter is divided into four sections for the purpose of examining each of these issues although it is acknowledged that the divisions are superficial and the issues interrelated. The conclusions to this chapter will summarise current views on areas relevant to the research in order to identify the contribution which the research can make to the present body of knowledge.
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A) HISTORICAL CONTEXT

English language publications covering educational evaluation have tended to come from the UK, USA, Israel or Australia and so reference to evaluation in the following sections will concentrate on practice in these countries. Particular reference will be made to work in the UK and the USA as most of the literature stems from work there. Similarities and contrasts will be drawn largely between these two educational systems and the methods used for educational evaluation.

Firstly the historical development of educational evaluation practices will be reviewed so that the teacher-evaluator approach can be viewed in context. Secondly the historical changes in two areas which it is argued have particularly affected the development of evaluative practices will be examined. These are the areas of autonomy and accountability in education. It will be argued that changes in these areas in particular affect the practice of educational evaluation and, consequently will affect the transferability and acceptability of the teacher-evaluator approach.

1) The history of educational evaluation

In spite of some fundamental differences which will be outlined in the next section, theories of educational evaluation on both sides of the Atlantic have developed along similar lines.
In this section, impetus for change in the field of educational evaluation will be linked with curriculum development and political influences which particularly affect funding and the extent to which education is ‘called to account’ (Nisbet, 1984; Simons, 1984b; Plowden Report, 1967; among others). The historical outline in this section is limited in that it traces changes in evaluation methodology from which the teacher-evaluator approach has developed in the UK and largely ignores other approaches to educational evaluation which are practised today in the UK.

Distinct but overlapping phases in educational evaluation have been identified by a number of writers (Stenhouse, 1984; Simons, 1984b; Nixon, 1981a; Stufflebeam, 1985; among others). In each phase there appears to be an alteration in the role of evaluation which is demonstrated by changes in three areas: the methodology adopted, the central concerns of the evaluation (an indication of the dominant interests represented) and the intended audience for the evaluation.

There appears to be wide agreement on the approximate timing of the first three phases. The fourth phase which is identified covers the present period and so publications are still limited in their coverage of this phase.

Phase one, which could be called the ‘ad-hoc’ phase in the UK, covers the period up to the early sixties. Educational evaluation was carried out largely on a voluntary basis by university lecturers and research students and of course by
Chapter 3A

HMI (Nisbet, 1984) and there was no identifiable common methodology or purpose. By contrast in the US Ralph Tyler's objectives based evaluation model was gaining wide acceptance (Harlen, 1978; Lewy, 1977).

The 'objectives' approach based on the work of Tyler, Krathwohl and Bloom was imported into the UK for the second phase (MacDonald and Parlett, 1973). This covers the period of curriculum development in the sixties which was principally funded by the Nuffield Foundation and which Becher (1984) identifies as the beginning of systematic curriculum development in the UK. McCormick and James (1983) regard this period as one of significant growth for educational evaluation (in both the UK and USA).

Evaluation of the new curricular initiatives was not initially an inherent part of project design but there was a gradual realisation 'that evaluation was a necessary institutional part of curriculum development' (Hamilton, 1976, p.32). The cost of developing new educational programmes in both the UK and the USA led to demands for accountability which resulted in evaluation becoming higher priority (Fullan, 1981; Travers, 1983; McCormick and James, 1983; MacDonald and Parlett, 1973). The 'objectives' model of evaluation which was imported and adopted, was based on the assessment of achievement of stated educational objectives and the central concerns were with student performance. However, reservations were soon expressed about the relevance of this model to the situation in this country.
Both MacDonald and Holt identify the model as a 'cultural artifact' of the USA (Holt, 1981, p.35; MacDonald, 1976, p.129) but it must be acknowledged that others in the UK support the approach (Wiseman and Pidgeon, 1970; Cope and Gray, 1979) and during this period the Assessment of Performance Unit was set up using the methodology of the objectives model to measure pupil performance in different areas of the curriculum (McCormick and James, 1983). Becher views the setting up of the APU as stemming from a political demand for evidence about standards (Becher, 1984, p.107).

Nisbet (1984) views these developments as bringing about changes in the role of evaluation from that of a subordinate one to one where evaluation became an instrument of power and control. The setting up of the Schools Council and the Scottish Consultative Committee on the Curriculum at this time had particular significance for the development of evaluation theory. The curriculum development work of these bodies and the growing dissatisfaction with previous evaluation methods (Hamilton, 1976; Simons, 1984b; Stenhouse, 1984; Skilbeck, 1984) was to stimulate changes in the role of evaluation leading to the third phase.

This third phase, labelled the 'Age of Professionalism' extends from the early to the late seventies (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 1985). At this time evaluation journals were established and books about evaluation began to appear. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1985) note the development of the
idea of meta-evaluation as a means of assuring and checking the quality of evaluation. In the UK views that the psychometric approach was too limited were leading to the development of new approaches to evaluation. This reassessment of evaluation methods led to the 1972 evaluation conference at Churchill College, Cambridge, as a result of which the 'illuminative' method of evaluation gained support. The ideas of involving teachers in research and evaluation can be seen to have stemmed from this change in emphasis. (Stenhouse, 1975, 1984; Becher, 1984; Nisbet, 1984). Examples are found in Lawrence Stenhouse's (1975) articulation of potential for the 'teacher as researcher', Barry MacDonald's evaluation of the Humanities Curriculum Project, the Ford Teaching Project (1975) and the work of the National Association of Teachers of English.

Becher (1984, pp.100-103) identifies the audience for the evaluation of this period as teachers, politicians and the public. The central concerns were with 'professional values' and 'on the assessment of educational products'. However evaluators were becoming concerned about the processes involved in education. Ensuring the relevance of an evaluation to the practitioners and working together with those being evaluated emerged as aspects of the new role for evaluation. The development of evaluation by and as a tool for the teaching profession (Nixon, 1981a) is a feature of the next phase.
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The fourth phase, of devolution of evaluation to local level, begins in the early eighties. Nixon (1981a, p.34) describes this period:

"The era of the large, centralised curriculum research and development projects is, for better or worse, in the past. Local, school-based research which responds to the immediate needs of the teacher is now the order of the day."

Evaluation skills were becoming part of the professional equipment of the teacher. Nixon (1981a) notes that many degree and certificate course for teachers include research and evaluation techniques and thus provide a firm theoretical base from which the evaluation work of teachers can be established.

This is the phase of expansion of school self-evaluation (Nisbet, 1984) which many see as a response to the call for accountability in the 1977 Green Paper "Education in Schools" (Holt, 1981). The economic squeeze of the mid-seventies and eighties where 'value for money' was a demand is seen to have resulted in demands for accountability at all levels and led to the evaluation of institutions as well as the curriculum. (Holt, 1981; Becher, 1984; Hamilton, 1976) These evaluations have involved teachers working singly or in teams often with the guidance of an outsider.
Nisbet (1984, p.166) regards this period as one of opportunity for the integration of evaluation into the educational context. In his words, it is a time of:

"breaking of boundaries which have built up around evaluation, so that it can take its proper place in the educational system, thus putting evaluation into its proper context."

Simons (1984b, p.48) supports this view of the integration of evaluation. She considers evaluation is becoming:

"to some extent, a formal pre-occupation of all system personnel. Teachers, local administrators and advisers, national administrators, and HMI are all evaluating more systematically or being exhorted to do so."

Becher (1984, p.100) considers the central concerns of evaluation in this phase to be 'questions of curricular and managerial structure' with an important audience being those responsible for resources. He views the role of the evaluator as much more affected by political values than had previously been perceived. Similar changes in the role of evaluations have occurred in other countries.

In the US, the move to make evaluation more relevant and democratic has led to the 'stakeholder' approach (Weiss, 1986a,b) with the widest possible audience being involved in the evaluation.
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The trend has taken a slightly different tack in Australia where the concept of 'augmented evaluation' has been developed. This is evaluation of projects by the project director with the 'assistance' of an external evaluation consultant. Teachers are used to collect data in schools. A different approach is being developed by Neil Russell (1981, 1982) with evaluations carried out by parents or members of the community.

Conclusions

Political and economic considerations clearly affect both the curriculum and evaluation methods used, and the teacher-evaluator approach is a product of its time as Nisbet's view (1984, p.170) bears out:

"This movement [for teacher participation in evaluation] is gaining strength though some would say it is still struggling to be born."

Donaldson (1984) agrees with Nisbet that the devolution of evaluation to the local level is new and development is still patchy. However, these developments have a great deal of potential for enhancing the professionalism of the teaching profession (Holly, 1986b). They could lead to what McCormick (1982) regards as necessary to the development of the profession - the establishing of a body, such as other professionals have, which monitors and upholds standards of professional practice.

In the next section, the effect on the practice of evaluation of autonomy and demands for accountability will be explored.
2) Autonomy and accountability in education

The history of educational evaluation has been traced in the last section in order to provide the historical context for the development of the teacher-evaluator approach. In this section, changes in the areas of accountability and autonomy will be examined. It is argued that changes in these areas significantly affect the practice and development of educational evaluation.

The English education system, up until the present time has been a 'delicately balanced tripartite system' (MacDonald 1976, p.134; Becher, 1984; D.E.S., 1980). Changes in the last few years have been covered in chapter two. Simons (1984b, p.45) sums up the English situation concisely:

"The English education system is often said to be a 'national system locally administered'. While central government exercises certain constraints on resources and teacher supply, LEAs have the major responsibility for the provision of education and the running of the schools. School principals and teachers, and their professional associations, have a very considerable say in curriculum matters. There are no central syllabuses and few national curriculum specifications. In fact, curriculum in Britain has been controlled less from the centre than in almost any other comparable European society."

It must be noted that there is little doubt that significant changes in this system are expected within the next few years as various new Education Acts are passed by Parliament. However, the above quote is accurate enough for the present time.

This autonomy of teachers and schools in the UK has allowed free development of action-research and school self-evaluation.
over the past ten years. However these relatively new approaches do not seem to have had as significant an effect in the USA. MacDonald (1976, p.129) attributes the differences between the systems to a different 'political vision'. He notes that in the UK uniformity is neither wanted nor trusted - 'goal consensus is neither ardently desired, nor determinedly pursued' (ibid). However in the US, the widespread practice of using psychometric tests to measure pupils' levels of achievement indicates that there is agreement that there can be consensus of possible educational goals (Harlen, 1978; MacDonald, 1976; Fullan, 1981). Stake (1976b, p.21) comments on the extent of this testing:

"In any one year, at least ten per cent of American teachers and pupils are involved, at least for a few minutes, in student achievement testing or institutional self study, as part of a formal evaluation effort."

There has been resistance to psychometric testing in the UK. Fullan (1981, p.326) cites MacDonald in support of his argument that this is due to differing values in the two societies.

"It is no accident that nearly all of the authors classified under the more structured approaches [to evaluation] are North American and those described under the unstructured approaches are British. Barry MacDonald, a Britisher, suggests that differences can be traced to differences in the societal value systems"

These political and value differences have affected the practice of evaluation in the two countries. Simons (1984a, p.56) identifies a 'tradition of informality in this country' which has allowed freedom of operation to evaluators.
Another difference is that public accountability of educational programmes has long been a feature of education in the USA (House, 1980; Stake, 1976b; Hamilton, 1976; MacDonald, 1976) but is a relatively new feature in the UK with many writers tracing the increased demand for it to the 1977 Ruskin Speech of the Prime Minister, James Callaghan and the accompanying Green Paper "Education in Schools" (Lacey and Lawton, 1981; Weiner, 1981; Simons and Humble, 1978; Holt, 1981; Becher, 1984). However, educational systems are not static. Hamilton (1976, p.128) predicted that calls for uniformity of standards in the UK 'will depend on the future health of the British economy' and he forecasts the need for changes in methods of evaluation in response to the new economic climate. Aspects of the changes he predicted have been covered in chapter two.

Conclusions

It is argued that the teacher-evaluator approach is a product of political changes and increasing demands for accountability as predicted by Pring (1984a) and Hamilton (1976) among others. It is a specifically UK response to changes in education and draws on the traditions of autonomy for teachers and institutions and on established traditions of illuminative evaluation in offering an alternative to psychometric testing to prove standards. In the next section different perspectives of educational evaluation will be outlined and the teacher-evaluator approach will be defined within these perspectives.
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B) APPROACHES TO EVALUATION

In the previous section, two major influences on the development of evaluation theory were identified - the objectives orientated approach typified by Tyler's work and the illuminative or naturalistic approach which was the focus of the 1972 Cambridge conference on New Approaches to Evaluation. These two approaches stem from the two fundamentally different paradigms relating to evaluative practice - the 'agricultural-botany paradigm' (Hamilton, 1976, 1977; Parlett and Hamilton, 1977; Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 1985) and the 'social-anthropological' paradigm (Parlett and Hamilton, 1977; Stenhouse, 1979; Miles and Huberman, 1984b; Jenkins, Simons, Walker, 1981).

The aim of this section is to locate the teacher-evaluator approach within the appropriate paradigm. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to analyse all recognised models of evaluation and to compare these with the teacher-evaluator approach - more than twenty-four 'models' of evaluation are identified in the literature and they are often described with insufficient detail to use in any comparison. It is felt that the term 'model' is used far too loosely by those writing about evaluation - the dictionary definition of 'model' is of 'a structure with specific attributes'. Use of the term to describe what is no more than a vague idea on the part of the writer is less than satisfactory. Stake (1976b) also seems to avoid the use of the word in analysing the different ways in which evaluations have been undertaken.
1) Differences between the two paradigms

Parlett and Hamilton's (1977, p.7) description of the agricultural-botany paradigm is concise and to the point:

"The most common form of agricultural-botany type evaluation is presented as an assessment of the effectiveness of an innovation by examining whether or not it has reached required standards on pre-specified criteria. Students—rather like plant crops—are given pre-tests (the seedlings are weighed or measured) and then submitted to different experiences (treatment conditions). Subsequently, after a period of time, their attainment (growth or yield) is measured to indicate the relative efficiency of the methods (fertilisers) used. Studies of this kind are designed to yield data of one particular type, i.e. 'objective' numerical data that permit statistical analyses."

The preoccupations of those following this paradigm are thus with testing over a period of time using pre-specified criteria to obtain proof of the results of the innovation which can be presented statistically. Tyler's work—the objectives orientated approach—is within this paradigm.

Parlett and Hamilton (1977, p.9) contrast this paradigm with the social-anthropological paradigm within which the 'illuminative' approach operates:

"[It] takes account of the wider contexts in which educational programmes function. Its primary concern is with description and interpretation rather than measurement and prediction...the aims...are to study the innovatory programme: how it operates; how it is influenced by the various school situations in which it is applied; what those directly concerned regard as its advantages and disadvantages; and how students' intellectual tasks and academic experiences are most affected. It aims to discover and document what it is like to be participating in the scheme, whether as teacher or pupil; and in addition, to discern and discuss the innovation's most significant features..."
Thus the major concerns of those working within this paradigm are with the processes of an innovation and the experiences of those involved with it. Methods used in reporting on an innovation are those of description rather than measurement and interpretation rather than statistics.

Conclusions

As outlined in chapter two, the work of the teacher-evaluators provides descriptive information about processes at work within the innovation for those involved - measurement and testing of specified objectives are not within their brief.

Thus the teacher-evaluator approach can be seen to fall within the social-anthropological paradigm. In the following section trends within this paradigm will be contrasted with the teacher-evaluator approach.

2) Trends within the socio-anthropological paradigm

There are a number of terms used to describe evaluations carried out within this tradition. Jenkins, Simons, and Walker (1981, p.186) include the various terms "'ethnographic', 'portrayal', 'anthropological', 'responsive', 'illuminative', 'descriptive', 'case study'" in their description of 'naturalistic' evaluation. They go on (ibid, p.170) to describe the method for conducting inquiries as "utilising qualitative/interactive methods of collecting data and descriptive/interpretive modes of reporting".
Within this tradition, there has developed a number of trends which utilize particular perspectives. The following developments preceded the development of the teacher-evaluator approach and the approach has been built on the theories which have been developed from them.

Lawrence Stenhouse's (1975) 'teacher as researcher' work and the development of action-research in education through John Elliott's (1975) work on the Ford Teaching Project resulted in the subsequent setting up of CARN - the Classroom Action-Research Network. This work developed recognition of the role the teacher could play in researching within the classroom.

Barry MacDonald (1977) in exploring the notion of 'democratic evaluation' defines key concepts of evaluation as 'confidentiality, negotiation and accessibility' (Kushner and Norris, 1981, p.28). Stake (1974, p.1) develops the idea of 'responsive evaluation'. He applies this to evaluations which:

"orient more directly to programme activities than to programme intents, if it yields information the audiences want, and if value-standards of staff and significant others are taken into account. In these three separate ways an evaluation study can be responsive."

Classroom research and school self-evaluation methods are usually based on educational action-research techniques developed by those working within this paradigm. It is argued that the teacher-evaluator role where the teacher is involved in LEA wide evaluation, complements present developments within this paradigm.
Conclusions

It is argued that the teacher-evaluator approach fills a gap in the development of evaluative practice within the social-anthropological paradigm. This idea will be further developed in the next section.

Although the teacher-evaluator approach shares a common methodology and philosophical perspective to the action-research work described above, it expands the role of teachers in evaluation - the scope is wide - across the LEA; and the issues are broad - a project implemented across a number of schools. It hands over the power of evaluation to the teachers to use in the development of the curriculum. These issues will be further discussed in the next section which examines the role of the teacher in evaluation and research.
C) THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER IN EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

"People rarely pass harsh judgements on friends."

Fitzgibbon, 1985, p.20

"evaluation ....initiated by insiders, owned by insiders, and carried out by insiders and outsiders working co-operatively (is) an ideal arrangement for 'meaningful and effective evaluation' of a school programme."

Lovegrove in Davis, 1981, p.43

These quotes illustrate the diversity of viewpoint over the involvement of teachers in evaluation. Some writers hold the view that only 'outsider' evaluations are independent and thus have any credibility while others state that the independence of an outsider evaluator is illusory. Furthermore, a number of authors go on to say that most 'professional evaluations' are irrelevant, having no effect on educational practice and that the involvement of teachers is essential if evaluation is to be used to improve educational practices at all (Holly, 1986a; Simons, 1971).

Since Simons (1971) wrote of the need for involving teachers in evaluation, the action-research movement has become established with teachers researching their work in the classroom and institutional self-evaluation techniques being developed and used. However, in the wider context of project evaluations, the 'professional evaluators' have dominated.

While many professional evaluators recognise the need for the involvement of teachers, this involvement often takes the form
of using teachers just to collect data (Elliott, 1985b; Lewy, 1977). The evaluation design, the analysis of data and the reporting of results remains in the domain of the professional.

In this section of the literature review the arguments for and against the involvement of teachers in research and evaluation will be considered. Firstly, the potential role of the teacher-evaluator will be compared with that of the professional evaluator and secondly it will be contrasted with that of the teacher as action-researcher.

**Definitions**

Educational research and educational evaluation share many techniques and thus problems, in common. Unless it is stated otherwise, comments about one are assumed to also refer to the other. The term 'insider' is used to refer to anyone in the permanent employ of the local authority in which the evaluation is taking place. The term 'outsider' will be used to refer to a professional from higher education carrying out evaluation or research. Lewy (1985) and Lovegrove (in Davis, 1981) define insiders as those who work in the particular school in which the evaluation is taking place.

As this research is taking place in the context of an authority-wide project, the term has been extended to include those in the permanent employ of the authority. However as Biott (1981) points out, the terms 'insider' and 'outsider' are not entirely satisfactory as an 'insider' may be
intimately involved with the project being evaluated or may be
distanced from it - the common link being through involvement
in the institution or LEA in which the evaluation takes place.

1) Teacher-evaluators or professional evaluators

The debate about the role which teachers (insiders) can play
in evaluating educational activities centres on the perceived
strengths and weaknesses of the professional evaluators
(outsiders) approach to date rather than actual accounts of
what teachers have achieved in evaluation.

Issues occupying those who have written about these topics
fall into four major categories:

- the relevance of 'professional' evaluations to
  teachers,
- the difficulties of gaining access and detailed
  knowledge of the object of the evaluation,
- the need for independence of an evaluation,
- restrictions on the role of teachers in educational
  evaluations.

i) Relevance

"In this country the widely acknowledged failure of
educational research to have impact on teaching practice
has implications for a curriculum development movement
which makes considerable use of educational research
techniques and styles."

Simons, 1971, p.119
Professional evaluators have been harsh critics of the effect of their evaluations in promoting change. Many evaluators express dissatisfaction with the outcomes of evaluations and acknowledge the 'irrelevance' of much professional research (Burgess, 1980a; MacDonald, 1976; McNamara, 1980; House, 1986; Harlen, 1978; Weiss, 1986b; Simons, 1971; Wilcox, 1981). Evaluations may be well designed and carried out but it is felt there is little evidence of impact on educational practices. Reasons given for this situation include the views that the professionals have other aims than the improvement of educational practice. Weiss (1986b, p.148) suggests that many have a 'primary commitment to the canons of social science' and are out of touch with classroom and school situations.

However those that see the remedy for this as involving teachers, suggest roles for the teacher which are restricted to classroom or school (Holly, 1986; Lovegrove in Davis, 1981; Stenhouse, 1980; Black and Geiser, 1971; Simons, 1971; Holly, 1986b). Burgess (1984) and Cooper (1975) are among the few authors to write of the potential of a cross-institutional teacher-evaluator approach.

Thus lack of relevance is a widely acknowledged problem for educational evaluations and while theories are devised proposing solutions to the problem little evidence is produced of successful practices which have produced more relevant evaluations.
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ii) Access to knowledge

"outsiders can never completely penetrate the private knowledge of insiders."

Elliott, 1984, p.23

"...will researchers recognise patterns in a society in which they are thoroughly acculturated? Are there problems in selecting what to study? Will researchers give full coverage to situations with which they are already familiar?"

Burgess, 1984, p.22

The debate over the relative merits of an insider or an outsider evaluation is carried through into the area of access to information.

Detailed knowledge of the object of the evaluation is clearly essential before any report can be written (Munro, 1977; House, 1980) yet professional evaluators comment that it is far too easy for their access to information to be restricted (Eraut, 1984; Macdonald, 1982; Burgess, 1984; Adelman, 1984). Smetheram (1978, p.101) suggests that "insider research may be expected to place the participant in an advantageous position from which to assess 'what kind of truth' is being told." and Harlen (1978) argues that an outsider is automatically excluded from acquiring this knowledge. Others acknowledge the advantage of the insider but argue that an insider has an unacceptably narrow perspective (Burgess, 1984 on the work of M.N.Srinivas). A joint approach involving both insiders and outsiders in an evaluation is seen by some to be one way of overcoming these problems and drawing on strengths possessed
by both insiders and outsiders (Lewy, 1985; Davis, 1981; Rudduck, 1981).

The issue of access to information and the success of any evaluation is also linked with issues of ethics and the establishing of trust. Pring (1984a) acknowledges that the establishment of an atmosphere of trust is essential to the work of an external evaluator and this must apply equally to an internal evaluator. Internal evaluation could have a very long term effect—skills and experiences, both positive and negative affect working relationships in the LEA or institution. Thus issues concerning the maintenance of trust and confidentiality are of prime importance to the internal evaluator.

The effect on the style of an evaluation of the different problems of the insider and the outsider will be explored in later chapters.

(iii) Independence

"Too often, evaluators do merely what sponsors want them to do."

House, 1980, p.15

An independent stance is often assumed to be an integral part of the outsider's approach to evaluation but in reality maintaining independence from the sponsors of the evaluation is difficult (Stenhouse, 1984). House (1980) and McCabe (1985) talk of evaluators being 'co-opted' into the project.
being evaluated and Simons (1984a) mentions that 'pressure' is brought to bear on external evaluators. Walker (1977a, p.22) identifies another pressure that concerns an outsider:

"The academic researcher ... worries about his reputation"

Insiders involved in evaluation might be expected to face pressures to reveal information, only to investigate certain issues or to perform in such a way as to enhance their own career prospects however little has been written about their experience or work (Holly, 1984; Holly in Biott and Storey, 1986; Summing, 1986). Their objectivity is also considered suspect (Stufflebeam, 1971). Loucks (1982, p.1) takes the view that it's "difficult for people too close and committed to a new programme ... to be objective" and Davis (1981, p.57) says there is a likelihood that the perceived lack of independence of an insider evaluation could lead to it being 'discounted by an audience'. Yet Cousins and Leithwood (1986, p.353) in a review of a number of evaluation projects over fifteen years found this was not the case:

"All relationships that were reported suggested that internal evaluations were more useful than external evaluations."

Adelman (1984a, p.52) develops this point. He identifies three types of evaluation procedures, only one of which is an 'internal evaluation'. He expresses the view that "In this type of evaluation, the evaluators are considered as 'bought'
by those in power". However, little real evidence is presented
which is actually based in the practice of 'insiders'. The
question of independence and objectivity in insider
evaluations is one focus of the research.

The notion of freedom from value judgement is often linked
with the idea of the inherent independence and detached
viewpoint of the outsider. Burgess (1980a, p.165) describes a
school of thought which holds that ideal educational
researchers are 'outsiders to schools and to the teaching
profession' - the implication being that these people are
somehow more objective and value-free. MacDonald (1976),
Harlen (1978), Hamilton (1976), and House (1980) are emphatic
in their views that no evaluation is value free.

If all evaluations are seen as arising from value judgements,
then the outside evaluator can hardly claim to be more value
free than the insiders. Moreover, there is the possibility
that an insider's values will be known to the audience
whereas the outsider may remain unknown at the personal level
and his/her value judgements less easy to identify.

(iv) Restricting the role of the teacher

Stenhouse (1976a, p.1) fully supports the involvement of
teachers in research and is confident of their skills: 'no
theoretically disposed teacher can be regarded as a layman'.
However, he identifies a deliberate belittling of the
teachers' role by some academics:
"In the lucrative area of education, the contributing disciplines (which have few outlets to applied fields) exercise a protection racket. You can see their theoretical muscles ripple beneath their jackets. They want educational data to make theories in which teachers are laymen."

Stenhouse, 1976a, p. 3

Stufflebeam (1985) writing in the US context, does not appear to be in sympathy with this approach. He lists a formidable list of skills needed by evaluators and supports the view that they should be trained professionals. Yet Lyons (1981) exposes the minimal training which appears to have been necessary for Schools Council evaluators in this country. Teachers could be just as easily trained. Harlen (1978) is supportive of Stenhouse’s views on the potential for teacher involvement but both are vague on the training which would be appropriate. The issue of appropriate training for teacher-evaluators is discussed in the research findings.

The gap between academics and teachers has still to be successfully bridged (Carr and Kemmis, 1986). Holly (1986b) can claim some success with his notion of a ‘professional evaluation’ but he, as does Stenhouse, still sees the role of the teacher as confined to classroom or institution. Nixon (1981a, p.33) talks of those outside the classroom making only ‘a token gesture’ towards recognising the potential of teachers in research situations. Harlen (1978) puts the difficulties down to the tradition that has grown up for the outsider approach. However Hamilton (1976, p.130) puts the resistance down to a more basic cause - a fear of loss of employment on the part of professional evaluators:
"If these trends become widespread .... then professional evaluators may cease to exist in their present form."

Restriction of the teachers' role in evaluation and research places restrictions on professional development which is seen as an important outcome of teacher involvement in evaluation (McCormick and James, 1983; Eraut, 1976, 1977; Stenhouse, 1975, 1980; Day, 1985). Shostak (1980) takes this one step further in suggesting that it is the duty of the professional teacher to evaluate their work according to established criteria.

Conclusions

A recognition of the strengths of both insiders and outsiders and the development of a combined approach is possibly a way forward for educational evaluation which could overcome the problems of relevance, difficulties with access and credibility which have just been outlined.

Stenhouse (1975, p.162) had a clear vision of what was needed.

"I believe that fruitful development in the field of curriculum and teaching depends on evolving styles of co-operative research by teachers and using full-time researchers to support the teachers' work."

Action-research and school self-evaluation were two methods of evaluation and research which developed from the ideas of the
early seventies. It is argued in this thesis that the teacher-evaluator approach is another logical, if later, development. The ways in which action-research and the teacher-evaluator approach differ are traced in the next section.

2) Action-research and the teacher-evaluator approach

The purpose of this section is to establish the differences between the teacher-evaluator approach and the practices which have developed under the heading 'action-research'.

"Evaluation serves decisions about educational provision. It does so by observing and describing educational programmes. Evaluators make known, to those who have legitimate claims upon their services, something of the circumstances, values, processes and effects of educational programmes."

MacDonald, 1977, p.50

"Action-research is concerned with everyday practical problems experienced by practitioners......The aim of action-research is to deepen the practitioners' understanding (diagnosis) of his problem."

Elliott, 1978a, p.1

These two quotes illustrate some of the basic differences between educational action-research and evaluation, namely differences of focus, scope and audience. Other important differences between the two approaches are in the areas of accountability, political implications, methodology and outcomes.
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The phrase 'educational' action-research is used because, as David Hopkins (1986c, p.5) points out, the practice of action-research in education today differs from Lewin's original ideas of action research:

"...Lewin's conception of action research is very different from what is currently going on in the name of educational action research. Lewin's concept of action research was (i) as an externally initiated intervention designed to assist a client system, (ii) functionalist in orientation, and (iii) prescriptive in practice. None of these features apply to what I assume to be the contemporary nature of action research by teachers which is characterised by its practitioner, problem solving and eclectic orientation."

Action-research has a narrower focus than evaluation - that of 'problematic aspects of practice' which arise in either the classroom or in the school (Elliott, 1985b, p.243). Holly (1986c, p.1) describes this as a 'short-term focus' - a comment he makes not to denigrate action-research but in recognition of the strengths of action-research. The focus of an evaluation is necessarily wider.

Evaluation has an informative and descriptive function as well as problem-solving role (Harlen, 1978). The teacher-evaluations forming the subject of the research have embraced this wider purview and have tended to be 'issue focused' - covering areas of interest to sponsors and audience as well as problem focused.
The teacher-evaluators are responsible to a different audience from that of action-researchers. The audience for action-research findings can be as small as to be limited to one other person (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1982) or to the whole school staff whereas teacher-evaluators, as with outside evaluators, report to staff at all levels in the LEA (Simons, 1971). This affects the reporting style and procedures for the dissemination of findings which are more formalised than is necessary for action-research work (McCormick and James, 1983).

Although some action-researchers publish their work for academic purposes, this is not an essential feature of action-research whereas the teacher-evaluator reports although confidential to the LEA are widely distributed to participants and non-participants of the project.

This wide distribution means that political implications of the teacher-evaluators' work are potentially more serious than for that of action-researchers. While it is recognised that action-research can be damaging and divisive within schools (Cumming, 1986; Simons, 1971; Holly, 1984), the teacher-evaluators' work is more publicly exposed and thus potentially more damaging for pupils, staff, schools and LEAs. This
damage could be to pupils who might be identified, to the careers of individual teachers, for the schools which are brought to LEA attention, and for the LEA when those not in the education service, newspapers for example, obtain reports which were intended to be formative and confidential within the authority. Teacher-evaluators are publicly accountable whereas action-research can be 'private' and contained within the institution (Holly, 1986c).

The methodology adopted by both approaches is similar, being of the naturalistic, eclectic variety. However, the teacher-evaluator approach relies on co-operative team work across institutions. This approach imposes checks and balances on the work of any individual whereas in action-research 'the individual teacher practitioner lies at the heart of the action-research process ....The process is highly personal and highly personalised.' (Holly, 1986c p.1).

The outcomes of the two processes vary. 'Action" is an integral part of action-research. The aim is that something will be changed as a result of the research; whereas any change resulting from the teacher-evaluators' work depends on the audience taking up the challenge of the report findings. This could be a flaw in this approach and the implications will be discussed in chapter eight.
Conclusions

Although action-research and the teacher-evaluator approach use a similar methodology, there are significant differences in the focus, scope and audience for the two activities. In addition, the teacher-evaluators do not choose or control the areas they research whereas action-researchers are usually working on issues of interest to themselves.

Teacher-evaluators are far more accountable for their work than action-researchers and the political consequences stemming from their work are also potentially more serious because of this increased scope and audience. The reporting style, dissemination procedures and structures are also more formal than is necessary with educational action-research. In the section which follows, views on standards in evaluative practice will be examined.
D) CRITERIA FOR GOOD PRACTICE IN EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

"There is no ideal strategy of evaluation; many factors need to be considered when planning an evaluation, and the position of the evaluator and the distribution of evaluation roles need to be negotiated in each case."

Tawney, 1976, p.12

Tawney sums up the complexity of the problem of judging evaluative practice. There is no established formula to apply in order to recognise 'good practice' in evaluation although there have been attempts particularly in the USA to establish one (Madaus, Scriven, Stufflebeam, 1983). Many authors have considered this problematic area and their conclusions are as varied as their evaluation backgrounds.

The purpose of this section is to establish an understanding of factors which contribute to the strengths or weaknesses in evaluation approaches in order to identify criteria for good evaluation practice with which the teacher-evaluator approach can be compared.

Four principal areas dominate the literature covering evaluative practice:

1) Establishing the credibility of an evaluation
2) Factors affecting the validity of an evaluation
3) The effectiveness and degree of utilization of the evaluation
4) Establishing standards for evaluative practice
1) Establishing credibility

"Credibility is almost always questionable. So long as different values can come into play, doubt and mistrust may be rampant. The use of a limited methodology which practitioners doubt has much utility for them also produces a lack of confidence. Users of evaluative information at one level will not accept at face value information developed at another level. Indeed, people rarely have any confidence in data developed by anyone but outside, independent agents."

Stufflebeam, 1971, p. 31

Stufflebeam pinpoints some of the key issues concerning the credibility of evaluations. Though his views on the use of outside evaluators would be contested by many of the writers quoted in the previous sections his concerns with values and methodology are still current. House (1980, p. 78) argues that many of the problems can be overcome with careful planning.

"Perhaps the most important agreements peculiar to a particular evaluation are those derived from the negotiation that often precedes the evaluation - agreements between sponsors, program personnel, and evaluators. In this exceedingly important negotiation, agreement can be reached on criteria, methods and procedures, access, dissemination of results and so on. Disagreement on these points can destroy the entire credibility of the evaluation."

Many writers agree with House that the credibility of an evaluation is dependent on the design worked out in the initial negotiations with the sponsors of the evaluation (Stake, 1976b; Fitzgibbon, 1985; Adelman, 1984a; Simons, 1984a). Aspects of an evaluation plan which are considered to be crucial for credibility with sponsors and audiences are:
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- i) Basing the evaluation design on clearly stated principles and taking into account 'preconditions' which will affect the evaluation.

- ii) Establishing clear procedures for field work i.e. data collection and release, which will create trust by confirming independence and impartiality.

- iii) Clarification of methods for dissemination of the findings.

A fourth issue concerns the evaluators' views on ensuring their independence and the credibility of their work.

- iv) Contract versus conscience - the politics of dissemination.

Design

Adelman (1984c, p.33) stresses that an evaluator ignores the management style and method of functioning of the commissioning organisation 'at his peril'. It is recognised by many of those involved in evaluation that the politics of both the evaluator and the institution will affect the conduct of the evaluation (Adelman, 1984c; House, 1980; MacDonald, 1976; Stenhouse, 1976b; among others).

Although Adelman (1984c, p.33) sees credibility as less of a problem with 'objectivist' approaches than with 'subjectivist' approaches where 'the evaluator depends on establishing a role and identity which would foster and...
sustain collaboration with the evaluated'', the credibility issue is one common to all methodologies.

There is some consensus that two of the basic principles behind a good evaluation design are a built-in element of negotiability and flexibility throughout the period of the evaluation and responsibility to a wide range of audiences (Stufflebeam, 1971; House, 1980, 1986; MacDonald 1973; Simons, 1984a). However, writers acknowledge that even with a clear design, difficulties are to be expected—often to do with access to information or dissemination of findings. Stake (1976b, pp.35-37) stresses the essential nature of 'good lines of communication' and recommends the setting up of a 'court of appeals'. Simons (1984c, p.87) establishes four principles—those of 'independence, impartiality, confidentiality and consultation' which she feels apply to any evaluations aspiring to 'independent conduct and reporting'. Her paper (1984c) "Guidelines for the Conduct of an Independent Evaluation" is a clear statement of principles and procedures not matched for its conciseness and clarity by any other UK publications in this area.

The 'non-credibility' of many evaluations was raised by Stufflebeam sixteen years ago. Stufflebeam (1971, pp.320-321) saw the necessity for developing new methodologies and techniques to enhance the credibility of evaluations and suggested that insider evaluations had enhanced credibility with some who make up the audience: 'credibility is almost automatic in this situation for the decision maker'. He proposes that outside critics can be silenced by making public
and explicit 'criteria, audience, dissemination policies' though he acknowledges that 'sensitive issues' might need some sort of 'outside audit'. This outside audit is to be different to an outside evaluation:

"The concept of an outside evaluation audit (not an outside evaluation) is an extremely critical one."

Lewy's (1985) 'Evaluation Unit' embodies some of Stufflebeam's ideas. Tawney (1976, p.12) appears to hold contradictory ideas: 'information from an independent source is more credible' yet he goes on to say 'there is little doubt that an evaluator who turns his hand for a short time to developmental work gains credibility'. It can be argued that an evaluator who works on a project becomes an insider. These two statements are only contradictory if one subscribes to the view that an inside evaluation cannot be independent. This issue will be further explored later in the thesis.

ii) Procedures for field work

"The politics of evaluating are those of making and sustaining interpersonal relationships with people who differ in their knowledge and in their power to influence events that are pertinent to the topics of the evaluation."

Adelman, 1984c, p.32

Trust between informants and evaluator is essential to any credible and valid evaluation (MacDonald, 1982; House, 1980). Helen Simons' insistence (1984a) on the need to clearly
establish the principles and procedures of the evaluation at the beginning reflects a recognised need for an evaluation to be seen to be independent of any of the power groups within the institution being evaluated so that the confidence of all involved can be gained. Ethical procedures dealing with the collection, use and release of data are dealt with in detail in her paper - the aim of this clarity in the early stages being to establish the credibility and autonomy of the evaluation.

Impartiality is an aim to which an evaluation should aspire although the effect of an evaluator's politics and values should not be ignored (MacDonald, 1976; House, 1980; Adelman, 1984c; Bynner, 1978). House (1980, p.219) defines impartiality and this definition will be used in the thesis when considering the work of the teacher-evaluators:

"To deliberate impartially is to deliberate without excessive attention to one's own interests, to consider only universal solutions."

iii) Methods of dissemination

"If the readers find the report credible, they are more likely to assume a corresponding valuing position vis-a-vis the object being evaluated. Furthermore, the readers may be led to action, depending on their disposition and other circumstances. The action may or may not be recommended by the evaluator."

House, 1980, p.102

House (ibid, p.255) develops his criteria for a credible report stating that it should be 'coherent', 'readable' and
perceived as 'true' by the audience. Some feel that the report need not be written (Stake, 1978; Bynner, 1978) although Lewy (1985) suggests that credibility is enhanced by a written report. Bynner (1978) notes that length of the report will affect its readers adversely - long reports are often not read.

The academic language of some reports is seen as affecting their credibility as they may be incomprehensible to a non-academic audience (Stake, 1976b; Munro, 1977). There is some feeling that different reports should be produced for different audiences (Adelman, 1984c).

Whilst it is generally accepted that at least one aim of evaluation is to inform decision making (Tawney, 1976 amongst others) there is controversy over the degree of judgement which an evaluator exercises in writing up a report. Tawney (1976), and Fiddy and Stronach (1986a) agree with Simons (1984c, p.89) about the use of a non-recommendatory style as it assures 'participants that their decisions will not be pre-empted'. House (1980) takes a neutral position on the issue whilst Scriven (1977) suggests that an evaluator who doesn't make recommendations and judgements isn't performing an adequate evaluation.

Simons (1984a) and Fiddy and Stronach (1986a) are among the few writers who deal with the necessary next stage of dissemination which proceeds from the circulation of the report - that of discussing the findings with the groups involved. Fiddy and Stronach (1986a, p.11) comment that:
"The formative process may be seen to begin with the report."

Saunders (1985) and Bynner (1978) also mention the need for 'debriefing' sessions with audiences. It would seem that this stage is particularly vital in evaluations which claim to be formative in intent.

In this section, no distinction has been made between forms of reporting suitable for formative evaluation and those more suited to a summative evaluation. This is because these distinctions have not usually been made in the literature. In any case, similar constraints probably apply to both forms.

iv) Contract versus conscience - the politics of dissemination

Evaluators are often faced with the fact that although they may have followed the proper procedures for producing an evaluation report the sponsors do not want the report circulated or the findings discussed. An evaluator in this situation is faced with a difficult moral decision - loyalty to a sponsor or loyalty to those perceived to have the 'right to know' (Madaus, Scriven, Stufflebeam, 1983; among others). Simons (1984a, p.56) reports that:

"Conflicts have arisen to a point where participants - whether they be teachers, managers, sponsors, or evaluators have threatened or sought legal action."
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For all her established and firmly held principles about agreeing release of data, Simons (1984c) says that the evaluator ought to publish if it is in the wider public interest. This view is supported by Stake (1976b) and House (1980). This apparent preparedness of some eminent professional evaluators to follow their conscience may be one lead which the teacher-evaluators would have difficulty in following.

Conclusions

Credibility of an evaluation appears to depend significantly on the level of communication and clarification of purpose between the sponsor and the evaluator. Procedures for the dissemination of findings is clearly an area which can cause difficulty between sponsor and evaluator and one in which procedures should be established before difficulties arise. Levels of communication and established procedures governing the teacher-evaluator approach will be examined in chapter six, seven and eight in order to establish strengths and weaknesses of the approach.

It is recognised that establishing the credibility of an evaluation approach is not enough to secure recognition of its significance for evaluative practice. An approach may have credibility with the sponsors and audience but use invalid methods and procedures. The next section is concerned with establishing criteria for analysing the validity of an evaluation.
2) Factors affecting the validity of an evaluation

"No evaluation approach, no method, will guarantee validity in advance. One must step back and examine a particular evaluation in its situation to see whether it is valid. In most cases, several evaluation approaches will be appropriate, and the evaluator can choose an approach on the basis of his and his client's preferences. Many evaluations will be mixes of different approaches. Ideally, the evaluator should be trained in several approaches and should not mechanically apply whatever he has learned. He should know the weaknesses of his favorite approaches so that he might guard against threats to their validity."

House, 1980, p.256

The validity of the teacher-evaluator approach will be examined in retrospect as House suggests, in later chapters based on current notions of validity as established in this section and through the research.

There are two parts to this section. The first deals particularly with notions of valid evaluative practices, the second with criteria for judging evaluation reports.

i) Validity in educational evaluation

First of all the notion of validity needs to be defined. Hopkins (1986c, p.1) offers the following definition:

"I take a catholic view of the word 'valid'. My dictionary defines it as 'sounds defensible, well grounded ....executed with proper formalities'. "
House (1980, p. 249) has written extensively on the notion of validity in evaluation and he establishes three criteria for the validity of an evaluation:

- it must be true,
- it must be credible to the audience ('trustworthy'),
- it must be 'normatively correct'.

He goes on to define validity in case study:

"In the case study approach validity depends on the match between the evaluation and the experiences of the participants and the audience." ibid, p. 253

As part of this research, those receiving the teacher-evaluators' reports were asked whether they felt the reports satisfied these criteria. The results are reported in chapter eight.

The importance of audience acceptance of an evaluation is stressed by House. House (1980, pp. 89-91) points out that an evaluation can be valid but useless because it doesn't 'enhance the understanding of that audience', irrelevant because it misses 'the main issues' or incorrect because 'the argument forms could be wrong'. Miles and Huberman (1984b) make similar points. House also suggests that if values are not held in common between the evaluator and the audience,
then the audience may well not perceive the evaluation as valid. This point has particular relevance to the perceived validity of the work of the teacher-evaluators.

Another perspective on the question of validity is provided in the work published in 1963 by Campbell and Stanley. Their work on validity has been drawn on by many writers on evaluation (Cohen and Manion, 1980; McCormick and James, 1983; Nisbet and Entwhistle, 1970; Hopkins, 1986c). Hopkins (1986, p.2) draws on the above work in proposing six types of validity:

"Face validity - requires that a measure looks as if it measures what it purports to measure.

Content validity - requires that data produced covers all relevant subject matter.

Criterion related validity - agreement between (for example) scores on a test and teachers' estimates . . . .

Construct validity - measurement must reflect the construct in which researchers are interested.

Internal validity - the soundness of an explanation; whether what is interpreted as cause produces the effect.

External validity - the generalisability of results to whole population . . . ."

Hopkins recognises that these concepts of validity are more relevant to the academic researcher than to the audience of an evaluation. He suggested, in a lecture on the eighteenth of
March 1987, that an audience of administrators and practitioners would be more likely to judge the validity of an evaluation using three criteria:

Face validity: an evaluation document must have an acceptable format and style.

Respondent validity: the findings of the report must resonate with the readership.

Content validity: The report must cover the relevant subject matter.

As the teacher-evaluators' reports are received by that type of audience these particular criteria will be applied to their work and the results discussed in the relevant chapter. The similarities of context between the action-researchers' work and the teacher-evaluators' work mean that similar problems in ensuring validity of the work apply.

This issue - of ensuring validity in the work of action-researchers - has been addressed by only a handful of authors. James and Ebbutt (in Nixon 1981b) express their concern over the lack of guidelines for establishing the validity of their work as action-researchers and the work of Hopkins (1986c, 1985c) goes some way to addressing the problem. Hopkins (1986c, p.11) also suggests eight ways in which action-research in particular can be made more valid:

"Be alert to threats of validity.
Be clear about analysis.
Call things by their right name.
Know what you are looking for.
Triangulate.
Be catholic in use of data sources.
Reduce and display data.
Use case study systematically"
In his book "A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research" (1985c), Hopkins (1985c, p.115) suggests two techniques which teachers could use in validating their work: triangulation and saturation, and illustrates their use. In this way, hypotheses emerging from data can be confirmed:

"By utilizing this methodology we can have confidence in our subsequent actions."

McCabe (1987b, p.2) in recognising the increasing role that teachers are playing in evaluation in the UK stresses that there is a need for 'some sort of quality control procedure'. He suggests that the evaluation structures and processes play an important part in ensuring the standards of evaluation work in which teachers might become involved:

"In this possible pattern of evaluation written into an in-service programme the characteristics of what could be practicable evaluations are seen:

1. An attempt to obtain evidence which will be both objective and subjective. Professional opinion is evidence in this case but not just that of the person leading or teaching the course.

2. The involving of at least one more person in the evaluation - but it need not be someone disinterested.

3. The collection and summarising of the evidence should be essentially in the hands of teachers - although probably teachers known to and working with advisers, and teachers with special interests in evaluative work.

4. The evaluation is the responsibility of the course leader or organiser - who will encourage and discuss it with the 'other person'.

5. To see that it is done - and its ultimate interpretation and correlation with others - are the tasks of the inservice organiser."

ibid, p.6
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The guidelines provided by these authors are not only applicable to the work of action researchers, many of these problems have long been recognised as problems for professional evaluation and research. For example, Becker (1958) raises the 'problem of evidence' and the difficulties of convincing others of conclusions. Stufflebeam (1971) and Miles and Huberman (1984a) among others, raise the problems of reliable interpretation of qualitative data.

ii) Criteria for judging evaluation reports

Burgess (1984) notes the paucity of literature in this area and contributes to the resolving of this problem by suggesting that five areas in particular be considered when evaluating research reports:

- How did the research begin?
- What theoretical perspective is employed?
- What principles of selection are involved?
- What methods of investigation are used?
- What is the impact of the study?

He also suggests that useful information could be gleaned by finding out who the funding bodies were and what the background is of those who have been acknowledged as helping with the research.
Stufflebeam and House comment that the style of the report is an important factor in affecting its reception with the audience:

"No matter what form the report takes it should be readable, brief and full of interest."

Stufflebeam, 1985, p.298

"I would like to argue, explicitly not tacitly, that greater coherence makes the evaluation report more credible, more worthy of belief and confidence. An incoherent report is not credible at all, and the more coherent the (up to a point), the more credible it will appear to be - all other things being equal."

House, 1980, p.105

The issue of whether a report should be recommendatory or not has been touched on previously. However, it is as well to reiterate here that a non-judgemental style, such as that adopted by the teacher-evaluators does not affect the validity of the findings. As Adelman (1976, p.143) suggests, members of the audience are capable of making their own judgements:

"The truths contained in the successful case study report, like those in literature are guaranteed by the 'shock of recognition'."

Conclusions

Methods for judging the validity of evaluations are issues of concern and debate among professional evaluators. As Miles and Huberman (1984a, p.20) point out:

"..we continue to need working canons and procedures to judge the validity and usefulness of research in progress."
In establishing the validity of the teacher-evaluator approach there are a number of questions which clearly must be answered. Audience reaction to the evaluation needs to be established — does the audience regard the evaluation as relevant, true, credible and correct? In addition, reports should be examined using the criteria suggested by Hopkins (1985c) and Burgess (1984). The methodology should also be examined — in particular the methods for selecting and collecting data. The question — 'What has been left out?' is a particularly appropriate one to consider when judging insider evaluations.

However, ensuring the validity of an evaluation is not sufficient guarantee of a successful evaluation. An evaluation which is valid but which remains disregarded is of little use. For this reason, factors ensuring the utilization of evaluations will be examined in the next section.

3) Factors enhancing utilization of an evaluation

Many factors which affect validity as outlined in the last section also affect the utilization and thus the effectiveness of an evaluation. Establishing criteria for measuring the degree of utilization of an evaluation is felt to be a legitimate area for this research because the principal justification for the teacher-evaluator approach is that it informs practice and aids decision making. If these functions are not fulfilled, then the usefulness and effectiveness of the approach must be in question (Stufflebeam, 1971).
There is growing debate about whether the issue of utilization should actually be the concern of the evaluator or the sponsor of the evaluation (Fullan, 1981; Munro, 1977; Macdonald, 1976). This debate is fueled by the view held by some evaluators that their reports are too readily put aside (Cronbach, 1963; Eraut, 1984a; Bynner, 1978). Munro (1977, p.50) carried out research into evaluation studies in the U.K. and reported that:

"...most evaluators are pessimistic about the fate of their reports. They feel that few people are aware of their work and that in some instances their reports have been filed without consideration by their sponsors."

Stake (1976b) considers that few sponsors make plans for the use of evaluation reports and suggests that it is therefore essential that this issue be raised in the initial negotiations.

The problems of use arise principally from a lack of experience with evaluation on the part of the sponsors and the audience (Cronbach, 1963; Munro, 1977) and a 'lack of understanding of the decision-making process' (Tawney, 1976, p.13; Miles, 1987). House (1980, p.29) quotes Patton as saying that at the present time, utilization of evaluation findings depends on the existence within the programme being evaluated, of an individual who 'takes direct, personal responsibility for getting the information to the right people'.
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For at least twenty years, the problem of timing of reports has been frequently cited as affecting the usefulness of an evaluation (Wilcox, 1981; Stufflebeam, 1971; Steadman, 1976; Cumming, 1986; Biott, 1981; Plowden Report, 1967). Eraut's comment (1976, p.124) is typical:

"The teacher decision maker may have committed himself long before the information reaches him."

Stufflebeam (1971) also cites a case where the evaluation report was handed in after decisions had been made.

Tofte (1981, p.400) quotes from the work of Weiss and Bucuvalar in establishing criteria for utilization of an evaluation:

"...an evaluation may have value to a decision-maker even if it is not used to make a dramatic change in the operation of the programme under review. Weiss and Bucuvalar argued that evaluation information was often used in a conceptual sense and that a report can be considered to have been utilized if it caused a decision-maker to:

- Clarify his/her own thinking
- Reorder priorities
- Make sense of what one has been doing
- Develop ideas for future direction
- Experience a reduction in one's level of uncertainty
- Justify an action
- Support a position
- Persuade others
- Develop a sense of how the world looks."
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These criteria will be used to help establish the usefulness of the teacher-evaluator approach as well as the twelve factors influencing use of an evaluation which Cousins and Leithwood (1986) have identified. They review the research into evaluation utilization carried out during the past fifteen years. Sixty-five studies into evaluation use in education, mental health and social services were examined.

As a result of this work they identified six factors concerning the style of an evaluation which affected utilization. These are set out in detail here, as they will be used in later chapters in the analysis of the teacher-evaluators' work:

- Evaluation quality: Characteristics of the evaluation process including sophistication of methods, rigor, type of evaluation model.

- Credibility: Of the evaluator and/or the evaluation process, defined in terms of objectivity, believability, appropriateness of evaluation criteria, and so forth.

- Relevance: Of the evaluation to the information needs of the decision makers in terms of the purposes of the evaluation and the organizational location of the evaluator.

- Communication Quality: Clarity of reporting results to the evaluation audiences in terms of style, evaluator advocacy of the results, and breadth of dissemination.

- Findings: Positive, negative, consistent with evaluation audience expectations, value for decisionmaking, and so forth.

- Timeliness: In the dissemination of evaluation results to decision makers."

ibid, p.347
They also identified six factors related to the context of the evaluation which affected utilization:

"- Information Needs: Of the evaluation audiences, including type of information sought, number of evaluation audiences, with differing information needs, time pressure, and perceived need for evaluation.

- Decision Characteristics: Impact area, type of decision, program novelty, and the significance of the decision or evaluation problem, and so forth.

- Political Climate: Political orientation of commissioners of the evaluation, dependence of the decisionmakers on external sponsors, inter- and intraorganizational rivalries, budget fights, power struggles, and so forth.

- Competing Information: From sources beyond the evaluation (personal observations, staff, peers, etc.) bearing on the problem and competing with evaluation data.

- Personal Characteristics: Defined in terms of the decisionmakers' organizational roles, information processing style, organizational experience, social characteristics, and so forth.

- Commitment and/or Receptiveness to Evaluation: Attitudes of the decisionmakers toward evaluation, organizational resistance, open-mindedness, and so forth."

Ibid, p.347

This work of Cousins and Leithwood and that of Miles (1987) fills what has been identified as a gap in the understanding of the links between evaluation and the improvement of educational programmes (Munro, 1977; Fullan, 1981).
Miles (1987, p.3) identifies five key conditions which must be present if the knowledge gained through evaluation is to be translated into action:

"CLARITY: The knowledge must be understood clearly — not be fuzzy, vague, or confusing.

RELEVANCE: The knowledge is seen as meaningful, as connected to one's normal life and concerns not irrelevant, inapplicable, impractical.

ACTION IMAGES: The knowledge is or can become exemplified in specific actions, clearly visualised. Without such images, knowledge-based action is unlikely.

WILL: There must be motivation, interest, action orientation - a will to do something with the knowledge.

SKILL: There must be actual behavioral ability to do the action envisioned. Without skill, the action will either be aborted or done incongruently with the knowledge undergirding it."

He emphasises particularly the need for the will and the skill to be present if change is to actually occur.

Conclusions

The work of Toft (1981), Cousins and Leithwood (1986) and Miles (1987) provides a useful framework for examining the work of the teacher-evaluators and will form part of the work in chapters six, seven and eight where the advantages and disadvantages of the approach are discussed.
The work of MacDonald (1976), Munro (1977), and Fullan (1981) among others, supports the conclusion that utilization is enhanced if the evaluator's role is viewed as continuing after the production of the report. Fiddy and Stronach (1986a) argue that the report should be seen as just one of the stages in an evaluation - particularly in formative evaluation.

If this extended view of evaluation and the role of the evaluator is accepted, then it is essential that a mechanism for ensuring utilization of the findings be set up at the beginning of an evaluation. This committee or group would have the specific responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the results of the evaluation. Without the inclusion of this mechanism the evaluation will be underutilized if not unutilized and change or serious consideration of the findings is unlikely to happen.

Issues relating to the credibility and validity of different approaches to educational evaluation concern evaluators of all persuasions and nationalities. In the USA a national committee was set up to establish standards applicable to educational evaluation. Their recommendations form the subject of the next section.
4) Establishing standards for evaluative practice: a contribution from the USA

Differing approaches to educational evaluation have long provided subjects for debate in evaluation journals and at conferences in the UK as has been detailed in previous sections. In the US, a similar divergence of views and approaches led to the establishment of a joint committee representing major interest groups with the responsibility of establishing standards in educational evaluation. It was recognised that there were disadvantages in this formalisation of evaluation practices -

"The committee was also mindful of risks associated with any standard-setting effort, including: promoting a field that possibly is not needed; legitimizing practices that may prove harmful; concentrating attention on matters of relatively little importance, while diverting attention from major issues; encouraging bad practices because they are not explicitly prohibited in the standards; and impeding innovation in evaluation."

Madaus et. al., 1983, p.396

However, the benefits were felt to outweigh these disadvantages -

"The perceived benefits to be derived from setting standards included: a common language to facilitate communication and collaboration in evaluation, a set of general principles for dealing with a variety of evaluation problems, a conceptual framework by which to study evaluation, a set of working definitions to guide research and development on the evaluation process, a public description of the state of the art in education evaluation, a basis for accountability by evaluators, and an aid to developing public credibility for the educational evaluation field."

ibid, p.396
Although these standards have been published, the joint committee has the ongoing responsibility for 'judging the soundness' and 'guiding the conduct' of education evaluations in the US (Madaus et al., 1983, p. 395). No such comparable committee or unanimity appears to exist at the moment in the UK nor does there appear to have been significant debate on the usefulness or need to take such a step — yet there is much in the standards which addresses the problems voiced by evaluators in the UK. In the following sections, the standards are summarised and their relevance to the teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation is examined. Some reference is made to the research findings, these are outlined in detail in chapters six to eight.

The USA standards cover four main areas:

A) Utility Standards: which ensure the evaluation provides information relevant to the audience.

B) Practical Procedures: which ensure that procedures are used which obtain the needed information with the minimum disruption.

C) Propriety Standards: which establish the ethical framework of an evaluation

D) Accuracy Standards: which ensure that information provided is collected and reported using explicit procedures
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A: Utility standards

"A1: Audience identification: Audiences involved in or affected by the evaluation should be identified, so that their needs can be addressed.

A2: Evaluator credibility: The persons conducting the evaluation should be both trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation, so that their findings achieve maximum credibility and acceptance.

A3: Information scope and selection: Information collected should be of such scope and selected in such ways as to address pertinent questions about the object of the evaluation and be responsive to the needs and interests of specified audiences.

A4: Valuational Interpretation: The perspectives, procedures, and rationale used to interpret the findings should be carefully described, so that the bases for value judgments are clear.

A5: Report clarity: The evaluation report should describe the object being evaluated and its context, and the purposes, procedures, and findings of the evaluation, so that the audiences will readily understand what was done, why it was done, what information was obtained, what conclusions were drawn, and what recommendations were made.

A6: Report dissemination: Evaluation findings should be disseminated to clients and other right-to-know audiences so that they can assess and use the findings.

A7: Report timeliness: Release of reports should be timely, so that audiences can best use the reported information.

A8: Evaluation impact: Evaluations should be planned and conducted in ways that encourage follow-through by members of the audiences."

Madaus et al., 1983, p. 399

Although as overall aims, these standards match the theoretical aims of the teacher-evaluator approach the reality of the practice as shown by the research findings has been that in a number of these areas, the practice has fallen short of the ideal. Problems of timeliness, impact, and dissemination were reported - further details are included in
the chapters reporting the research findings. There was little adverse comment relating to the other utility standards: teacher-evaluators and their work were generally felt to be credible although the reports so far produced were of limited scope due to limited resources.

B: Feasibility standards

"B1: Practical procedures: The evaluation procedures should be practical, so that disruption is kept to a minimum and that needed information can be obtained.

B2: Political viability: The evaluation should be planned and conducted with anticipation of the different positions of various interest groups, so that their cooperation may be obtained and so that possible attempts by any of these groups to curtail evaluation operations or to bias or misapply the results can be averted or counteracted.

B3: Cost effectiveness: The evaluation should produce information of sufficient value to justify the resources extended."

ibid, p.400

No comments were made during the research which indicated that participants were unhappy with the conduct of the teacher-evaluations (B1). Regarding 'political viability' (B2) participants and teacher-evaluators appeared satisfied with the stance of the teacher-evaluators.

On the issue of cost effectiveness (B3), this issue has not been systematically explored by the research. However, some interviewees did mention the relative inexpensiveness of the approach and the potential this offered for the conduct of a far reaching evaluation.
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C: Propriety standards

"C1: Formal Obligation: Obligations of the formal parties to an evaluation (what is to be done, how, by whom, when) should be agreed to in writing, so that these parties are obligated to adhere to all conditions of the agreement or formally to renegotiate it.

C2: Conflict of Interest: Conflict of interest, frequently unavoidable, should be dealt with openly and honestly, so that it does not compromise the evaluation processes and results.

C3: Full and Frank disclosure: Oral and written evaluation reports should be open, direct, and honest in their disclosure of pertinent findings, including the limitations of the evaluation.

C4: Public's right to know: The formal parties to an evaluation should respect and assure the public's right to know, within the limits of other related principles and statutes, such as those dealing with public safety and the right to privacy.

C5: Rights of human subjects: Evaluations should be designed and conducted so that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are respected and protected.

C6: Human interactions: Evaluators should respect human dignity and worth in their interactions with other persons associated with an evaluation.

C7: Balanced reporting: The evaluation should be complete and fair in its presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the object under investigation, so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed.

C8: Fiscal responsibility: The evaluator's allocation and expenditure of resources should reflect sound accountability procedures and otherwise be prudent and ethically responsible."

ibid, p.400

The practice of the teacher-evaluators while conforming with most of these standards is at variance with the standard relating to the 'Public's right to know'. The reason for this difference could relate to difference in intent between formative and summative evaluations. It was considered by
some interviewees that the teacher-evaluators' reports were essentially formative and public involvement was not appropriate at this stage.

D: Accuracy standards

"D1: Object identification: The object of the evaluation (program, project, material) should be sufficiently examined, so that the form(s) of the object being considered in the evaluation can be clearly identified.

D2: Context analysis: The context in which the program, project, or material exists should be examined in enough detail so that its likely influences on the object can be identified.

D3: Described purposes and procedures: The purposes and procedures of the evaluation should be monitored and described in enough detail so that its likely influences on the object can be identified.

D4: Defensible information source: The sources of information should be described in enough detail so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed.

D5: Valid measurement: The information-gathering instruments and procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented in ways that will assure that the interpretation arrived at is valid for the given use.

D6: Reliable measurement: The information-gathering instruments and procedures should be chosen or developed and then implemented in ways that will assure that the information obtained is sufficiently reliable for the intended use.

D7: Systematic data control: The data collected, processed and reported in an evaluation should be reviewed and corrected, so that the results of the evaluation will not be flawed.

D8: Analysis of quantitative information: Quantitative information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analysed to ensure supportable interpretations.

D9: Analysis of qualitative information: Qualitative information in an evaluation should be appropriately and systematically analyzed to ensure supportable interpretations.
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D10: Justified conclusions: The conclusions reached in an evaluation should be explicitly justified, so that the audiences can assess them.

D11: Objective reporting: The evaluation procedures should provide safeguards to protect the evaluation findings and reports against distortion by the personal feelings and biases of any party to the evaluation."

Madaus et. al., 1983, p.401

Few evaluators would probably disagree with these broad guidelines for accuracy. Certainly those working as teacher-evaluators aimed to produce accurate evaluations. Inevitably, with the benefit of hindsight it was possible to suggest changes in methodology in some investigations which would have improved the final report. Conformance to these accuracy standards would be enhanced by inservice training and with the accumulation of experience by teachers.

Conclusions

The teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation appears to conform generally with these standards and it may be that these standards could be applied, with little modification, to other evaluations carried out in the UK context. However, the desire to have such standards and for evaluations to be scrutinised by such a body may be culturally alien to the UK context. As was indicated earlier (chapter 3 part A) there has to date been more emphasis on accountability in the USA than perhaps in the UK although the UK situation is rapidly changing with new legislation before Parliament.

In the following chapters, the research methodology is outlined and the results of the research presented and discussed.
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CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: DATA COLLECTION

INTRODUCTION

The intention in this chapter is to provide a detailed account of the data collection methods used in this research and of the allowances made for possible sources of error so that the validity of the findings may be established.

The research spans a three year period during which time the researcher held various positions in the project and the internal evaluation - school project co-ordinator, teacher-evaluator and seconded teacher with the responsibility of co-ordinating and developing the teacher-evaluators' work.

Over the three year period, field notes were made and documents were collected relating to the evaluation and to the project. During the academic year 1986-87 when the researcher was seconded to co-ordinate and develop the teacher-evaluators' work, anonymous questionnaires were administered with some of the teacher-evaluators' reports and thirty-one semi-structured interviews were held with individuals representing a variety of interests and with differing degrees of involvement in the internal evaluation. In addition, another sixteen professional evaluators were interviewed by telephone in order to clarify practices used in TVEI local evaluations nationwide. Evaluators involved in over half the
education authorities in Scotland, England and Wales were contacted. The purpose of the interviews and the questionnaires was to establish the views held about the potential and practice of the teacher-evaluator approach.

A wide variety of methods were used during the research. The most useful data collection methods were:

A) interviews
B) questionnaires
C) archive search
D) report analysis
E) observation (field notes)

and less successful were,

F) diaries
G) use of electronic mail networks.

Details of the ways in which each of these methods were used are included later in this chapter.

The close contact between the researcher and the object of the research can be seen as both an advantage and a disadvantage. It could be argued that this research is in the 'classic case study tradition' of which 'a particular characteristic is the use of participant observation as a research strategy' (Stenhouse, 1982, p.263). Stenhouse is referring to ethnographers who lived in societies while studying them. Conversely it could be argued that bias is inherent in the research because the researcher is so closely connected with the area being researched and may overlook problems because of familiarity or find it difficult to question accepted concepts (Burgess, 1984).
Burgess (1980a) in drawing on the work of Becker and Junker distinguishes between different degrees of involvement that participant observers experience and suggests several ways in which the problems which arise - which he considers relate principally to the validity and reliability of the data - can be resolved:

- the use of a variety of methods
- cross-checking data with other sources
- using triangulation methods

These problems relating to possible bias on the part of this researcher have been considered in planning and conducting the research. The methodology for the research is eclectic in the ethnographic case study tradition described by Simons (1971), Stenhouse (1982), Adelman et. al. (1976) and MacDonald and Walker (1977).

One particular strength of an eclectic approach to the research is that it is considered to enhance validity through the cross-checking of data gathered from a range of sources (Patton, 1980; Burgess, 1984; Steadman, 1982; Becker, 1958). This is particularly important given the 'inside' position and role of the researcher. Stake (1985, p.282) considers that validity in case study is also enhanced by the provision of a detailed account of how the study was carried out:
"The case researcher indicates the validity of the report by giving an elaborate account of how he/she carried out the study."

Such an elaborate account will be provided in this chapter and in chapter five in which the methods used to analyse and organise the data are explained in detail.

Publications which include the 'correct' methods of using particular research techniques abound. The research methodology outlined here has been based principally on the work of Parlett and Hamilton (1977), Hopkins (1985), Davis (1981), Kemmis and McTaggart (1981), Burgess (1984) and the Open University (1979).

A) INTERVIEWS

Semi-structured interviews were used as the principal method of obtaining information from individuals and were chosen for this purpose rather than questionnaires in order to obtain the individual perspectives of the interviewees. It was felt that an interview could provide scope for clarification of views and reveal unexpected information not easily afforded by a questionnaire.

However, the danger of bias in interview is recognised. McCormick and James (1983, p.210) note that:
"Both interviewers and respondents are sources of bias: the former through the questions they ask or their perceived role and presence. The latter through their conception of the interview, their memory of the event, their ability to answer and their motivation in taking part in the interview."

For these reasons, the interview was not the only source of data. A number of interviews with different people of similar status were carried out in order to give an overall picture of perceptions and to lessen the impact of any one viewpoint.

In planning the use of the semi-structured interview as a research method a number of issues were considered so that the quality and usefulness of the data obtained could be maximised:

i) clarity of purpose
ii) choice of interviewee
iii) Interview arrangements
iv) ethical procedures
v) style of interview
vi) interviewing skills
vii) method of recording the interview

i) Clarity of purpose

The interviews were held with the aim of obtaining information on a number of areas which would inform the research. Namely establishing:

- the conditions in the LEA which led to the teacher-evaluator approach being developed and which have affected its development.

- the effect on schools and teachers of being involved in this type of evaluation.
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- procedures and other factors governing the operation of the teacher-evaluator approach.
- criteria which people apply in judging both evaluation documents and evaluation.
- views on the role of an external consultant.
- views on the validity, effectiveness and replicability of the approach.

Interviewees were forewarned of the general areas which the interviewer wished to cover.

ii) Choice of interviewee

Twelve schools were involved in the project being evaluated and with the exception of two schools, one or two staff were interviewed from each institution. These two schools were omitted because of staff changeover and it was felt in any case, that the selected group was sufficiently representative. Two colleges of further education were also omitted because they were significantly less involved than the schools.

Eight groups were identified as being in a position to usefully comment on the teacher-evaluator approach and the numbers after the group indicate the number of individuals interviewed.

- professional evaluators (9)
- advisers and officers of the LEA involved (6)
- head teachers (4)
- the project central support team (3)
- school project co-ordinators (4)
- teacher-evaluators (4)
the nucleus group: those involved in establishing the teacher-evaluator approach (6: 5 of whom are included in the above groups)
- the 'Cambridge group' (14 teachers from 6 different LEAs on an evaluation course.)

A number of those interviewed had changed group during the period of the research. Their views are identified with the group in which they were most involved.

Care was taken in choosing individuals for interview. Walker (1981) suggests that 'reliable informants' might be identified through the interviewer's experience with people. Burgess (1984, p.55) puts a similar point when he talks about 'judgement sampling' rather than 'opportunistic sampling'. A number of writers pinpoint the problem of the reliability and representativeness of informants (Miles and Huberman, 1984b; Burgess, 1985b; Becker, 1958). In any case the alternative of random sampling does not necessarily guarantee satisfactory results (Burgess, 1984).

Where there was a choice in whom to select for interview—for instance in the case of head teachers and school project co-ordinators, two particular criteria for selection were used:

- involvement and knowledge about the teacher-evaluator approach
- a reputation for critical outspokenness

It was felt that interviews with those who were known to be reluctant to openly criticise LEA policy, would yield little critical data. Professional evaluators were chosen for their
known involvement in educational evaluation and to some extent, their accessibility to the researcher. Those interviewed came from six different universities in the UK and two institutes of higher education in Australia.

A separate group of teachers, from eight different local authorities was asked to comment on the replicability of the approach by drawing on their experiences in their local authorities. All had completed an evaluation course and were involved in evaluation and research themselves (the Cambridge group).

iii) Interview arrangements

Professional evaluators were contacted by letter which outlined the researcher's field of interest and requested an interview lasting about an hour. A selection of documents produced by the teacher-evaluators was sent on before the interview. The other interviewees were all known to the researcher and were contacted personally usually by telephone. No one who was asked, refused an interview although one professional evaluator suggested a colleague who they felt was more knowledgeable in the area.

The interviews were arranged at a time and place to suit the interviewee and lasted from three quarters of an hour to an hour and a half. The longer times being by choice of the interviewees.
iv) Ethical procedures

At the beginning of each interview, confidentiality and interviewee control over release of data was assured. Professional evaluators were offered transcripts or copies of tape recordings while other interviewees were offered notes made from the tape recordings for checking. In some instances it was not possible to tape record the interview. These interviewees were offered the notes for checking at the end of the interview.

There were some instances where interviewees did not want some of their data released but this has not had any significant impact on the research findings. The establishing of trust in the interview was felt to be a priority so that there could be a free dialogue between the participants. There were two instances where this was felt to have not been wholly achieved.

v) Style of interview

The researcher trialled the interview with colleagues and an unstructured approach was found to be most fruitful in allowing individual perspectives to emerge. All interviews began however with an explanation about the researcher's role and with discussion about confidentiality and the way in which the data would be used.
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The unstructured interview was sometimes followed by a more structured part at the end of the interview when the researcher asked for comments on areas that had not been covered. Note was taken of the work Cohen and Manion (1980), and Simons (1977a) where they suggest the adoption of a conversational style in interview. A useful description of the style of interview used is provided by Hopkins (1980, p.101) when he draws on the work of Merton and Kendall in describing the 'focused interview':

"The interviewer having made a content analysis of the situation focuses on the subjective experience of the interviewee in order a) to test the hypotheses derived from the content analysis and b) to ascertain the unanticipated responses and produce new hypotheses."

The researcher supports the view that an interview should be a two-way process with the interviewee feeling that they have also gained from the meeting. During the interview, the researcher made notes of the information she possessed that might provide useful to the interviewee. This contribution was made to the 'conversation' when it was felt it would no longer affect the contribution of the interviewee to the research.

vi) Interviewing skills

As an important part of the interview was felt to be the establishing of a relationship of trust and a relaxed atmosphere, attention was paid to what Lafleur in Davis (1981, p.138) labels as 'attending behaviour' and 'reflection of
feeling'. This concerns stance, body language, appropriate eye contact and listening skills. Care was also taken not to interrupt unnecessarily (Simons, 1977a) or to ask guiding questions which would bias the interview. Paraphrasing and summarising were used to check meaning with the interviewee (Lafleur in Davis, 1981).

After the interview, a number of interviewees spontaneously commented that they had found the experience enjoyable and others commented that they had found it intellectually demanding.

vii) Methods of recording the interview

The preferred method of recording the data was using a tape recorder with notes as an 'aide memoir' (Burgess, 1984, p.108). It was felt that errors in memory, transcribing and interpreting notes could be avoided by the use of a tape recorder. Davis (1981) supports this view and MacDonald (1981) identifies five advantages of using a tape recorder:

- it is possible to observe continuously
- nuances of meaning and non-verbal clues can be picked up
- it is possible for the interviewer to respond facially rather than verbally
- post editing and categorising of data is possible
- a person to person dynamic can be established.

In some cases, tape recording was not feasible and in two cases interviewees did not want to be recorded. Notes were made in these instances.
B) QUESTIONNAIRES

A questionnaire was distributed to all of those who received two of the teacher-evaluator documents. Two documents were selected to allow time for the return of the questionnaire so that responses could be used in this thesis. The purpose of the questionnaire was to elucidate views on the usefulness of the documents and to provide information on their utilization.

As Oppenheim (1966, p.37) suggests, an anonymous questionnaire was felt the most appropriate method to use as it was expected that some of those responding would want to be extremely critical and that they would be more likely to give frank responses if they could not be identified:

"[Anonymity] is often crucial in obtaining frank and revealing responses; indeed anonymous questionnaires often produce a greater proportion of socially unacceptable responses than face to face interviews"

In fact this was not found to be the case. Almost all of those who were most critical deliberately wrote their names on the questionnaire - no space had been left for this purpose.

There are problems with the use of questionnaires. Questionnaires are considered time consuming and complicated to construct (Steadman, 1976; Lafleur in Davis, 1981;
McCormick and James, 1983). However, Nisbet and Entwhistle (1970, p.44) consider that simply constructed questionnaires can successfully be used for 'relatively simple factual inquiries'. This was the purpose of the questionnaire devised for this research. It was felt to have achieved its purpose although the important question which concerns all who send out questionnaires is of course unanswered - who didn't respond and why. As a number of writers have noted, it is impossible to find this out (Nisbet and Entwhistle, 1970; Stufflebeam, 1985) yet the non-respondents are a potentially important group (Parlett and Hamilton, 1977). It was difficult to give an accurate response rate as some copies went to libraries and staffrooms, and some people would have received multiple copies if they held a number of posts of responsibility e.g. INSET co-ordinator and Supported Self Study co-ordinator.

The questionnaire was brief and an attempt was made to use clear language. Some closed and some open questions were used and space was provided for additional comments as suggested by Kemmis and McTaggart (1981). Those responding were asked to indicate their sex, position, teaching experience and whether they found the document useful or not. Space for additional comments was given to allow for responses to questions on what action they would take on the basis of the findings and what action they felt that their schools or the LEA should take.
C) ARCHIVE SEARCH

There was a two-fold purpose in examining the documents relating to the setting up and running of the TVEI evaluation. Firstly, to establish as Parlett and Hamilton (1977) suggest, the historical perspective. Adelman (1984) stresses the need to consider the existing 'preconditions' governing any evaluation and it was hoped to establish the local and national conditions which led to the adoption of the teacher-evaluator approach. This data was also to be cross-checked with that obtained through interview and from field notes made at the time by the researcher. Secondly, on a local level, to establish the context in which the teacher-evaluator approach has been developing so that that could also be checked against the perceptions and experiences of the interviewees.

Patton (1980, pp.157-158) warns against placing too much reliance on documents. They 'may be incomplete, inaccurate, selective' and 'uneven in quality' and so the cross-checking of this data source against others (e.g. interview data) was considered an important part of the data analysis.

Documents from as wide a variety of sources as possible, both internal and external to the LEA, were examined. They included:

- minutes of meetings
- letters between the MSC and the LEA
- the MSC/LEA evaluation contract
- letters and memoranda to teachers, heads, and teacher-evaluators and others
- MSC TVEI reports
- LEA annual TVEI reports
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- unpublished theses of teachers previously on secondment from the LEA on aspects of the functioning of the LEA
- documents relating to teacher-evaluator INSET
- NFER TVEI evaluation reports
- TVEI evaluations from other LEAs

Access to the majority of these documents was not a problem because of the files kept by the researcher over the previous three years. Because of her position in the project and in the 'Internal Evaluation' many of these documents had been sent to her routinely.

D) REPORT ANALYSIS

Various aspects of the reports produced by teacher-evaluators were considered. McCormick and James (1983) suggest the method of looking for the 'appearance and non-appearance' of particular categories of information in examining this sort of document.

Firstly, reports from the early, middle and latest stages of the teacher-evaluators' work were compared in terms of quality, format, content, depth and style in order to establish ways in which they had developed over the three year period. Secondly, the criteria for judging evaluation reports established from the literature and from interviews were applied to these reports in order to establish their credibility and usefulness and to identify ways in which they should be improved.
E) OBSERVATION / FIELD NOTES

Notes of conversations are considered by some to be useful data sources (S.C.D.C., 1986). Notes were made at all evaluation report back meetings attended and of casual references made to the teacher-evaluators' work and about evaluation generally.

These notes have been used to cross-check interviewees' views of particular instances, to note down significant issues which emerged at report back meetings and as a useful reference for pinpointing change in attitudes by those involved and affected by the evaluation over time.

However, note is taken of Patton's warning (1980, p. 157) that 'the evaluator may affect the situation being observed' and that observation 'focuses only on external behaviours'. Patton recommends the use of interviews as a balance to observation in revealing the 'internal behaviour' of an individual. Kemmis and MacTaggart (1981) also warn of the subjective nature of interpretations made from observation but as Parlett and Hamilton (1977) suggest, the difficulties are perhaps outweighed by the consideration that data is obtained which would not be obtained in more formal interviews. Becker (1958, p. 251) gives considerable weight to 'volunteered statements' maintaining that respondents are more sure about issues which they mention of their own accord.
Certainly it was felt by the researcher that some useful insights were gained by the use of this method—particularly in the areas of attitude change to the evaluation over time and in the utilization of the evaluation findings. The usefulness of this data was borne out by instances of factual changes in practice mentioned to the researcher by a member of staff's colleagues but unrealised, forgotten or ignored by some of those involved in their later interviews.

F) DIARIES

The usefulness of diaries in ethnographic research is well documented (Burgess, 1981, 1984; Kemmis in Davis, 1971; Steadman, 1976; among others). Consequently some of the more experienced teacher-evaluators were asked to keep diaries to include issues which arose during their involvement with the evaluation and of the time spent in doing the work.

However not all of the teachers found the time to do this—two diaries out of four being returned—so this was considered one of the less successful methods of collecting data. Nevertheless, the diaries do cast some light on the commitment required by the teacher-evaluators. Norton (1986) carried out more detailed work in this area with the teacher-evaluators and her findings from the previous year will be considered in later chapters.
This method of data collection is relatively new and unexplored. However this researcher has found it particularly useful in obtaining quick responses in a number of areas. However it is probably necessary to explain how the method works for those who are unfamiliar with it.

In the LEA in which the research has largely taken place all schools are linked through existing telephone lines to a central computer which stores messages from and for any institution linked to it. Any message or questionnaire once typed can be instantaneously sent to all institutions. This removes postal delays, reduces photocopying and labour costs and minimises the time needed to contact people.

Acknowledgment of the message by each institution is automatically sent so the researcher is sure the message has been received and not lost in the post or delayed. This method is particularly useful for obtaining quick responses on any issue and was used by the researcher to obtain information relevant to the evaluation before her secondment. However, with a change of location to an institution which didn’t have the facility, the researcher was unable to pursue this method of data collection and it was only used for a period of a few months. In a sense, it is a more modern version of Fitzgibbons' idea (1985) of telephone interviewing.
Conclusions

The methods used for data collection are set out in detail so that the validity of the methodology can be assessed. The next chapter contains an account of the processes by which data was analysed and conclusions drawn.
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RESEARCH METHODOLOGY : DATA ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The importance of making explicit the methodology used for data analysis in qualitative research is stressed by many writers in this area - Becker (1958), Hopkins (1986c), Stenhouse (1977), and Miles and Huberman (1984a) among others. Thus the purpose of this chapter is to explain the methods used to process the raw data collected during the research.

The several stages which marked the progress of the research are represented in the diagram below and are explained in detail in this chapter.

```
initial hypotheses

research design

data collection  \rightarrow \text{modification of hypotheses as new hypotheses emerge}

\rightarrow \text{data reduction/categorisation}

\rightarrow \text{data organisation}

\rightarrow \text{data analysis}

\rightarrow \text{drawing of conclusions}

\rightarrow \text{verification of conclusions}
```
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A) INITIAL HYPOTHESIS

The initial hypothesis was generated from field notes and observation of the project over a two year period as well as from concerns and apparent gaps in evaluation literature relating to teachers' involvement in evaluation. The research was designed to test this hypothesis. However, as data was collected new hypotheses were generated. This led to the modification of the original design and changes in focus for the data collection.

The initial hypothesis was that the teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation might represent a fundamentally new direction for evaluation in the UK but that it might not fulfil that potential because of an inherently unsound foundation in that it relies on voluntary work by teachers who have minimal training and who undertake evaluation tasks of limited scope. It was hypothesised that this would lead to their evaluation reports being dismissed as incomplete and biased. However, during the process of data collection, it became clear the approach received positive support from all groups and that questions of bias and training, were less important than questions of timeliness, issue selection, relevance and utilization of findings.
Chapter 5

B) RESEARCH DESIGN

The aim of the research was to examine "the incipient role of the teacher as evaluator" and six specific areas were initially identified as being relevant to the research.

- the specific conditions in the LEA which fostered the adoption of the approach
- the characteristics distinguishing the approach from other approaches to evaluation
- how the approach is working
- insider and outsider views on the theory behind the approach
- the role of the external evaluator in such an approach
- a critique of the practice: insiders and outsiders views

The research was designed to ensure that data relating to these areas was obtained from at least three different sources — thus making triangulation and cross-checking of data possible. Figure 1 (p. 104) illustrates the cross-referencing of these different data sources to provide data for the principal areas of the research e.g archives provided information on context, role, and practice; interview data was used to inform all sections of the thesis; whereas questionnaires provided particular information on practice.

The detailed contributions of each data source were then identified — for example interview data was obtained from individuals whose opinions were informed by their experience as members of one or more of eight distinct groups:
Chapter 3: Theoretical Background

Chapter 2: National Context

Chapter 7: Emerging Role of Teacher-Evaluators

Chapter 6: Issues Relating to Practice

Literature Search

Interviews

Questionnaires

Electronic Mail

Diaries

Observation (field notes)

Archive Search

Professional Evaluators
- Nucleus Group
- LEA Officers
- School Co-ordinators
- Teacher-evaluators
- Central Support Team
- Cambridge Group

Nucleus Group
- Cambridge Group

Local Context in Which the Teacher Evaluator Approach Has Been Developed

Issues Relating to Practice

Figure 1: Interrelationships between data sources and categories
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- professional evaluators
- nucleus group (initial LEA evaluation planning group)
- head teachers
- LEA Officers
- school project co-ordinators
- teacher-evaluators
- central support team
- Cambridge group (teachers external to the particular LEA)

Each of these sub-groups provided information particular to members of that group as well as providing information which overlapped with other sub-groups.

For example, professional evaluators particularly contributed to the categories of:

- measuring validity and effectiveness of the approach
- methods of identifying and minimising bias
- possible ethical problems
- the level of training required for teacher-evaluators
- role of external evaluators
- replicability

and the views of interviewees internal to the LEA contributed to additional categories as well as to categories in common with the professional evaluators:

Additional categories -
- preconditions in the LEA leading to the approach
- how the approach appears to be working
- aims and purpose of the evaluation

Categories in common -
- constraints on evaluation work by teachers
- role of external evaluators
- possible ethical problems
- views on effectiveness/bias/utilization
- opinions of documents/bias/resulting changes
- replicability
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The data from different sources was assimilated into categories which had either been anticipated in the research design or had emerged from the data. Figures 2a, 2b, 2c (pp. 107, 108, 109) illustrate the contributions to particular categories made by data from different sources. The categories which emerged through the research rather than from the initial research design are marked with an asterisk. Once these specific categories were defined, broader categories which could be used to organise data into chapters were established. Figures 2a, 2b, 2c illustrate the allocation of the specific categories to provide outlines for chapters six, seven and eight:

- The local context in which the teacher-evaluator approach has been developed (figure 2a : Chapter 6)
- The emerging role of the teacher-evaluator (figure 2b : Chapter 7)
- Issues relating to practice (figure 2c : Chapter 8)

C) DATA COLLECTION

The data collected was to a significant extent predetermined by the research design. Although interviews were relatively unstructured, there were specific issues about which the researcher sought responses. Appendix 1 shows the initial list of questions which it was felt would provide the required information for the research.

These questions were devised prior to any interviews in order to clarify issues which needed to be discussed to provide the
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Figure 2a

Detailed interrelationships between data sources and categories forming the basis of:

**Chapter Six**

The local context in which the teacher-evaluator approach has been developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS:</th>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Conditions in the LEA...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Perceptions of aims and purpose...</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Supporting structures and accountability.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Perceived audience.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Procedures for selecting areas to investigate.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ethical concerns.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Independence and autonomy of teacher-evaluators.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Replicability.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Current views of the worth of evaluation.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories arising from data collected rather than from the research design.*
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Detailed interrelationships between data sources and categories forming the basis of:

Chapter Seven

The emerging role of the teacher-evaluator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Professional Evaluators</th>
<th>Nucleus Group</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
<th>LDA officers</th>
<th>School Coordinators</th>
<th>Teacher-Evaluators</th>
<th>Central Support Team</th>
<th>Camtrige Group</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Archive Search</th>
<th>Report Analysis</th>
<th>Observation (field notes)</th>
<th>Diaries</th>
<th>Electronic Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Selection of teacher-evaluators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Training of teacher-evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Commitment required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Role of an external evaluator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) General views of the teacher-evaluator approach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Professional outcomes for teacher-evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories arising from data collected rather than from the research design.
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Detailed interrelationships between data sources and categories forming the basis of:

Chapter Eight

Issues relating to practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>INTERVIEWS:</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
<th>ARCHIVE SEARCH</th>
<th>REPORT ANALYSIS</th>
<th>OBSERVATION (field notes)</th>
<th>DIARIES</th>
<th>ELECTRONIC MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Evaluative methods used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Dissemination procedures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Effectiveness and utilization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Bias</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Validity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Comments on and criteria used in judging the reports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Style and purpose of the reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Unintended outcomes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories arising from data collected rather than from the research design.
maximum possible information in the areas being researched. They were modified as a result of trial interviews. The interview methods used are explained in chapter four.

D) DATA REDUCTION, CATEGORISATION AND ORGANISATION

The raw data was reduced to a form in which it could be searched for the categories which related to the issues identified as relevant to the research. At this stage new hypotheses emerged. Hopkins (1982, p.18) describes his experience of this process:

"Data was searched for categories, and when established they were tested against the data, and when there was sufficient evidence to saturate the category it became a working hypothesis."

Methods used to reduce the data to a usable form varied according to the form in which the data was held.

Interview data was held in either tape or note form. Tapes were transcribed and the data obtained was then summarised. Figures 1, 2, and 3 in chapter seven (pp. 141, 143, 148/9) are examples of the notes obtained when the data was summarised. This reduced data was then ordered according to categories inherent in the initial research design or according to new categories which appeared relevant to the research. This process was continued until all individual responses relevant to the research were categorised. Data considered not relevant to the research was discarded at this point.
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Questionnaires were used to elicit information about the specific categories of utilization and outcomes of the evaluation. Responses to particular questions were analysed to identify areas of consensus and unusual responses. A check was also made to see if responses were sex or experience dependent.

A wide variety of documents (listed in chapter four) were scrutinised to provide a local and national perspective. In addition, they were used to cross-check other data sources and to provide information both on conditions in the LEA prior to the development of the approach and on issues concerning the implementation of the approach. This information was also used to identify recurrent concerns. Figure 2, chapter eight (p.178, 179) presents an analysis of teacher-evaluator reports and illustrates the tabulation method used to reduce and collate data collected from different archive sources such as minutes of meetings and printed documents.

E) MODIFICATION OF HYPOTHESES

The initial hypothesis that the teacher-evaluator approach was inherently weak and ineffective had to be revised in the light of the evidence from all quarters that although there were weaknesses the approach represents a positive advance in methods of project evaluation. As part of this revision process, the six key areas identified in the research design (p.103) were refined in the light of preoccupations and concerns emerging during the research. Three substantive areas
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were the result and they form the basis of the following three chapters in which the research findings are reported. These three new key areas are:

- The context in which the teacher-evaluator approach has developed. (Chapter 6)

- The emerging role of the teacher-evaluator. (Chapter 7)

- Issues relating to practice. (Chapter 8)

F) DATA ANALYSIS

The precise method used to analyse the data depended on the form in which the data was held. Generally all data was then collated to provide a summary of the views of particular interest groups on particular issues. As explained in section D, figures 1, 2, and 3 in chapter seven, and figure 2 in chapter eight, illustrate the methods of summarising data. Once the data was in this form, the range of views expressed could be clearly identified as could any commonly held views and emerging trends. This system for mapping data and discovering trends is similar to that suggested by Jones in Murphy and Torrance (1987).

The data thus organised, categorised and reduced provides the basis for the description of research findings which follow in chapters six, seven and eight.
The conclusions drawn from the data were verified principally by triangulation methods but also by considering guidelines established by Miles and Huberman (1984a, P.28). They suggest a number of 'tactics' by which conclusions can be verified:

"The first set [of tactics] deals with assuring the basic quality of the data at hand.

- checking for representativeness .......
- checking for researcher effects ....
- triangulating
- weighting the evidence (deciding which kinds of data is most trustworthy)

Conclusions can also be verified by looking carefully at differences within the data set:

- making contrasts and comparisons
- checking the meaning of outliers
- using extreme cases......
- ruling out spurious relations
- replicating a finding .....  
- checking out rival explanations ...
- looking for negative evidence ....
- getting feedback from informants...

In reporting the research findings, checks for representativeness were carried out by establishing categories for data only when a number of data sources confirmed the importance of particular issues. Where concerns expressed solely by one group or one individual are included this is clearly stated and these views have only been included where it was felt they threw particular light on an issue. Alternative explanations have been sought particularly on key issues - for instance what part lack of finance played in the development of the approach.
The researcher effects were carefully considered in the research design and data collection methods were selected to minimise, and to allow for cross-checking of, the effects of the researcher. This problem has been covered in detail in chapter four. Briefly, data obtained from interview (where the fact that the researcher was a colleague was most likely to have inhibited interviewees) was checked against data obtained through other methods – anonymous questionnaire, documentation, observation and from other interviews and discrepancies identified. There are also undoubtedly gaps in the research due to the perspective of the researcher but all researchers start from a particular standpoint and this researcher has clearly stated her position so that this can be considered by those reviewing the evidence.

Triangulation of data has also been covered earlier in this chapter. Figures 1, 2, and 3 (pp.107-9) show the interrelationships between data sources and data categories and illustrate the fact that data for each category has been cross-checked with data from at least two other sources.

It is recognised that the selection of interviewees has the effect of weighting the evidence. In this case, where possible, interviewees within the LEA were chosen for their openness and independently critical stance. The professional evaluators interviewed were chosen partly for their known interest in teacher research.
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As a general rule, where there were discrepancies and wide variance of views, the views of an interviewee more in a position to know were given more weight than those of someone further removed - although alternative perspectives were included where it was considered relevant.

As Miles and Huberman (1984a) suggest, feedback from informants is another method of verifying conclusions. For this purpose, a document summarising the research findings was sent to key informants and their comments were sought. This document was favourably received.

Thus particular care has been taken to ensure that high quality data was collected and that the conclusions can be substantiated.

The following chapters report the research findings and conclusions obtained using the methodology outlined in this and the previous chapter. As has been explained earlier, the research findings have been organised into three main sections. In chapter six, the importance of the local context and initial evaluation design are explored; in chapter seven, the emerging role of the teacher-evaluator is defined and in chapter eight, issues relating to the practice of teacher-evaluators are covered.
CHAPTER SIX

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Local Context
CHAPTER 6

THE CONTEXT IN WHICH THE TEACHER-EVALUATOR APPROACH HAS BEEN DEVELOPED

INTRODUCTION

Replicability of this approach is a key issue in developing theory from the practice. In this section, research findings relating to the local context fostering the approach are presented.

Nine areas were identified from the data and the research design as providing information on the context supporting development of the teacher-evaluator approach. The data collected during the research which relates to these categories is presented in this chapter.

A) Conditions in the LEA affecting the development of the approach
B) Perceptions of the aims and purpose of the evaluation
C) Supporting structures and accountability
D) Perceived audience
E) Procedures for selecting areas to investigate
F) Ethical concerns
G) Independence and autonomy of teacher-evaluators
H) Replicability
I) Current views of the worth of evaluation
A) CONDITIONS IN THE LEA

Those working for the LEA were asked what conditions had affected the development of the teacher-evaluator approach. The answers revealed two differing perspectives. Those involved in management (head teachers, LEA officers) identified the contribution of management policies while those with classroom responsibilities had much more pragmatic views.

Head teachers, the project central support team, LEA officers and the nucleus group identified similar aspects of the LEA management policy as contributing to the development of this approach to evaluation. Open mindedness and the development of new ideas were seen to be encouraged in the LEA through the establishment of working groups consisting of LEA officers and teachers of varied status. One interviewee described these changes in working relationships in the LEA as leading to the:

"...graying of status and institutional boundaries."

Some put the establishment of this climate down to a recruitment policy carried out over a number of years of appointing people with 'the ability to make things happen'. This policy was particularly attributed to the 'personal vision' of a senior officer.

There was also some agreement that there is a shared sense of direction in the LEA and a working atmosphere which 'allows
people to take risks in a safe secure framework'. One head noted that these more open working relationships had developed over the past six to seven years. S/he commented that previously the sort of evaluation which was now developing would have met with a negative, fearful response.

However, those with specific classroom responsibilities (teacher-evaluators, school co-ordinators), did not appear to share this vision. When asked about conditions in the LEA which had affected the development of the teacher-evaluator approach they mentioned negative features—problems with time and resources:

“It's an attempt to do things on the cheap.”

“The LEA like to work teachers hard to show their commitment.”

The TVEI philosophy was noted as reinforcing attitudes of self-criticism and performance analysis among staff as through TVEI, their pupils were being encouraged to become more self-critical. This ethos was considered to have contributed to the acceptance of evaluation by school co-ordinators that their work should be scrutinised through an ongoing programme of evaluation.
B1 PERCEPTIONS OF AIMS AND PURPOSE

Those who set up the evaluation and were responsible for it in the early stages, the nucleus group, did not present a consensus of opinion when asked for their perceptions of the aims and purposes of the teacher-evaluation. While half mentioned that the process was meant to be formative, the remainder of their responses were very varied. Answers ranged from staff development, informing the MSC and the LEA, preparing the way for setting up an Evaluation Unit within the LEA and improving the quality of debate.

In contrast, the LEA officers all mentioned that informing practice was the principal aim. The information was seen to be for the use of those in the field and for those making decisions about the future. One added four additional functions of the evaluation: 'corrective, supportive, confirming good things, giving a sense of comfort.' Another mentioned particular professional gains for the teachers:

"If we wish to move to a stage in which all teachers can appraise their own performance then we're on the road to moving to that stage by involving teachers."

Co-ordinators and teacher-evaluators were also agreed that the main aim was to inform practice and decision making. Some mentioned that the evaluation benefited not only to those in TVEI but also non-TVEI staff who could gain from the lessons learned.
C) SUPPORTING STRUCTURES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The structure of the Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG) was described in chapter two. This group oversees the work of the teacher-evaluators and clears their work for publication through the use of a reading panel. A second group, the Borough Evaluation Steering Group (BESG) was recently set up to oversee all evaluation work in the LEA. Both groups meet regularly.

Some teacher-evaluators felt that the establishment of this Borough Evaluation Steering Group might hinder the production of reports. This does not appear to have happened. The EAG is accountable to the BESG and has kept the group informed of the progress of investigations. The BESG has supported the EAG by the production of ethical guidelines and procedures for good practice for use in LEA evaluations. They have also acted as a reference point on questions affecting the LEA - for example on the publication of articles about the evaluation. So the overall effect of the BESG would appear to have been to further legitimise and thus support the work of the teacher-evaluators.

The TVEI Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG) has acted as a support for the teacher-evaluators' work particularly on questions of release in order to write reports, and in clearing and circulating reports. However, the group had difficulty in solving clerical support problems which hindered the evaluation over the entire period. A shortage of funds has
limited the contribution from external consultants as well as the provision of specialised equipment for teachers (tape recorders and tapes). Recognition of the work of these advisory and steering groups was not widespread amongst the interviewees. Both the EAG and the Borough Evaluation Steering Group would appear to have a low profile in the LEA.

Industrial action by teachers has persisted throughout almost the entire period of the development of the teacher-evaluations and seems to have hindered a number of aspects of the work: teacher release, teacher involvement, in-service training. More than one professional evaluator expressed surprise that teachers voluntarily carried out this work. Motivation will be examined in the following section.

The team structure within which the teacher-evaluators work was considered important. Working with colleagues from other institutions in teams on particular issues, was cited as one of the very positive features of involvement in the evaluation. Although these teams generally worked well the team function was affected by the attributes and approach of the leader.
D) PERCEIVED AUDIENCE

Almost all teacher-evaluators and co-ordinators mentioned pupils as the main audience for the evaluations - if only second-hand through the changes in the practice of their teachers. The other principal audiences mentioned were colleagues and schools, both TVEI and non-TVEI and LEA officers.

This breadth of audience raises questions relating to the format used for reporting of the evaluation findings and the level of feedback (which most groups considered inadequate). Noticeable is the absence of an outside audience: parents, TVEI Steering Group and other LEA groups. The focus is clearly the practice of teachers and experiences of pupils involved in the project.

E) PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING AREAS FOR INVESTIGATION

The procedures for selecting areas for investigation have developed through three stages. Initially, the external evaluator advised the EAG of areas which s/he thought could be usefully investigated. For a second group of documents, the EAG decided that issues which were of particular current concern be investigated. In a third phase, all interested parties in the LEA were asked to submit ideas for the teacher-evaluators' work. Those issues which seemed of most concern were then the subject of an investigation (see figure 2, pp.178-179).
It was generally felt by interviewees that the foci of the teacher-evaluators' work would be different to those of an external evaluator. Some interviewees commented that this was borne out by the practice of the teacher-evaluations to date. This was one of a number of areas in which a joint approach was favoured between external and internal evaluators.

With the advantage now of some experience of teacher-evaluations, staff at different levels in the LEA claim to be more aware of the ways in which evaluation can inform their own practice and more specific requests for evaluation have been received by the EAG. However, problems have arisen when teacher-evaluators have had to deal with difficult personal and political issues. Some professional evaluators suggested that dealing with these very issues is an important contribution which they themselves, can make to an evaluation. However, other professional evaluators felt that they experienced similar problems to the teachers. One member of the nucleus group explained the problem:

"A disadvantage is the difficulty a teacher-evaluator has in reporting on issues relating to the use of power. The insider may invite retaliation if too much honesty about the State of Denmark is allowed to emerge."

One teacher-evaluator reported the stress s/he experienced when interviewing for one investigation:

"All the stress and strain they'd gone through was off loaded onto me."
This person reported finding themselves caught between two groups with opposing perspectives on events. S/he felt that each group expected their perspective to dominate in any report.

F) ETHICAL CONCERNS

Professional evaluators felt that teacher-evaluators faced no different ethical problems to those normally experienced by external evaluators. It was stressed that teachers ought to be aware of the 'highly sensitive political arena' into which they were venturing. One professional evaluator warned that there were particular problems at this point of time with industrial action by teachers and teacher appraisal looming. S/he emphasised the duty of the teacher-evaluators to fully inform interviewees of the 'full implications' of their co-operation:

"...documents can very easily get beyond your own control in terms of you own release. Once you've released them beyond your own school .... They're published and you've had it."

S/he cited the case of a teacher from another LEA whose career had been destroyed by the use of data s/he had voluntarily given but which had been used out of context after some time had elapsed.

A member of the nucleus group felt that there were 'greater ethical responsibilities' inherent in the teacher-evaluator
approach in comparison with other forms of teacher research because of the inter-institutional dimensions:

"...more sensitivity and discretion was required."

School co-ordinators reported having no concern about ethical problems as long as procedures safeguarding confidentiality were adhered to. Teacher-evaluators too reported no serious ethical concerns. Head teachers have freely allowed access to school documents and staff although a small number of staff did not want to provide information for the evaluation.

One teacher-evaluator was concerned about the truthfulness of the accounts s/he was given by some members of staff. Another reported that s/he had been approached by senior management and asked to divulge information which s/he felt was confidential to the evaluation. Some co-ordinators and teacher-evaluators felt that a higher profile within the LEA should be accorded to the teacher-evaluation with clear guidelines issued for staff information.

Trust and openness between institutions within this LEA was reported by many to be a significant factor in contributing to the lack of ethical problems.

G) FREEDOM AND AUTONOMY IN TEACHER-EVALUATIONS

Teacher-evaluators and professional evaluators were asked to comment on the issue of freedom and autonomy in the work of teacher-evaluators.
All of those interviewed who had done any work for the teacher-evaluations were asked who they felt they were working for and how much control they felt they had over the planning, methodology and release of data.

Some teacher-evaluators, especially those who had been involved early on felt isolated and would have welcomed more guidance. This was rarely reported by those of more recent involvement although there were instances where the team approach had not functioned properly for reasons of illness and accessibility. Lack of a shared vision of the importance of teamwork in terms of staff development and validation of data could also have been a contributory factor to poor team work.

All teacher-evaluators interviewed reported feeling in control of decisions about methodology and scope and they did not feel influenced by anyone who might be considered to be more powerful within the LEA. They acknowledged that the areas for investigation were agreed by the EAG but that once that decision had been made, the choice of method and the planning of the investigation was the prerogative of those involved. All except one felt that they were working for colleagues, for the pupils or for the benefit of educational practice within the LEA. The person who was the exception said they felt they were working for the seconded teacher and for the 'bureaucrats at the Civic Centre'.
However, one teacher-evaluator pointed out that the autonomy that teachers felt they had was, in fact, spurious:

"[Autonomy is] a meaningless concept for members of a society. No one tried to put pressure on me but I was not autonomous. I was still a member of a hierarchy."

S/he felt that the 'pressures from within the self' should not be underestimated and that teachers will feel torn between loyalty to colleagues and reporting critical data.

Anxieties about autonomy surfaced particularly when data of a controversial nature was being collected. Three teachers had collected data which they felt should not be for public release. The leader of the investigation was concerned that s/he might not be allowed to abandon the investigation. The others, who were collecting data within their own schools, did not realise that they and those they had interviewed had the right to control the release of data. This issue was dealt with by the EAG by returning the data to those who had given it. Professional evaluators were divided over this method of dealing with the problem. The majority were in favour of the approach taken but a couple pointed out that valuable lessons about pupil perceptions could have been gained if the knowledge of relevant research work had existed within the EAG. This was a perspective, they said, which could be offered by a professional evaluator.
While the professional evaluators did not rule out the idea that teacher-evaluators could be independent they did foresee problems. Teacher-evaluators might tend to 'play it safe':

"Even independent evaluators have enough problems with local authorities manipulating them and controlling what they do....most evaluators don't cope with the pressures ....so if independent evaluators find it difficult to maintain their independence there's no chance for the internal ones."

Strength of personality was mentioned as a key attribute:

"Evaluators should be knowledgeable people who can't be fobbed off."

The framework within which the teacher-evaluators worked would it was felt, contribute to or detract from independence:

"The evaluation should be independent so that the authority doesn't control the kind of data that one collects and what is publicly represented about the authority."

Personal integrity was considered to have considerable affect on the independence of an evaluation whether the person was internal or external.

H) REPLICABILITY

All groups were asked whether from their experience, they thought the teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation would work in other LEAs.

Responses were mixed. Attitudes in schools were considered to have changed over the past few years because of new
initiatives and there was some consensus that many teachers would be willing to cooperate although the problems of industrial action still had to be taken into account. Distance between schools was considered an inhibiting factor in large or rural LEAs but it was thought that the work could be done within LEA divisions or existing specialist groups which already met for other reasons.

LEAs which had particularly centralised power structures with inspectorial staff rather than advisory staff were not felt to offer fertile ground for the development of this approach nor did LEAs where the schools still operated in isolation. Backup in terms of resources, good will and LEA commitment were considered essential, as was the appointment of someone with a full-time responsibility for supporting the development of the work.

1) CURRENT VIEWS OF THE WORTH OF EVALUATION

Interviewees within the LEA were asked for their opinions about evaluation in general. The purpose of this question was to establish whether after their experience of teacher-evaluation they held positive or negative perceptions. It was felt that if the teacher-evaluations had not been experienced as worthwhile that this question would reveal negative or neutral views from a majority of interviewees.
The opposite was found to be the case. Members of all groups with the exception of one individual agreed that evaluation was to be welcomed.

"It gets people discussing things with their colleagues."

"It's good that people stop and think rather than just ploughing on."

"I think it's vital: all teachers are doing it. Training in techniques is very useful."

The individual who did not express positive feelings about evaluation was concerned that illuminative evaluation was not 'real' evaluation and s/he wanted to see the use of control groups and objectives measurement.

A significant change was recorded in the views of two people in informal interviews held a year apart. Both were initially very concerned about evaluation and did not want to take part - one in particular was scathing about the usefulness of evaluation. For his/her purposes it was 'too little, too late'. The other did not want his/her practice exposed. Both had changed their views in the course of the year and in the later interviews expressed positive feelings about particular aspects of the teacher- evaluators' work.
CONCLUSIONS

Climate and Replicability

The potential for evaluations which involve teachers playing a major part, is recognised by some academics (Holly, 1986a; Stenhouse, 1976a; among others), and is supported by the findings in this research—many teachers want to be involved in the evaluation of educational programmes. Although a particular set of circumstances encouraged the development of this type of evaluation in one LEA, interviewees consider the approach to be replicable in other LEAs where there is a working atmosphere which supports curriculum development and initiatives. However, they expect that LEAs in which there is an inspectorial service rather than an advisory service would experience problems in establishing the trust and openness required. The pre-existence of cross-institutional working groups would, it is considered, aid introduction of the teacher-evaluator approach. Distance between institutions could be a problem in larger LEAs but in many cases, institutions are organised into consortia and the teacher-evaluator approach could be developed within these consortia.

Teachers expressed the desire to acquire the skills necessary to evaluate their work and felt that this approach provided a framework within which they could develop evaluation skills. However, the use of volunteer teachers to do this work does require good will. While this did not appear to be a serious problem in the case being researched, the add-on nature of the commitment had clearly limited the numbers of those involved.
Supporting Structures

Flexibility and negotiability as the evaluation progresses are identified by Stufflebeam, 1971; House, 1980; MacDonald, 1973; among others, as good practice. There appears to have been an attempt to build such flexibility and negotiability into the design of the teacher-evaluator approach through the structure and working of the EAG and the BESG (as described in detail in chapter two). These structures which involve representatives from all levels of the LEA hierarchy provide a forum for discussion, planning and backup, and provide credibility for the work of the teachers. To some extent, these structures undertake a role similar to Stakes' 'court of appeals' (1976b, p.37) which he suggests would eliminate some of the problems commonly experienced in evaluation.

Without this LEA support, teacher-evaluators could be placed in vulnerable positions particularly when dealing with difficult political issues. Difficulties in a number of areas (procedures, ethics) were reported and are to be expected whether internal or external evaluations are carried out, as Adelman, (1984c); MacDonald, (1976) and Stenhouse, (1976b) among others, point out. Systems for dealing with these issues must be an integral part of the work of the committees set up to support the evaluations.

The team structure was viewed as a positive aspect of the approach by participants. It was seen to provide support and the sharing of the skills, knowledge, responsibilities and concerns of the teacher-evaluators. Within this framework,
different team members are able to develop their skills. The team approach was also thought to help to eliminate individual bias, as within the team, data is cross-checked and investigations are planned. Burgess (1984) and Cooper (1975) recognise the importance of teamwork and its usefulness is supported by these research findings.

Audience

Some professional evaluators (Stake, 1976b; House, 1980) argue for the public 'right to know' the findings of an evaluation. The teacher-evaluators' reports were viewed as 'internal working documents' and thus not for public circulation (chapter eight, section F). However, within the LEA the reports have been widely circulated. Documents have been circulated to teachers, LEA officers, advisers, inset co-ordinators, school project co-ordinators and special interest groups. Outsiders wishing to use the documents must approach the EAG for permission.

This breadth of audience within the LEA may account for some interviewees holding the view that some documents tell them what they already know while other interviewees, talking about the same document, say how much they have learnt from it. (Chapter eight, section C contains further data relating to this point.) Nevertheless, there does appear to be a consensus that the evaluation reports paint a recognisable picture of practice within the LEA. These findings support claims for the validity of the approach - Adelman (1976) makes the point that 'recognition' of the case forming the subject of the
evaluation should occur if the evaluation is 'true', and Hopkins (18/3/87, as cited on p.64 of this thesis) defines 'respondent validity' as occurring when the findings of the report 'resonate' with the audience. The validity of the approach is further discussed in chapter eight, section E.

Issue selection

Responsiveness to the needs of participants is considered a positive feature of an evaluation (Simons, 1984c; Stake, 1974). However for the evaluation to be useful, the audience and those involved in the work being evaluated, need to be able to identify appropriate issues. The research findings indicate that insiders have different perceptions of what constitutes the important issues to outsiders. It may be that asking the audience for issues to evaluate - the attempt at responsive evaluation with the teacher-evaluator approach - does not necessarily result in the most relevant or useful evaluation. Interviewees reported that the joint selection of issues involving discussion between the external evaluator and the internal evaluators would be beneficial.

There was some feeling that the scope of the teacher-evaluators' work was too narrow. Certainly the teacher-evaluators work to date appears to focus more on issues of practice rather than on procedures or management (see figure 2, pp. 178-179). However, instances were also reported where the teacher-evaluators' work was particularly useful.
There appeared to be a lack of awareness on the part of the audience, of how to use the teacher-evaluation as a tool aiding decision making and informing practice. However, problems relating to the use of evaluations are not limited to this approach. Fullan (1981), Munro (1977) and MacDonald (1976) are among a number of evaluators who are concerned about the lack of use of professionally produced evaluations.

The perspectives represented in the documents produced by the teacher-evaluators have often included those of the pupils. Thus the approach appears to give a voice to the concerns of pupils which previously may not have been heard. House (1980) identifies lack of representation of the least powerful as generally a deficiency in evaluation. This would appear to have been remedied in this case.

Ethics

Simons, 1971; Holly, 1984; and Cumming, 1986 among others, warn of the potential damaging effect of evaluation. No instances of damage were reported in the case being researched. Although some staff had been worried about particular evaluations, they were reassured when issues were dealt with by following the previously agreed ethical procedures. A positive feeling in the LEA towards the approach was noted.

Pring (1984a, 1984b) stresses the importance of trust in evaluation. Trust was found to have been built up through the application of the ethical code, through the practice of the teacher-evaluators and through the sense of shared goals.
across the LEA. However, this crucial building up of trust cannot be assumed with the teacher-evaluator approach. It is dependent on the personal characteristics of the teacher-evaluators. Data related to the characteristics required of evaluators are reported in chapter seven, section A.

It was generally thought that teacher-evaluators and external/professional evaluators experience similar ethical problems although it was considered that an external evaluator is better able to deal with such difficulties. No major ethical problems were reported, possibly because the clear procedures for maintaining confidentiality as outlined by Simons (1984c) were accepted and practised.

Freedom and autonomy

The independence of the external evaluator is considered by many, both from the literature and the research to be mythical (House, 1980; McCabe, 1985; Stenhouse, 1984). However the independence of an insider is similarly considered by some to be negligible (Fitzgibbon, 1985). Concern for the independence of teacher-evaluators formed one focus of the research and it was found that the teacher-evaluators felt that they were independent of overt LEA influence. They reported no pressure from those in positions of authority in the LEA in relation to the conduct and findings of the evaluation however some peer pressure was reported. Although no major problems were uncovered by the research, the establishing of independence is clearly an area of vulnerability in the teacher-evaluators' work.
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Stake (1976b), House (1980), and Simons (1984c) discuss the problems faced by professional evaluators in dealing with controversial and political issues and teacher-evaluators report similar problems. Personal integrity and strength of character were noted as attributes needed by teacher-evaluators if they were not to 'play it safe' and avoid difficult issues. The findings relating to the characteristics required of teacher-evaluators are reported in chapter seven, section A.

Resourcing

A resourcing commitment from the LEA is considered essential. Many expressed the view that teachers should be timetabled for evaluation work and that the role should be given more status within the school. Clerical and printing costs should be budgeted for. The role of co-ordinating the work and organising in-service training was considered vital to the functioning of the approach.

The resourcing implications for teachers' involvement in evaluation do not appear to have been considered in any of the literature available to this researcher. This issue could usefully form the subject of further research.

Summary

From the data reported in this chapter, it is concluded that given a climate of support and openness within an LEA, the teacher-evaluator approach could be replicated in other...
education authorities - either on an LEA wide basis, interest group basis or consortia basis. However, an appropriate initial design allowing flexibility and negotiability is essential - both to support the independence of those involved and to develop evaluation work over a period of time. The 'right to know' issue in particular should be addressed and procedures for selecting issues and constructively using evaluation findings, carefully considered. Ethical procedures need to be clear to all and scrupulously adhered to.

Within the LEA studied, while there had been some difficulties, the teacher-evaluator approach appeared to be well designed with the support structures working reasonably well. Teacher-evaluators considered themselves independent and ethical guidelines were being followed.

In the following chapter, chapter seven, the research findings relating to the differing roles of the teacher-evaluator and the professional evaluator are reported in detail.
CHAPTER SEVEN

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The Emerging Role of the Teacher-Evaluator
CHAPTER 7

THE EMERGING ROLE OF THE TEACHER-EVALUATOR

INTRODUCTION

In this section, findings relating to the developing role of teacher-evaluator are reported. Six relevant areas were identified from the data and from the research design:

A) Selection of teacher-evaluators
B) Training of teacher-evaluators
C) Commitment required
D) The role of an external evaluator
E) General views of the teacher-evaluator approach
F) Professional outcomes for teacher-evaluators

A) SELECTION OF TEACHER-EVALUATORS

There are two parts to this section. The first includes details of those who are or have been teacher-evaluators and covers their status, qualifications and motivation. The second reports the views of those interviewed as to the qualities required in a teacher-evaluator and includes responses to questions of status and personality type. The question of appropriate skills is included in the next section under training.
A survey was carried out covering the twenty teachers who had been most involved in the evaluation over the three year period. All but two were above scale one with more than half being heads of department. None were of higher status than deputy head (of which there were three). The group consisted of five males and fifteen females. They came from diverse backgrounds: geography, English, science, technology, TVEI, economics, history, physical education, business studies, pre-vocational studies, law, home economics. None were from maths, foreign language, music or art backgrounds.

One professional evaluator expressed surprise that teachers would voluntarily become involved in such demanding work with no reward:

"I can't understand why they are doing it. You offer them so few incentives."

Another professional evaluator commented that when discussing this type of development with colleagues, s/he has been often told that teachers will not want to do this kind of work.

Eleven of those most actively involved were asked for details about their teaching experience, academic qualifications, and reasons for becoming involved in the evaluation. These results are presented as figure 1 (p.141). The reasons they gave for their involvement were very varied. The most commonly cited being an interest in finding out what is really
Figure 1: DATA REDUCTION:
TEACHER-EVALUATORS' VIEWS ON MOTIVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Length of Service (years)</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cert.Ed., B.Ed.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>feels passionately about education and enjoys finding out what's going on; seeing theory put into practice; evaluation component in degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B.Ed., M.A.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>interested in research and have had previous experience; welcome the chance to work independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>liked action-research idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>B.A., M.A.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>was shocked to realise s/he hadn't evaluated courses s/he'd developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Cert. Ed., B.A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>head asked if s/he was interested because of previous involvement in TVEI in another LEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>B.A., P.G.C.E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>wanted to talk to pupils and find out what was going on; felt evaluation was important but was aware of being ignorant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>B.Ed.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>part and parcel of the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Cert. Ed., B.Ed.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>deputy head requested s/he went in their place. may not have made the move if not approached; evaluation component in degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>B.A., M.A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>finished M.A. degree and saw this as a challenge; like to be occupied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>B.A., P.G.C.E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>wanted to learn how to evaluate own practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>B.Sc., M.A.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>some one dropped out; found it addictive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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going on in education and in being involved in work they thought would be stimulating. All had a first degree with over half having a second degree. The average length of service in the teaching profession was ten years. The possible effect of their involvement on their professional development is explored in the section of this chapter covering the professional outcomes for teacher-evaluators.

2) Factors to consider in choosing teacher-evaluators

A wide range of attributes desirable in teacher-evaluators were reported and these are summarised in figure 2 (p.143). Four main categories emerged from the data: status; personality; mental abilities and experience.

Interviewees were divided over the importance of status. A number from different groups felt that a high status teacher-evaluator could, while being perfectly competent, have an inhibiting effect on interviewees. However, it was also felt that it was important to have high status personnel involved as results would be taken more seriously if this was the case.

A strong, confident but empathetic personality was indicated as desirable. Strength of personality was considered necessary in order to resist pressures and in the handling of sensitive issues. Empathy with those being evaluated was considered important so that trust could be established. Discretion in handling data was essential in developing trust.
## Factors to consider when choosing teacher-evaluators

### Professional evaluators' views:
- A vast difference in status will cause problems in interviews.
- Status is irrelevant (twice).
- Status may help results being taken seriously.
- Sensitivity
- Empathy (twice).
- Personality is important.
- Avoid 'hidden agenda' people.
- Basic interpersonal skills.
- Secure personality/confidence/self esteem.
- Beyond 'ego-centric' stage.
- Able to listen.
- A view of the role as providing a service, not serving the bureaucracy.
- Slow to make judgements about people or issues.
- Enquiring mind/excited by the unexpected.
- Not shattered or defensive.
- Discretion.
- Sound judgement about what to reveal.
- Open-minded (twice).
- Not a 'know it all'.
- Able to handle sensitive politically charged material.

### Nuclear Group:
- If ethics and procedures are followed, status and personality will not matter.
- High status could cause a problem (twice).
- Evaluation by peers most acceptable.
- Empathy.
- Personality (three times).
- Ability to establish trust.
- Integrity matters more than status.
- Able to communicate.
- Must share views of ethics.

### LEA Officers' views:
- Status not a problem (twice).
- Status could be a problem.

### Head teachers' views:
- Status not a problem.
- Status enhances acceptability of results (three times).
- Personality important.
- Mustn't have negative personality.
- Organised mind.
- Open mind.
- Only 10-20% staff would be capable.
- Experience important.

### Central support team:
- High status a problem: these people could go into other schools (twice).

### Co-ordinators' views:
- Senior management should be involved.
- Those who can affect career prospects shouldn't be involved.
- Experience.
- Supportive and able to establish trust.
- Not those set in their ways.

### Teacher-evaluators' views:
- Not high status.
- Not policy makers.
- Experienced (twice).
- Not exclusively TVEI or non-TVEI.
- Confident.
- Positive.
- Not with set ideas.
An open mind was mentioned by members from most groups as vital while professional evaluators particularly mentioned the ability to reflect and analyse. Members of a majority of groups felt that the teacher-evaluator should have considerable experience in education. One head teacher commented that only 10-20% of his/her staff would be able to fulfill his/her criteria and one professional evaluator commented that significant numbers of his/her M.A students were unable to analyse data satisfactorily.

B) TRAINING OF TEACHER-EVALUATORS

Three groups (professional evaluators, the nucleus group and the teacher-evaluators) were asked what training they considered was appropriate for teacher-evaluators.

Basic research skills were cited by all groups. Teacher-evaluators need training in interviewing skills, listening skills, writing and analytical skills, observation skills, and documentary analysis skills. Teacher-evaluators also identified management techniques and skills for dealing with hostility as additional areas for inservice training.

No one mentioned academic training as being the best way to become trained — in fact the opposite opinion was voiced by several professional evaluators:
Learning by the 'collaborative model' - working with experienced evaluators was favoured, together with time to read the work of other evaluators and current research and evaluation trends in education. One professional evaluator described the training process as rather 'like a snowball' with skills accumulating and growing over time. It was felt by members of the nucleus group that training had been inadequate in the early days of the teacher-evaluations but that there was a noticeable build up in teachers' possession and use of evaluative skills within the LEA over the three years. Two professional evaluators mentioned that they found the idea of starting the process of developing evaluative skills within the teachers in an LEA, a daunting task.

C) COMMITMENT REQUIRED

The heavy time commitment had caused some teachers to pull out of the evaluation. For those leading investigations and co-ordinating the writing-up of reports this time has been estimated to be somewhere in the region of two weeks full-time equivalent. This time is fitted into weekends, holiday times, lunch times and out-of-school times. Some, but not all of the teacher-evaluators, had been able to take two days out of school for the writing-up of reports (the time is allowed at
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the discretion of the school). It is estimated by aggregating the time spent by team members on an investigation, that each report has taken at least the equivalent of five weeks of one person's time to produce (plus typing time).

Some members of the nucleus group and some of the teacher-evaluators objected to the work being seen as an 'add-on' to a full-time work load. They felt that the work was important enough for it to be given timetabled time - .1 FTE or half a day a week was suggested. As one person commented:

"Spare-time work is not high quality work."

and a professional evaluator commented on the necessity of good support systems:

"It needs underpinning if the LEA is to take it seriously."

The original plan for the teacher-evaluators' work included provision for five or six days out of school per year to allow time for evaluation work. This was never put into effect. Part of the reason was that teacher industrial action began at the same time and permission was not easily obtained for time out of the classroom.
D) THE ROLE OF AN EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

All groups were asked to say what they thought were the advantages and disadvantages of having an external evaluator and these views are summarised in figure 3 (pp. 148, 149).

For the purpose of the research, an external evaluator is considered to be someone not in the permanent employ of the local authority in which the evaluation is taking place.

All groups were agreed that there is an important role for the external evaluator within the teacher-evaluator approach. There was also some agreement between those internal to the LEA and the professional evaluators about what that role should include.

Both agreed that external evaluators bring a wider and different perspective to bear and so will identify different issues as important. It was considered that insiders might not be removed enough from the scene of the action to appreciate the significance of certain conditions. The external evaluators' work was expected to be of a higher quality both in terms of depth and in the research skills employed than that of the teacher-evaluators.

A majority of interviewees agreed that in the evaluation of difficult and painful issues, the external evaluator was in a better position than the teacher-evaluator in that any hostility engendered would not affect working relationships beyond a short span of time. The external evaluator was felt to be more able to take an independent and impartial stance particularly on difficult political/emotional
## Positive and negative features of external evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Evaluators' views</strong></td>
<td>80% of professional evaluators' work is tedious and boring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can identify issues insiders are blind to (four times)</td>
<td>time is a problem because of other responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can act as a resource: can advise on difficulties (twice)</td>
<td>for most purposes teachers are superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: training input</td>
<td>can suffer career penalties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: wide experience (twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best if internal and external work together (four times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more independent: not subject to internal pressures (twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'flak deflector': can publicize painful findings (twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more leverage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEA Officers</strong></td>
<td>takes considerable time to absorb the culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better able to cover certain issues</td>
<td>everyone is biased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree of detachment implied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't share views of insiders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of prior knowledge can give fresh view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignorance is useful: 'innocent questioner'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'street' credibility is high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nucleus group</strong></td>
<td>objective is only apparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide richer data with more depth</td>
<td>teacher-evaluators have good contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-service training (thrice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wider perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help plan team work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource/sounding board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more able to report difficult issues (twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide academic context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination of internal and external is best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on different issues: institutional/administrative processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check validity and methodology of teacher-evaluators' work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Central Support Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wide experience: educational and research (thrice)</td>
<td>Many teachers have experience from degree work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview (twice)</td>
<td>Will see issues insiders miss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training (twice)</td>
<td>Will provide status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (twice)</td>
<td>Will have own biases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will see issues insiders miss</td>
<td>Wider perspective (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will provide status</td>
<td>Could emphasise irrelevant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider perspective (twice)</td>
<td>More impartial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different priorities</td>
<td>Help avoid introspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help avoid introspection</td>
<td>Useful sounding board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Head Teachers

| Skilled educationalist | Perceived authority is spurious |
| Good analytical skills | Will have reduced credibility because unknown |
| Wider perspective (thrice) | Work with teachers (twice) |
| People will take more notice of results (twice) | Offer directives |
| Work with teachers (twice) | Experience will have reduced credibility because unknown |
| Offer directives | Can tackle issues raising hostility |
| Experience | More skilled (three) |

### Teacher-Evaluators' Views

| Experience | Teacher-evaluators know what questions to ask |
| In-service training | Won't have the same values (biased) |
| Could comment on bias in reports | Out of touch with classroom |
| Different perspective | Staff are more relaxed with known people |
| More impartial (twice) | Can't easily pull out the important areas to evaluate |
| More time | Take a long time to find out what is going on |
| Can tackle issues raising hostility | More judgemental |
| More skilled (three) | Could tackle sensitive issues |
| Help validity/ better practice | Joint effort is best |

### Co-ordinators' Views

| More astute/ get at subtleties | Could be difficult to find out what is really going on |
| Could have both internal and external | Couldn't afford to have one all the time |
| Totally detached/ no allegiances/ impartial (thrice) | Out of touch with schools |
| More skilled and experienced (twice) | Will leave no expertise in LEA when they leave |
| Overview | Trust not easily established |
| Pick up bias | More time |
| Better selection of issues | Better selection of issues |
issues. One professional evaluator commented when explaining the contribution of the external evaluator:

"If somebody can be blamed as a lunatic academic who doesn't know what he's talking about ..... I think that's as important [a role] as any...."

The external evaluator role was considered to provide a useful resource for in-service training and advice by both groups. It was felt that they added status and validity to the work. Although some interviewees considered this validity as 'spurious', others mentioned that they thought 'other people' would find the results more acceptable if an external evaluator was involved.

Some of the internal groups thought the external evaluator would be more judgemental. However one professional evaluator considered that s/he would be less judgemental. One misconception about what the external evaluator could offer, was in the area of time. Internal groups saw the external evaluator as having more time than they themselves did whereas the professional evaluators mentioned that shortage of time was a problem for all evaluators. This misconception may be due to the fact the only contact most people in the LEA have had with an external evaluator was with one who worked full-time in the LEA. It may not have been appreciated that this is not the usual situation with external evaluators and that many external evaluators are academics with other responsibilities which make demands on their time.

It was recognised by the internal groups that external evaluators do experience difficulties: difficulty in making
contacts and of building up trust and credibility were mentioned as well as the possibility that they may become co-opted in the process. The view was expressed that they may choose irrelevant issues and be out of touch with what is happening in the classroom particularly because of the rapid nature of the changes occurring at the present time.

That procedures should be adopted to limit the effect of personal bias was agreed by both teacher-evaluators and professional evaluators who were interviewed. Neither group claimed, or was considered to be free of bias. A more detailed analysis of the research findings in relation to bias are reported in chapter eight, section D.

The potential for a joint approach between external and internal evaluators was recognised. Teacher-evaluators and external evaluators were seen to possess complementary advantages. These will be further examined in the section following in which general opinions of the teacher-evaluator approach are recorded.

E) GENERAL VIEWS OF THE TEACHER-EVALUATOR APPROACH

Many comments reported in figure 3 (pp.149,149) regarding the positive and negative aspects of external evaluation can also be applied in reverse to teacher-evaluation. However, additional general points emerged during the research and these are reported in this section.
3) Professional Evaluators

The professional evaluators interviewed were known to favour some involvement of teachers in evaluation and research so their comments should be viewed with that perspective in mind.

There were several issues which concerned them. It was felt by one that practice could be improved in three ways: by the involvement of lay people in the evaluation advisory and steering groups; the involvement of parents and pupils in the evaluation exercises; and the education committee having direct access to the evaluation. Problems of a lack of overview and knowledge of recent research were cited by two professional evaluators. One expressed concern about current trends in evaluation:

"I feel that for a number of reasons, some of which are just crudely financial, the LEAs are opting for internal evaluation. Some of them of course are crudely political. That way you don't get a bloody nose from the evaluation."

Lack of time, resources, overview and political problems were identified as problems to be considered in developing a teacher-evaluator approach.

4) Nucleus group

Not surprisingly members of the nucleus group, regardless of background were supportive of the teacher-evaluator approach. Opportunities for staff development and benefits in terms of a
more reflective staff for the LEA were mentioned as points in favour of the adoption of a teacher-evaluator approach as was the relevance of the data:

"The success of this approach stems from the relevance of the data. Teachers know where to look, particularly if they are from the same project."

Difficulties which were acknowledged included 'personal pressure', 'lack of reflection', 'too close to the action' and the possibility that the teacher-evaluators may be supporters of one particular point of view within a programme. However, the difficulties were felt to be outweighed by the benefits - particularly if the team approach was used and 'if an external presence is also maintained'.

LEA Officers

LEA officers noted that the teacher-evaluation offered opportunities for professional development and gains for the project:

"It is a safe and legitimate way of focusing people's attention .... an acceptable way for people to receive feedback."

The need for an outsider to 'look at things dispassionately' was mentioned as was the need to be realistic about the type of work that the teachers could do.
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4) Head teachers

Most head teachers were positive about the approach. Some wanted to organise teams of evaluators in their own schools. Another mentioned that notice would be taken of teacher-evaluators' work because they were known and respected within the LEA. S/he added:

"At least you can't say they've written a book on the basis of a few interviews."

However there was also some feeling that the teacher-evaluator work was too restricted in its aims and objectives and that better feedback was needed.

5) Teacher-evaluators

The teacher-evaluators were positive in their support of the approach particularly if training, resources and status were given. They too acknowledged the difficult political problems which had to be faced, the lack of time to do thorough work, the need for better feedback and the possible problems of isolation.
Central Support Team and School Co-ordinators

The central support team and the school co-ordinators found the cross-fertilization of ideas useful and the encouragement of discussion with colleagues both inside and outside their own school to be of positive benefit. Trust was high between the teacher-evaluators and those involved and it was felt that the teacher-evaluators tackled real problems although their sympathy with those working on the project could be considered a positive or a negative feature of the approach.

F) PROFESSIONAL OUTCOMES FOR TEACHER-EVALUATORS

As professional development of teachers with consequent spin-off for practice in the LEA had been cited as a reason for the adoption of the approach an attempt was made to discover what the effects had been. It was found that the teacher-evaluators are not a static group. There has been a steady turnover for two main reasons - the extent of the commitment and the promotion of those involved.

A study was done of the career changes of twenty teachers who had been or who were becoming very involved in teacher-evaluation. Of this twenty, all except four experienced a change in their career during their involvement with the evaluation - either through promotion or through secondment or through both. Of the four who have not experienced change, one took maternity leave, one withdrew at an early stage and the other two were new to the evaluation in 1987 (as are two
of those who gained promotion or secondment). It is beyond the scope of this research to discover whether those attracted to teacher-evaluation are those who would normally be expected to seek and gain promotion or whether being involved as a teacher-evaluator has precipitated and helped career change. Those teacher-evaluators who were asked about the effect of their involvement on their professional development reported that they felt their practice had been improved and that the wider perspective they gained through working with people from other schools was particularly valuable.

With the exception of two of the group, all were on scale two or above at the beginning of their involvement. After involvement: five had become advisory teachers; two head teachers; two deputies; two heads of department and five were on secondment.

Of the twenty, only seven are likely to be active in the teacher-evaluations of the next academic year - a number have moved to other LEAs while others are giving more time to their new responsibilities. Thus there is a constant turnover and consequent need for a continuing programme of in-service training.

The professional development stimulated by the teacher-evaluation was not felt to be restricted to those directly involved in gathering data and writing reports. Some head teachers have indicated they now want more formal evaluation in their own schools and in some cases they have taken steps
to start this. One member of the nucleus group now liaising with schools across the LEA reported definite progress in the acceptance and expectation of evaluation of practice.

LEA officers were not asked directly about the possible effect of involvement on a teachers' professional development but two opposing views were expressed in interview. One referred scathingly to the people involved as 'self-nominees' yet the other referred to the usefulness of such developments in identifying new talent within the LEA.

CONCLUSIONS

Selection

The attributes identified as important for teacher-evaluators to possess were also thought to apply to evaluators in general. It was considered that those involved in the work should be secure, confident yet discrete, empathetic and able to establish trust. They need an open mind yet be able to reflect and analyse. Although it was considered that they should possess experience of education, their status ought to be such that an interviewee doesn't feel threatened - for instance it would not be appropriate for the teacher-evaluator to interview a member of staff for whom s/he controls promotion prospects. The teacher-evaluator teams should have members of various status who might work in schools other than their own, to allow for this problem. The school of thought described by Burgess (1980a) which holds that the ideal
educational researchers are complete outsiders to the profession, was not supported by the data collected from those interviewed for the purpose of this research. Motivation was high among those involved – most wanted to acquire the skills of evaluation to help them with their work.

A heavy time commitment is required for periods up to four months at a time during which an investigation is planned, data collected, and the writing up is done. Most teacher-evaluators used lunch hours, their own time and non-teaching time to collect data and to meet. There was some feeling that the quality of work would improve if time for evaluation work could be timetabled.

Training of teacher-evaluators

Professional evaluators who were interviewed thought that skills could adequately be learnt 'on the job'. It was suggested that basic research skills be taught early on, with higher level skills being acquired by working with more experienced people over a period of time. Teacher-evaluators in the LEA which is the subject of the research had days of training as and when it was considered necessary. This training was usually provided by a professional evaluator.

Two schools of thought on evaluation training were found in the evaluation literature. Stufflebeam (1985) holds the view that training for evaluators is a long complicated process while others (Harlen, 1978; Lyons, 1981) hold the opposing view that an academic training is less important than learning through experience. No papers suggesting 'good practice' for
such training were found in the evaluation literature studied. The teacher-evaluators themselves suggest that training is needed in basic research skills, management skills and techniques for dealing with hostility towards evaluation.

Internal and External evaluators' roles

A joint approach to evaluation using internal and external evaluators was thought to be best able to provide evaluations which could influence educational practice.

The teacher-evaluator approach found favour with all groups interviewed. It was considered that teachers had advantages over external evaluators in a number of ways.

For instance, teacher-evaluators are considered not to have difficulty in identifying relevant sources of information as that knowledge is at their fingertips. They know what the issues are and it is more difficult for information to be kept hidden from them than from an outsider. Eraut (1984) and Adelman (1984) are among a number of professional evaluators who have commented on the difficulties they have as outsiders, in gaining access to relevant information.

Trust was thought to be more easily established by teacher-evaluators as they are already known within the LEA. Pring (1984a) establishes the importance of trust if effective evaluation is to take place. It seems that the teacher-evaluator approach has two advantages over external evaluators
at this point - one being that trust is more easily established and the other being that a report can be produced in less time because time does not have to be spent establishing the credentials of the outsider.

It is thought that the work of the teacher-evaluators is more likely to be relevant to those involved in the project - tackling issues of immediate concern arising from practice. This goes some way to solving a problem raised in the evaluation literature - that of the 'irrelevance' of much educational research and evaluation (MacDonald, 1976; Simons, 1971; Weiss, 1986b, among others). Cousins and Leithwood (1986) found that internal evaluations were considered more useful than external evaluations. This potential for relevance of the teacher-evaluators' work must be considered a significant strength of this approach over more traditional approaches although the method of selecting areas for evaluation may affect relevance as discussed in chapter six.

Teachers were seen to suffer disadvantages in that they lacked an overview and knowledge of recent research. However these problems could be remedied through the development of a joint approach between teachers and external/professional evaluators.

Time to do the evaluation work was a problem noted by teacher-evaluators - both for reflection and to do the research. These difficulties with time are shared with professional evaluators who report similar difficulties. The provision of
timely evaluation is one of the measures of good practice as outlined by Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983). The teacher-evaluators' reports are analysed with regard to timeliness in chapter eight: some reports were found to be produced in time to be of use whereas others were delayed for so long that they were of little use. (The lack of any mechanism for ensuring the use of the reports contributed significantly to the delay).

Professional evaluators and teacher-evaluators reported sharing problems relating to bias. They agreed that procedures should be adopted to limit the effect of personal bias and neither group claimed, or was considered, to be free of bias. Research findings relating to bias are discussed in more detail in section D of chapter 8.

It was acknowledged that teachers may have difficulty in reporting sensitive information and that political problems in the LEA could threaten their independence. However, this weakness of the teacher-evaluator approach is also shared with professional evaluators. Simons (1984) and House (1980) discuss similar threats to independence in professional evaluations.

The terms insider and outsider as defined in the literature by, for instance, Elliott (1984) and Lewy (1985), are not entirely satisfactory. Some of the teacher-evaluators were from institutions with no involvement in the project being evaluated and considered themselves 'outsiders' although for
the purposes of this research they have been labelled 'insiders'. These 'distanced insiders' provide checks and balances within the teacher-evaluator approach - they have the advantages of being inside the LEA yet have the detached viewpoint of the outsider.

A key question in the debate about the advantages of insiders over outsiders was raised by two interviewees. They posed the question of finance and the approach: "If money was not limited, would the teacher-evaluator approach still be considered desirable?". As early as 1976, Hamilton predicted that changes in evaluation methods would occur because of economic pressures. However, a cost analysis of the teacher-evaluator approach has yet to be done so these questions cannot be answered by this research.

External evaluators were seen to have important advantages over teacher-evaluators. They were felt to be dispassionate, to have a wider perspective and were expected to produce higher quality work of more depth using more sophisticated research skills. They were seen to have a particular role advising on in-service training, areas for evaluation and providing up-to-date information about areas being researched.

There were unexpected gains for the teachers and for the LEA resulting from the adoption of the approach. Teachers reported that the work made them more reflective of their practice and they valued the cross-fertilization of ideas. Some interviewees considered that evaluation was the duty of the
professional, not an 'add-on': a point of view endorsed by Shostak (1980).

The LEA gained in terms of building up expertise within teachers, creating a more reflective profession, the welding of a sense of common purpose across the LEA and a growth of evaluation in different areas as teacher-evaluators applied their skills in other areas.

Summary

A collaborative approach to evaluation between professional evaluators and teacher-evaluators was thought to offer a solution to many of the problems besetting evaluators - those of timeliness, bias, access to information, relevance and trust. Professionals were considered to offer a different perspective and to have an important role in providing training.

The teams of teacher-evaluators should include staff of differing status who are open minded and who are known and generally trusted within the LEA.

The teacher-evaluator approach offers the advantage of building up evaluation expertise among teachers thus helping to create a more reflective profession, and of encouraging communication between institutions within an LEA.

In the next chapter, issues relating to the practice of the teacher-evaluators are explored. These are considered in the light of concerns expressed in evaluation literature, views of those interviewed on aspects of the teacher-evaluators' practice and an analysis of the work done to date.
CHAPTER EIGHT

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Issues Relating to Practice
CHAPTER 8

ISSUES RELATING TO PRACTICE

INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapters the perceptions of those involved regarding the context in which the teacher-evaluators have been working and the way in which their role has been developing have been reported. In this section, wider issues are explored - issues which relate to the work which has actually been done - and they are reported under the following categories:

A) Evaluative methods used.
B) Dissemination procedures.
C) Effectiveness, utilization and change.
D) Bias.
E) Validity.
F) Comments on and criteria for judging reports.
G) Style and purpose of reports.
H) Unintended outcomes.

A) EVALUATIVE METHODS USED

Three principal methods were reported as being used for the collection of data for the evaluations (see figure 2, pp.178/9):

- interviews: with pupils, staff and employers
- questionnaires: used with pupils, parents and staff.
- documentation: from outside organisations and publications from schools and from the LEA.
Diaries and observation were not used because they were not considered appropriate for the work that was done. Teacher-evaluators were not restricted in their choice of methods except by constraints due to lack of time and insufficient skill (for instance in the design of questionnaires). There were some problems in maintaining uniformity of data collection methods in particular investigations - these can probably be attributed to poor communication between team members.

Interviewees were asked to comment on methods used in the evaluation as set out in each report. Small sample size was an issue which concerned a number of the individuals interviewed although when pressed they were unable to define what they considered an adequate sample size - just 'more' data from pupils/schools/teachers. However, the sample sizes were not considered a problem by those external evaluators who were asked to comment.

A small number of interviewees indicated a preference for the objectives model of evaluation citing the measurement of objectives and use of control groups as important aspects of evaluative method. Others preferred the illuminative approach and found 'soft data' about, for instance, 'feelings' particularly useful.

Teacher-evaluators were asked to keep data for five years so that the validity of their findings could be checked if necessary. It was decided not to keep this centrally as agreements about clearance were made between the individuals and the teacher-evaluator concerned.
No complaints were received about the release of confidential data in any of the reports so it is assumed that correct procedures for the clearance of data were carried out. A number of draft reports were amended before publication by those who gave the data. In all except one case the alterations were of a minor nature.

Cross-checking of data occurred in several ways. People working in a team collecting data from different institutions were able to identify dissonance and examine data and methodology for explanations. The EAG reading panel examined draft documents and asked for and received justifications and explanations of areas in question. No major alterations were suggested in any case.

B) DISSEMINATION PROCEDURES

Initially, there appeared to be no attempt to organise the dissemination of findings from the teachers' evaluations. There was also difficulty in finding anyone willing to do the extra work of distributing the reports to those who should receive them. This aspect of evaluation design - establishing procedures for the organisation of feedback and report distribution, had apparently been omitted in the original design of the internal evaluation.

The newness of the situation is one possible explanation together with the fact that members of the EAG were pressed for time. The first two reports were not distributed until
seven months after the teachers involved submitted them to the EAG. Because one report was lengthy, discussion on it was put off month after month. There was also a problem in organising funding of the production of the reports. Early reports were typed by the teachers themselves or by school secretaries.

Temporary solutions to the problem of funding the production of reports were found. However, the problem continually resurfaced causing delays in production. A serious problem delaying dissemination arose when teachers who could not type or who did not have acquiescent school secretaries, were team leaders for the production of teacher-evaluation reports. A significant amount of clerical assistance is required to support the teacher-evaluators work: typing, producing, addressing and distributing reports, assembling mailing lists, providing backup and information for inservice courses, and correspondence with those involved.

Although EAG members recognise that rapid feedback is essential to the success of the evaluation the problems with a lack clerical supporting structures have severely hampered dissemination of results.

Report back sessions with participants were not organised for the early reports so these reports were never discussed with interested groups. The EAG had not taken on the responsibility of seeing that the findings were taken seriously. With the secondment of a teacher to support the teacher-evaluators, the situation improved. Feedback and
discussion sessions were held with school co-ordinators and special interest groups. However, with a couple of notable exceptions, none of the staff with particular borough responsibilities for the areas researched, appear to have formally taken up the issues raised. Consequently feedback is still patchy.

C) EFFECTIVENESS, UTILIZATION AND CHANGE

As the principal purpose of this approach to evaluation is to inform the practice of those involved in the programme, the questions of effectiveness and degree of utilization of the work were considered important areas to research. All those involved were asked if they had used the reports and to define criteria for judging the effectiveness of the evaluation. The answers were very varied with no marked differences between the different groups.

The main criteria were:

- whether the documents were read
- raising the level of debate and awareness among participants
- the level of feedback to participants at all levels
- highlighting of issues which need attention, planning should follow
- whether any changes in practice or perceptions could be directly related to the evaluation work.

However it was acknowledged that effectiveness is difficult to measure and that changes in practice and policy are rarely the result of one influence but the result of a number of influences which come together to make the change or the taking of a particular decision a logical step. Evaluation
findings were likely to be only one of the influences.

Members of all groups expressed the view that a measure of the success of the evaluation was that those affected found evaluation valuable:

"...the extent that people who are involved in it can value evaluation."

"Do people feel they've benefited from the activity rather than been destroyed by it or diminished in some sense as human beings by it."

The majority of those working in the LEA who were interviewed claimed to find the evaluation useful and to have discussed the findings with others.

"It highlighted problem areas ...forced us to think about them."

However two people at school level mentioned that the reports were not telling them anything new. This problem, that the evaluation may only confirm what people know or suspect already was mentioned by two professional evaluators. One commented that in many cases it is only once knowledge becomes public that action results even if the knowledge was instinctively known beforehand. The other commented on the usefulness of confirming what those involved may know already:

"...even if you're just confirming [old insights] you may still be being very effective ....because people who have those kind of insights with regard to say gender issues require such support at the moment. If you are only offering support in terms of insights they already have you're fulfilling a tremendously important function. But if you're actually changing people's perceptions .... that would be absolutely amazing."
That the evaluations had influenced their practice was mentioned by the majority of school co-ordinators, teacher-evaluators and Central Support Team members who were interviewed. 'Awareness of different perspectives' and ways of improving their own practice were mentioned as well as the usefulness of debate within and outside the school situation stimulated by the reports. At LEA officer level it was reported that insights were gained into how participants in project development felt - information which was previously largely inaccessible to them.

However, feedback sessions and the level of debate about documents and their findings were not considered to be adequate. A number of those involved in the project felt there was scope for more discussion in the schools as well as among participants. As one interviewee commented:

"We need to know how to use and ask for information."

D) BIAS

Those interviewed were asked for their views on bias in procedures used and on bias in the documents produced. They were also asked to identify ways in which bias could be reduced when teachers were working with this approach.

Bias was not felt to be a major issue by any of the groups interviewed. Reasons given for this were that the teacher-evaluators were known and thus although they were clearly presenting a particular perspective in their reports this bias
was not hidden from the audience. Group working both at planning and analysing stages together with the use of the reading panel before publication were felt to reduce the effect of an individual's bias. The comment that outside evaluators are just as likely to be biased as inside evaluators was made by a number of interviewees from all groups. Two interviewees commented that if there was any bias it would be that 'insiders support and don't question the LEA framework' and that 'teachers shied away from controversial issues'.

An analysis was done to try to illustrate the balance on teams between those very involved in the project and those almost 'outside' the project (figure 1, p.172).

Team members were given ratings according to their involvement in the project. A rating of 1 meant they were not involved in the project at all and thus to a certain extent could be considered (and considered themselves) to have an 'outsiders' viewpoint while a rating of 5 meant they were involved in the project full-time. The mean rating for each report was then calculated. A mean rating of 3 for a report indicates that there was balance between teachers involved full-time in the project and those not involved at all. The results of this analysis are presented on the next page.
Analysis of teacher-evaluation team members degree of involvement with the project.

RATING DIVISIONS

Rating | Degree of involvement
--- | ---
1 | team members who were not involved in the project at all.
2 | those working in an institution which offered TVEI but who were not otherwise involved.
3 | those with minor involvement in TVEI.
4 | those with half-time or more teaching involvement or very involved in the development.
5 | those with full-time responsibility in the scheme.

MEAN RATINGS FOR REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>date of publication</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service training</td>
<td>October 1985</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profiling</td>
<td>Spring 1985</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>March 1986</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>March 1986</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment (1986)</td>
<td>July 1986</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Issues</td>
<td>October 1986</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Based Curriculum</td>
<td>March 1987</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEI - a wider curriculum</td>
<td>March 1987</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TVEI Residential</td>
<td>May 1987</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing TVEI</td>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tec/Voc options: some aspects</td>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About half the reports were produced by those very involved in the project and about half by groups balanced by those less involved with no tendency for either pattern to dominate.

E) VALIDITY

Professional evaluators, LEA officers and the nucleus group were asked to comment on the validity of the teacher-evaluators' work. There was a considerable degree of consensus among members of the three groups that while the evaluative methods employed should satisfy academic criteria for validity, the style of the reports would be different to those produced by an academic researcher because their purpose and the audience are different.

"If you're talking about strict research criteria whereby you're able to show by going through these procedures that these interpretations are valid from the data that's drawn and you can generate these propositions or these implications and you hand those on intact to the reader then I don't think that's what one's doing here.... If you were saying the purpose of these documents is to raise people's consciousness about the issues .......to give them some sort of data base for thinking further about these issues ...and that one has cross-checked the data and have a sufficient basis for coming to the judgements that you've derived from the data....then that should be valid at least that is one criteria for validity."

"....different purpose and agenda to research...."

"..no less valid than using external evaluators. It's different. The two are quite different."

"If you're doing fairly immediate evaluations and you consider them as working documents then you don't have to be so fussy about whether it's got flaws. If it actually gets the job done. What you want are documents which are approachable."
An eclectic approach to methodology was considered to improve validity:

"A broad and varied approach to data gathering is required...they must meet the three criteria - accuracy, fairness, relevance."

"It depends on the sources used and the way the sources have been checked."

"If you go for description and analysis I'm not sure if the questions of validity and reliability are as important. They would be important if you were trying to establish and justify an hypothesis."

Some interviewees suggested that documents gained validity if they were useful and used:

"Validity is sterile.....reports gain validity when they become active documents."

"It is more important that they are accepted and used."

The brevity of the documents was seen to have a negative effect on validity (but a positive effect on use - see section F, p.175)

"Brevity of documents means trust is needed."

"In any short documents like this there will obviously be gaps."
The reaction of the audience was also mentioned as providing a validity check:

"There's another kind of validity check and that's in terms of the people reading them and receiving them and recognising the issues."

"Invalid work will be challenged by colleagues."

There were differing opinions on the acceptability of reports prepared by insiders or outsiders:

"One of the problems of the internal evaluations is that you can't get external people to take them seriously."

"The external report was not as valid because it was not written in full knowledge of the circumstances."

**F) COMMENTS ON AND CRITERIA FOR JUDGING REPORTS**

All groups agreed that the reports were readable and coherent and that their brevity and the fact they came in 'little waves' meant that they were able to be read in spite of busy schedules. Many interviewees commented that thick reports 'go on the library shelf' or are left in the intray until they are out of date. All interviewees with one exception claimed to have read the reports as they arrived. (The interviewee who was the exception had particular reasons for not giving these reports high priority). It was also reported that the fact that the reports were short meant that they were more likely to be discussed in meetings and thus made use of. Their immediacy was considered particularly helpful:
"Short evaluations catch the thing on the wing as opposed to waiting until the thing is dead and stuffing it."

Clear language and lack of jargon were reported as positive features which influenced views about the reports, as was the appearance - 'looks professional' - and 'clarity of presentation' of the findings. A number of interviewees described the reports as 'an interesting read' and it was felt that the 'house style' had improved over time.

There was general agreement that the reports were trusted and trustworthy because those producing them were known and their 'judgement and professionalism as teachers' was respected. It was reported as a positive advantage that they were known because it was 'easier to detect bias when people are known'. A number of interviewees reported that the reports had 'struck a chord' with them. Others mentioned that it was important that the reports:

"...feel right in the light of one's own experience."

The use of quantitative data in reports jarred with some and conversely the lack of quantitative data in other reports was felt to be a flaw by others.

A number of interviewees indicated that the reports should be seen as working documents, 'hot off the press', providing 'snap shots' of the scheme and that they should be viewed in that light.
Others were concerned with sample size and with the limitations of scope of the reports. It was felt that the complexity of issues might be neglected and issues dealt with superficially because of self-imposed constraints of time and length. Most interviewees reported that they read the documents with the view of informing their own practice:

"What has it got to say to me?"

G) STYLE AND PURPOSE OF REPORTS

The teacher-evaluators' reports were analysed for the purposes of this research, under several headings which it was thought, would throw light on issues relating to the teacher-evaluator approach in action - including issues of relevance, timeliness, independence, methodology and use. These findings are reported in figure 2, pp.178-179.

There appear to have been three phases in the development of the responsiveness of the evaluation. Initially issues were selected by the external evaluator and the EAG, secondly by the EAG but thirdly by wide consultation with LEA staff. A variety of methods have been employed in covering a wide range of issues.

The sample size has varied from document to document. Staff and pupil perspectives have been principally represented although the views of parents, employers and LEA officers have also been considered.
Chapter 8

Figure 2: DATA REDUCTION

Analysis of teacher-evaluator reports

With the exception of the most recently produced report, all reports have been widely circulated and are available within the education authority. One hundred and fifty copies are usually printed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT and DATE</th>
<th>SELECTION of ISSUES</th>
<th>AIM</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>PERSPECTIVES REPRESENTED</th>
<th>TIMING: date circulated/production time/cause of delay</th>
<th>FEEDBACK SESSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSET Oct.85</td>
<td>EAG/ext.ev.</td>
<td>perceptions of INSET over 2yrs</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>providers</td>
<td>Jun.86/18mths/industrial action/staff change</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFILING Apr.85</td>
<td>EAG/ext.ev.</td>
<td>national trends/local perceptions</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>Jun.86/18mths/admin.-lack of procedures</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUIT-MENT Mar.86</td>
<td>EAG/ext.ev.</td>
<td>patterns of option choice</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>pupils (parents)</td>
<td>Jun.86/9mths/admin.-lack of procedures</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK EXP. Mar.86</td>
<td>EAG/ext.ev.</td>
<td>examine work exp.element of TVEI</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>employers/pupils/staff Proj. Trident staff</td>
<td>Jun.86/9mths/admin.-lack of procedures</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUIT-MENT 1986</td>
<td>EAB</td>
<td>identify factors causing drop in recruitment</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>pupils</td>
<td>Sep.86/4mths</td>
<td>school co-ords.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER ISSUES Oct.86</td>
<td>EAB</td>
<td>identify factors affecting girls taking TVEI/CDT</td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>pupils</td>
<td>Oct.86/5mths</td>
<td>co-ords. CDT HOGs special interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNMENT BASED CURRIC. Mar.87</td>
<td>TVEI CO-ORD.</td>
<td>identify process provoke discussion</td>
<td>q/aire</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>Mar.87/2mths</td>
<td>resident trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TVEI: A WIDER CURRICULUM Mar.87</th>
<th>LEA staff consulted</th>
<th>Investigate TVEI integration</th>
<th>Interview case study/one school</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Mar.87/6mths/clerical delay 2½ mths</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TVEI: RESIDENTIAL May 87</td>
<td>LEA staff consulted</td>
<td>Investigate residential experience</td>
<td>Q/Aire 7 schools</td>
<td>pupils</td>
<td>Jun.87/9mths/clerical delay 5 mths</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none as yet</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCING TVEI Jun.87</td>
<td>LEA staff consulted</td>
<td>Highlight setting up TVEI issues</td>
<td>Interview 2/2 new schools</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Jun.87/9mths/clerical delay 3 mths, data clearance 2 mths</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none as yet</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEC/VOC OPTIONS Jun.87</td>
<td>LEA staff consulted</td>
<td>Consortia issues</td>
<td>Interview pupils staff</td>
<td>not circul.as yet/8mths/staff illness</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* the circulation list has not yet been agreed for this document.
Some reports have been produced reasonably quickly while others have taken much much longer - problems with clerical help accounted for much of the delay.

Feedback sessions were held in the second phase but had not yet been held in the third phase at the time of writing, because of changes in personnel.

H) UNINTENDED OUTCOMES

In the course of the interviews with those within the LEA various data was collected concerning unexpected effects of the teacher-evaluators’ work.

The effect on the teachers involved and on the LEA appears to be more profound than had been expected. For some teachers it is considered that their involvement has ‘revitalised their work...they are ‘up and running’’. Others have experienced unexpected career changes and ‘practical problems have generated a renewed interest in different aspects of theory’.

One member of the nucleus group commented on the significance of the gains for the LEA:

"I didn't expect it to be so significant for the LEA as it is...evaluation knowledge is now very widely dispersed in the LEA. In many schools up to a third of staff may have been interviewed or involved in some way."
It was felt that the 'fear of evaluation' had been removed in
the LEA and many teachers expected that new work should be
carefully evaluated as a matter of course. 'More questioning
of their own performance' was noted. The skills which some
teacher-evaluators have gained have been seen to be
transferred to other aspects of their work - as 'critical
friends' of schools and in reports they have produced on
aspects of their work.

One LEA officer reported that s/he hadn't realised that
evaluation could be a 'tool for action'.

Unexpectedly, two major critics of evaluation within the LEA
were found to have become more accepting and interested in
evaluation over a fifteen month period.

CONCLUSIONS

Methodology

The reports produced constitute a series of case studies
limited in scope, but largely based on qualitative data
collected from a variety of sources using a variety of
methods. This methodology conforms with that identified by,
for instance, Parlett and Hamilton (1977) and Patton (1980) as
falling within the purview of 'illuminative evaluation' or the
socio-anthropological paradigm. Hopkins (1986c) identifies an
eclectic methodology in case study as aiding the validity of
an evaluation and thus the methodology adopted for the work of
the teacher-evaluators appears to support claims for the validity of the approach.

Selection of interviewees and sampling techniques are issues in qualitative evaluation about which little was found in the literature studied. This could be usefully pursued in further work as it was raised by interviewees who asked for clarification about what constitutes an acceptable sample size.

Ethical and data clearance procedures appear to have worked well with no complaints from those involved. Triangulation and cross-checking of data is ensured through the structures set up including checking data from various sources, cross-checking work within the team, the work of the reading panel, and the referral of data back to participants for clearance. McCabe (1987b) identifies such collaborative work as enhancing the validity of teachers' evaluative work. The storage of data as suggested by Fitzgibbon (1985) and carried out by the teacher-evaluators supports the development of an evaluation accountable to participants.

Although the approach shares a common methodology with action-research, the teacher-evaluator works to a wider, more public brief and is accountable at a different level. The audience, political implications, dissemination and outcomes are different for teacher-evaluations. The differences between these two approaches are discussed with reference to the literature in chapter three section C. Evaluation is seen to
serve a decision making audience, action-research is used to
deepen practical understanding - MacDonald (1977) and Elliott
(1978) further define differences between evaluation and
research. The teacher-evaluator approach clearly falls within
the category of 'evaluation' rather than 'action-research'
because the reports are produced primarily to inform those
with the responsibility for making decisions about the
curriculum. The approach hands over the power of evaluation to
the teachers to use in the development of the curriculum.

Dissemination procedures

Although reports are widely disseminated, unless follow up
debate was organised, utilization was found to be limited.
This is not a problem restricted to the teacher-evaluator
approach alone - many professional evaluators: Stake,
(1978b); Cronbach, 1963; Eraut, 1984a; among others; express
concern about the non-utilization of reports. Committees with
evaluative responsibilities within an LEA, clearly need to
develop procedures for ensuring that reports are used.

The issue relating to the distribution of controversial
reports needs to be clarified if the credibility of teacher-
evaluation is not to be called into question. Again, it is a
problem which is not confined to the teacher-evaluator
approach. Helen Simons (1984c) discusses the dilemma of
publication of controversial reports and House (1980)
comments that many professional evaluators choose not to
confront this issue.
There is the potential for the production of timely and relevant reports using teacher-evaluators but this potential may not be realised if clerical support is not available or if there is no allowance within a teacher's work load for the time to do the work.

Effectiveness, utilization and change

Those interviewed identified criteria for the effectiveness of an evaluation which can be used to judge the approach. The main criteria were:

- whether the documents were read
- raising the level of debate and awareness among participants
- the level of feedback to participants at all levels
- highlighting of issues which need attention, planning should follow
- whether any changes in practice or perceptions could be directly related to the evaluation work.

Judged according to these criteria, the teacher-evaluator approach can claim to be effective. Interviewees claimed to have read the documents and for the majority this led to discussion and debate with colleagues. Many interviewees noted changes which had been encouraged by findings of the evaluations but felt a higher level of debate should be organised formally. In any case it was noted that changes are rarely the result of one influence. It was considered that greater effectiveness could be achieved if feedback procedures were more organised. That the evaluations have had a formative effect has been recognised within the LEA (LBE 1987, p.19) but there is room for improvement. Madaus, Scriven and
Stufflebeam (1983) include the ensuring that the evaluation has impact as an example of good practice. The data collected indicates that the teacher-evaluators' work has had varying impact because of poor dissemination procedures. The potential for sound evaluation exists but it is not always realised.

Utilization of the teacher-evaluators' reports largely depended on individuals taking up the issues, not just on the evaluator giving reportback sessions. Response to the teacher-evaluators' work in this way has been patchy.

Utility also depended on the selection of relevant areas for investigation in the initial stages — ensuring that the evaluation is of particular use to the proposed audience. Utilization of an evaluation did not happen automatically with the distribution of a report. The research findings support House's view (1980, p.50) that unless a mechanism exists which ensures that the issues are debated seriously then the reports may be 'filed without consideration'.

Bias and Credibility

Teacher-evaluators reported being on guard against the influence of their own biases and felt group work helped to eliminate the influence of an individual's bias. McCabe (1987b) identifies team work as helping to ensure a good standard in teacher-evaluations and House's definition (1980, p.219) of impartial deliberation does not exclude the notion
of insiders achieving a similar degree of impartiality to outsiders. Stufflebeam (1971) considers that insiders may have enhanced credibility with some sections of the audience. The fact that the credibility of the teacher-evaluators' work was not called into question by interviewees, supports Stufflebeams' view.

Those receiving the reports reported that bias had not been apparent, nor was it an issue that concerned the majority of interviewees. It was reported that there were advantages in knowing the people involved as their biases were likely to be known whereas the biases of outsiders would not necessarily be known to the recipients of reports.

A number of interviewees noted that if there was bias in the teacher-evaluators' work it was likely to be in the area of preferring to report on positive issues and shying away from difficult areas.

The reports were considered 'readable', 'coherent' and 'true' by the majority of those interviewed thus satisfying House's definition (1980) of a credible report. Stufflebeam (1971, p.31) points out that the credibility of any evaluation, whether carried out by insiders or outsiders, is 'almost always questionable'.
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Validity

"They won't take the work of insiders seriously."

This attitude was met in interview yet no one interviewed considered themselves part of the group encompassed by the word 'they'. This phenomenon was not apparent until the data was analysed but follow up research in this area would be useful. A study of the literature reveals a significant body of opinion supporting insider evaluation with writers including McCabe (1987b) and Hopkins (1986c) suggesting ways to ensure the maintenance of standards.

There was general agreement among interviewees that evaluation reports produced by teacher-evaluations would be different in format and style to those reports carried out primarily for academic research because the purpose and audience were different. However, it was considered that the methodology should conform to academic standards of validity. As one interviewee explained, one reason for the development of the approach was that evaluations produced solely by outsiders were often irrelevant and/or unused:

"You're not doing formal technical research in order to fill shelves, you're doing it to change schools and the rules are therefore different."

A summary of the criteria for establishing the validity of the teacher-evaluator documents as suggested by the interviewees is as follows:
data must be cross-checked
- arguments must be supported from the data
- the documents should be approachable and be useful working documents
- varied data sources should be used
- documents should be accepted and used by the audience

The analysis of the reports and a study of other data collected for this research indicates that the teacher-evaluator approach is valid when judged against these criteria.

Comments were made that the brevity of the documents meant that the validity of the findings had to a certain extent to be taken on trust by the audience but that this brevity also ensured that they were read. Stufflebeam (1985) comments that brief reports are essential. The teacher-evaluators' findings did appear to 'match' the 'experiences of participants and the audience' - something that House (1980, p.253) considers essential for a valid evaluation and which Hopkins (p.64 of this thesis) said establishes 'respondent validity'.

Appropriate initial design of the evaluation framework was identified from the literature as crucial to maintaining a high standard in evaluation (Madaus et.al., 1963; Adelman, 1984a, 1984c; Simons 1984a, 1984c). In the case being researched, the initial design of the evaluation by outsiders and insiders working together (as described in chapter two) appears to have provided a sound foundation for the internal evaluation. Lovegrove (in Davis, 1981) suggests this is an 'ideal arrangement'. The early establishment of an ethical
code and supporting structures as suggested by Simons (1984c), helped establish the independence of the teacher-evaluators.

The 'feasibility standards' identified by Madaus and his associates relating to 'Practical procedures' and 'Political viability' appear to be satisfied by the evaluation design adopted - a large number of interviews were carried out involving many institutions but no adverse comments were made about disruptive effects and the interests of various groups were considered with no one group dominating. The third 'feasibility standard' - 'cost effectiveness' - has not been investigated as part of this research.

The teacher-evaluator reports were described as having a professional appearance, using clear language and lacking in jargon. Stufflebeam (1985) and House (1980) stress the importance of reports being readable and coherent and Hopkins (as quoted on p.64 of this thesis) identifies acceptable 'format' and 'style' as contributing to the 'face validity' of an evaluation. Interviewees appeared to be generally satisfied with these aspects of the teacher-evaluators' reports. It was mentioned that the reports should be viewed as working documents rather than as summative evaluation reports - reporting 'instances in time' rather than the 'complete picture'.
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Other criteria for judging the reports

Views were divided about whether the reports should present judgements about practice or not. However it was felt that analysis of data was required not just the presentation of data for the audience to use in forming their own opinions. As the reports were intended to immediate local use, generalisability of the findings is an issue which was considered within the design for this research.

The scope of some reports was felt by a number of interviewees, to be too limited - there is clearly a tension between timeliness of reports, the time available to the teacher-evaluators and the scope of the reports. Timeliness of reporting is important if an evaluation is to be effective and Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983) include timeliness as one measure of good practice in evaluation as do Cousins and Leithwood (1986).

The reports served the interest of a wide range of groups within the LEA. They were generally well received by the audience and views about evaluation were positive.

Unintended outcomes

The impact on the teachers involved cannot be discounted in an assessment of the teacher-evaluator approach. Professional development had been felt to be significant by those involved in the work - often revitalising their interests in the theory of learning and in curriculum matters.
Chapter 8

The expertise developed by these teachers was seen to be used in other areas of their work and the value of evaluation appreciated by some heads who as a result wanted to introduce regular evaluations within their own schools.

Summary

From the data presented in this chapter, it is clear that the teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation appears to offer enormous potential for the professional development of teachers and for the supply of timely, relevant, valid and useful, formative evaluation. Potential problems can be limited by careful design of the evaluation and by the provision of the support both clerical and in the allowance of time for teachers to do the work.

The final chapter which follows contains a summary of development and implementation issues relating to the teacher-evaluator approach and an analysis of the significance of this research for educational evaluation in the UK.
CHAPTER NINE
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CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

The principal aim of the research was to examine the potential of an approach to the evaluation of curriculum innovation which relies on teachers planning, directing, controlling and carrying out such an evaluation. The focus of this 'teacher-evaluator' approach is the improvement of the curriculum through formative evaluation. As such, it can be seen as a natural extension of the developing research tradition in the UK which was stimulated by Stenhouse. In his seminal work (1975, p.165), he wrote:

"A research tradition which is accessible to teachers and which feeds teaching must be created if education is to be significantly improved."

In the UK since 1975 there have been a number of developments in educational evaluation practices particularly in the area of qualitative evaluation through action-research and school self-evaluation. The work of MacDonald, Simons, Rudduck, Nixon, Holly, Hopkins, Jenkins and Elliott among others, documents this process and the good practices which have been established for teachers evaluating and researching within their own classrooms and institutions.

The teacher-evaluator approach fills a gap in this developing teacher-researcher tradition - that of LEA-wide project
evaluation. For this research, the evaluation work done by teachers in one LEA has been monitored over a three year period.

Through the examination of the evidence collected - particularly through documentation, field notes and interviews, the significance of this development in the teacher-based research tradition has been confirmed. It is considered to have the potential of providing timely, relevant, effective and valid project evaluation. It provoked particular interest from professional evaluators who were involved in evaluation of the same national project in other LEAs but who did not have this teacher involvement. Collaboration with teachers was seen as a way of overcoming the common problems of non-utilization (and thus non-effectiveness) of evaluation carried out by professional 'outside' evaluators. However, there was concern at the enormity of the task of training teachers in evaluation skills and clearly firm LEA commitment is needed if the approach is to be developed and succeed.

In evaluation literature, concerns have been expressed over a period of time about the problems of effective formative project evaluation. Peter Holly (1986b, p.72) in his article "Developing a Professional Evaluation" discusses the need to develop an essentially formative teacher-based evaluation tradition 'within the anthropological paradigm' using teachers 'who become the subjects not the objects of the evaluation'.
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The findings presented in this thesis offer the opportunity to ground new theories of evaluation in reality as revealed through an empirical study. Lewy's work (1985, p.205) concerning problems relating to relevance, effectiveness and utilization of educational evaluation indicates the important contribution to be made by the publication of detailed case studies such as this work:

"A sound theory of curriculum evaluation can be developed only on the basis of the critical analysis of well-written published empirical studies. The lack of empirical studies in this field may create a situation in which theory and practice are not related to one another at all."

Lessons learnt from this case study should help to establish criteria for good practice for those attempting to follow a similar path as well as to prepare them for the pitfalls in adopting borough-wide, inter-institutional, formative evaluation. The particular case is TVEI evaluation within one LEA, nevertheless the practice could be applied to evaluation in the wider educational context. The remainder of this chapter is divided into two sections. In the first, practical issues relating to the development and implementation of the teacher-evaluator approach are discussed and in the second, theoretical issues relating to the significance of this research for educational evaluation in the UK are examined.
The potential of the teacher-evaluator approach has been explored through the presentation and analysis of the research findings in the previous chapters of this thesis. The need for the development of such an approach is noted by many professional evaluators including Holly, (1986b, 1986d); McCabe, (1987b); and Harlen, (1978).

The success and effectiveness of the teacher-evaluator approach was found to be affected by a variety of issues which relate to three key areas:

1) The impact of the local context on the evaluation framework.
2) Perceptions of the role and responsibilities of the teacher-evaluators.
3) The methodology and practices adopted.

These findings relating to these issues are set out in the remainder of this chapter as a major purpose of this research is to provide information for those wishing to establish successful teacher-evaluator networks. Strengths and weaknesses, and pitfalls and gains, are identified in order to provide a foundation on which further work can build.
Successful replicability of the teacher-evaluator approach in other education authorities would appear to depend on a number of factors. Where the LEA has a tradition of cross-institutional working parties, the approach would be relatively easy to establish. However, where no atmosphere of co-operation or trust exists between institutions, implementation would proceed more slowly. The existence of an inspectorial service rather than an advisory service within the LEA is also considered to hinder the development of a constructively critical atmosphere. The management policies practised within the LEA are crucial in that they can promote a shared sense of purpose within the LEA and the trust which is essential to effective evaluation.

The initial planning and design of the evaluation plays a vital role in success and must be carefully considered. Issues such as appropriate ethical guidelines and the committee structures necessary to support and oversee but not censor the work must be resolved, and decisions and roles made clear to all who become involved in the evaluation. Simons (1984c) and Leask (1987) offer detailed guidelines useful for developing the teacher-evaluator approach.

It is considered good practice to establish procedures for the debate and utilization of findings (Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam, 1983). In addition, issues such as resourcing,
the role of teachers, the status of the evaluation, report circulation and publication, and appropriate audience must be resolved at this stage. At the same time, an element of flexibility and negotiability in these procedures is necessary to allow for changing circumstances over the period of the evaluation (House, 1980; MacDonald, 1973; Simons, 1984a; among others).

The selection of relevant issues or areas for evaluation is a crucial one for credibility of the work and yet is one of the most difficult as perceptions of what constitutes an appropriate area of work vary according to an individual's perspective. The external evaluator is considered to have a valuable input at this point.

It was found that the validity and credibility of the teachers' work is enhanced by the establishment of a clear, publicly recognised framework which supports freedom and independence while ensuring adherence to strict ethical guidelines.

2) Teacher-evaluators: the role and the responsibilities

A joint approach to evaluation with teachers and professional evaluators working as equals was favoured by most interviewees as each group was considered to possess complementary advantages.
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Professional evaluators were thought to provide a wider perspective, possess more sophisticated evaluation skills and to be more aware of broader educational issues and recent educational research. The time to evaluate issues in depth is a problem mentioned by both professional evaluators and teacher-evaluators. A joint approach with teachers drawing on the strengths of each group would improve the quality of evaluation particularly in the area of timeliness of evaluation reports.

An outside evaluator was thought to face particular disadvantages in the length of time required to establish trust and credibility and in terms of access to information. Whereas teacher-evaluators with their inside knowledge were able to collect relevant data more quickly.

However, pressure of time is a very real problem for evaluation. Teacher-evaluators gave lack of time to do a thorough job as a major reason for dissatisfaction with their work and professional evaluators commented that teacher-evaluators need time not just to collect data and plan investigations but also to read and think about evaluation work.

This problem requires a resource commitment from any LEA interested in developing work in the area as does the question of suitable equipment and clerical backup.
While it was accepted that insider evaluation could be subject to accusations of bias it was considered that with the establishment of suitable supporting structures, bias would be no more of a problem than for external evaluators. The objectivity of outside evaluators was questioned. There was a general consensus that both external and internal evaluators had to cope with problems of personal bias but that teacher-evaluators working within a team structure, do not suffer any more severe problems than outsiders particularly as their personal points of view were more likely to be known within the LEA and thus taken account of, than those of external evaluators. In addition, group planning of investigations and production of reports limits the effect of individual bias as does the clearance of reports through the reading panel. It was found that the teacher-evaluators' reports were generally considered to be credible and unbiased though limited in scope.

Many interviewees felt that the involvement of an external evaluator added status and validity to the work although equally a number commented that this status and validity was illusory.

Outsiders have advantages in dealing with the hostility which is often engendered by evaluations. Although this could potentially damage their reputation, on the whole they leave any hostility behind when they finish working for the LEA whereas teacher-evaluators have to live with the problem. One problem to be considered is that being involved in the
political and ethical problems which are encountered regularly in evaluation could affect a teacher's career prospects. This was thought to apply not only to teacher-evaluators but also to teachers providing information for the evaluation.

Professional evaluators acknowledged that evaluations by those outside the LEA, while offering advantages in the area of expertise, breadth of knowledge and remoteness from an LEAs political problems, were often slow or felt to be irrelevant by those involved and thus were not used. However, the external evaluator has a particular contribution to make as trainer, anonymiser and catalyst.

Teacher-evaluators share many of the problems faced by all evaluators: maintaining confidentiality, avoiding co-option, preserving anonymity of sources and ensuring publication of controversial findings. However, they should have the added advantage of support from colleagues and the LEA if good supporting structures have been established.

Teachers reported experiencing divided loyalties when involved in certain issues. That teacher-evaluators will experience stress in their role when confronted with difficult issues must be recognised. Without proper team structures they will also experience isolation and uncertainty about their work. They are potentially vulnerable to pressures from colleagues, the LEA, the school and from within themselves. However although these problems were encountered by some teacher-evaluators they were not considered severe enough by those
involved to negate the positive advantages of the approach. If these problems are anticipated then supportive and protective structures can be developed through the evaluation advisory group.

The role of the teacher-evaluators does need to be carefully considered if teachers are not to be exploited. Effective evaluation is very often dependent on good will—reports can all too easily be filed or 'lost' if good will towards the evaluation is not established. This good will is particularly important when teachers are performing work additional to their normal duties. The teacher-evaluators indicated they would like to see the role given a higher profile within school, with time specifically timetabled for evaluation work.

The teacher-evaluator teams are not self-maintaining. All involved have other commitments and if several investigations are to proceed across the LEA simultaneously one person must be given the time take on the responsibility of co-ordinating and supporting the work of the teacher-evaluators as well as sustaining the network. In the case researched this is done by a seconded teacher who is also studying for a higher degree.

Responsibilities of this 'evaluation co-ordinator' include:

- recruiting teacher-evaluators
- liaising with professional evaluators
- training teacher-evaluators
- supporting the teacher-evaluators' work and dealing with problems as they arise.
- collecting data where this is difficult for team members
- liaising with head teachers about access and ethics
- keeping the EAG informed
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drawing reports to the attention of those with responsibility for the areas evaluated
arranging INSET and conferences
organising the typing and production of reports
updating mailing lists
packaging and distributing reports
organising feedback sessions and stimulating debate

A tutelage model for learning evaluation skills was universally suggested as the best way to develop expertise in evaluation - less experienced staff work with more experienced staff with the support of a professional evaluator. Specific training sessions are then given as and when required. These sessions should include: hostility management, management skills, data collection techniques, report writing, and ethics of evaluation. The involvement of teachers can encompass any or all of four roles: planning the investigation; collecting data; writing the report (preferably a group effort) and running feedback sessions.

In spite of pressures of time, teachers expressed support for the approach giving as major reasons, the chance to develop skills which would help them in assessing their own practice and the exchanging of ideas with colleagues from other institutions. The teacher-evaluator within school could play a wider role in promoting discussion of evaluation findings, in staff training, and in developing evaluation skills within the institution. The gains for the LEA were also felt to be considerable. A more reflective profession was being developed and trained in the skills needed to critically analyse their practice. A common sense of purpose was also developed across the LEA as teachers work together with others.
from other institutions. The possible volume of evaluative work with fairly rapid feedback is considerable and of course, as evaluation expertise remains within the LEA, continuity is possible over a period of years.

The personal qualities of a teacher-evaluator as for all evaluators play an important role in establishing the right conditions for evaluation. Attributes considered essential are an open mind together with the ability to withstand pressures, be discrete, preserve confidences and to create an atmosphere of trust. Teacher-evaluators should be experienced, able to work in teams, show sensitivity and empathy, be able to reflect and analyse, and be able to work to deadlines. Teams should contain staff of high status to lend credibility to reports as well as staff of differing status to aid in the collection of data. It was thought that staff whose work was being evaluated would probably be more open with and less threatened by peers. Careful selection of teacher-evaluators should take place as some staff were not considered to possess the suitable qualities.

The aim of this approach is to aid professional development and curriculum evaluation not the provision of evaluation on the cheap. A vital question was posed by a professional evaluator - 'If money was available for full-time professional evaluators would there be any merit in pursuing the teacher-evaluator approach?' unless those interested in this approach can answer 'yes' then the approach is not being pursued for the right reasons.
It is the contention of this thesis that the approach offers advantages in providing timely, relevant evaluation reports which will aid curriculum development, professional development and establish improved communications and relationships within the LEA - not that it is inexpensive evaluation. In fact, when costs relating to the production of a steady stream of reports, secretarial help and seconded teacher expenses are taken into account there may be little difference between the costs of supporting teacher-evaluators over a long period and the cost of commissioning occasional evaluation reports produced solely by professional evaluators. Allowance must also be made for the costs of a professional evaluator who might provide training and consultancy for teacher-evaluators. A clear formal agreement between the LEA and the professional evaluator is required so that the expectations of the role are clear.

2) Methodology and practice

The rigorous adherence to an established and accepted code of practice has already been noted as an essential feature of the teacher-evaluators' work ensuring fair and accurate reports and encouraging the acceptance within the LEA of the work of teacher-evaluators. Principles and procedures relating to confidentiality and control of data, impartiality, negotiation, collaboration and accountability were worked out in discussions between the professional evaluator overseeing the first eighteen months of the project evaluation and the
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'nucleus group' – a working party established to develop evaluation in the LEA. These have been found to work well in practice and the LEA is on the verge of publishing evaluation guidelines for advisers, working parties, schools and colleges in an attempt to promote even wider understanding of evaluative procedures and the use of evaluation reports.

The teacher-evaluation has followed in the tradition of the social-anthropological paradigm and an eclectic approach to methodology has been adopted. Teams are free to choose appropriate methods which then must be reported in detail in their reports. These reports are usually non-judgemental although there has been some demand for more detailed analysis of the findings and a more judgemental approach. Interviews, documentary search and simple questionnaires have been most often used and data is kept available so that the findings can be verified by those for whom access is agreed. The scope of the reports has inevitably been restricted – at some point investigation must stop and a report made. Rapid production of reports so that the evaluation can be formative is one of the positive features of the teacher-evaluator approach.

The brevity of the reports (four to five thousand words) was found to enhance use – in that they were read (many interviewees admitted not having the time to read the many long documents which came their way). However a minority view was that brevity was considered to limit validity as a lack of detail meant findings were taken on trust. While there was some feeling that complex issues could not be covered in
enough depth if reports were brief, there was a consensus that they need to be seen as working documents performing a different function to academic research reports.

Several criteria for establishing the effectiveness of evaluation emerged from the data. An evaluation could be considered effective if:

- reports are read
- the issues raised are debated
- relevant issues are highlighted
- there is feedback to all participants
- changes in practice and perceptions follow
- those involved feel that the evaluation is valuable

Interviewees within the LEA claimed to have read the reports and most had discussed the findings with at least one other member of staff. However the lack of a clearly defined procedure for dealing with the reports - e.g. formal discussion at staff meetings, meant that the level of debate and dissemination of findings varied and were often dependent on individuals taking up issues. This lack of use also applied to committees who were sent copies of the reports. Procedures for use should be established and responsibility for follow-up perhaps given to particular individuals.

Relevance of any report depends on correct issue selection in the first place and although issue selection might appear to be straightforward because the project has certain aims, in practice it was found that perceptions varied as to what
constituted relevant issues. This problem is perhaps inherent in an approach which aims to be responsive to an audience which represents a broad range of interests. Inevitably particular issues will be less relevant to some members of the audience than others.

There was some consensus that although the research methods used should be rigorous and thus able to be judged using academic notions of validity, the reports themselves would be of a different format and style to those produced for academic research as their purpose and audience are quite different. The teacher-evaluator work aims for quick feedback so that the evaluation can be formative: the documents are working documents - 'catching the thing on the wing'.

The methodology and practice of the teacher-evaluators has been governed by the principles and procedures established in the initial negotiations setting up the evaluation. This initial stage must be seen as crucial to the establishment of a sound foundation for the work of teacher-evaluators.
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B) SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

The significance of this research is five fold:

- It advances theory of educational evaluative practices with particular reference to the UK.

- It identifies an approach to evaluation which enhances the professionalism of teachers.

- Through the publication of a detailed case study it develops theory from the reality of practice.

- It provides the groundwork for the forging of new links between professional educational evaluators and the teaching profession.

- It defines an approach to evaluation which has the potential to provide timely, relevant, useful, formative evaluation.

The teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation is a natural development from the work on action-research and school self-evaluation which has developed from the work of Stenhouse, MacDonald, Holly, Hopkins, Simons, Adelman and Elliott among others since the early nineteen seventies. It provides a framework for a new model of educational evaluation which combines the strengths of professional external evaluation with the knowledge and expertise of teachers. Publication of this research should further stimulate work in this area and thus fill a gap in the development of evaluative practices in the UK.

To be involved or not in evaluation is no longer a choice for many teachers, advisers and educational administrators. Changing funding arrangements for education mean that those involved in courses funded for instance through the Manpower Services Commission or through the Education Support Grant,
must provide evaluation reports as a matter of course. The Department of Education and Science is in the process of producing a document on evaluation in education for distribution to Local Education Authorities.

The teacher-evaluator approach to evaluation not only provides a pool of evaluation expertise within an LEA for dealing with these demands, it also enhances the professionalism of teachers by giving them the tools of evaluation to use in the development of the curriculum and in assessing changing teaching styles. The LEA also gains through increased communication and the development of a clear sense of purpose through the analysis of practice across institutions.

That the teacher-evaluator approach has the potential to provide valid, effective, relevant and formative evaluation has been proven through this research. For those interested in the development of a reflective profession which possesses the skills for its own self-monitoring this approach represents a major step forward. It has the potential for providing teachers with the skills they need in order to face the new climate for accountability and appraisal from a position of strength and knowledge about their own practice.

It is the contention of this thesis that this approach provides the foundation for a new partnership between academic institutions, LEAs and schools: new opportunities for
collaboration for the improvement of education, the sharing of research findings, and for providing real and useful information about curriculum development through timely, relevant, formative evaluation. It extends the boundaries of what is possible in evaluation through the utilization of the potential of teachers as professionals.

Thus this case study is presented as a contribution to the advancement of evaluation theory relating to teacher-led evaluation and to the further development of a research tradition accessible to teachers.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1

DRAFT OF QUESTIONS TO BE COVERED IN INTERVIEW

Interview notes:

Interviewees: 6 groups:
H) Head Teachers
C) School Co-ordinators
T) Teacher-Evaluators
L) LEA officials
E) External Evaluators
N) Nucleus Group

NB: 1) Tape record interviews and send transcript for checking.
2) Explain how data will be used - not attributed.

Note on questions: Unless otherwise indicated, the questions are to be put to all groups. X before an initial indicates that that group is not to be asked this question.

Open ended questions are to be asked first...in an attempt to obtain responses which are not directed or limited by the questions.

Before Interview:

1) Mark key questions so they get asked if there is a shortage of time.

2) Cross out questions not relevant to the interviewee to avoid interrupting the flow of the interview.

3) Take detailed notes in case the tape is ruined.

4) Show notes to interviewee before leaving and ask for comments.

5) Take question sheet, tape recorder and extension lead.

Section A: Conditions which led to the development of the teacher-evaluator approach.

1) (N,L) How and by whom was it decided that the evaluation was worth proposing and funding?

2) (xE) What conditions in the LEA affected the establishment of the evaluation?
Appendix 1

3) (N,L) Who were considered to be the audiences of the evaluation?

4) (N,L) Why was the teacher-evaluator approach adopted? (professional outcomes considered?)

5) (N,L) Was cost a major factor influencing the approach adopted? (Has ending of pooling affected views of the future of the evaluation?)

6) (N,L) Who did you see as the sponsor of the evaluation?

Section B: Characteristics of the approach

1) (L,N) What were the original aims of the internal evaluation?

2) (L,N) What supporting structures were seen to be necessary?

3) (L,N) What methodology was it envisaged the teachers would use?

4) (L,N) What procedures for accountability were considered necessary?

5) (L,N) What safeguards were considered necessary to ensure validity of the work?

6) (L,N) What was the teacher-evaluators role vis-a-vis the external consultant?

7) (L,N) Whose interests was the evaluation to serve?

Section C: Theory into practice: How the approach is working
(Contrast the views of those who set it up with those involved in it now.)

1) (xEJ) What conditions in the LEA have affected the conduct of the evaluation?

2) (All) What do you see as the aims of this type of evaluation?

3a) (H) What has been the effect on the school of having a teacher-evaluator?

3b) (All) What are the implications for those involved? Time/commitment/professional development/input required.
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Questions for teacher-evaluators

4) Did you get time out that you needed to write up/interview? Were there any problems?

5) Why did you do it? Would you get involved again?

6) Did you keep a diary? Can we go through it?

7) What are your qualifications? For how long have you taught?

8) What is your teaching experience/status?

9) Who do you feel you are working for?

10) What INSET have you had? By whom? Content? Opinions on what is needed?

11) Role vs status quo. Do you feel constrained/controlled? What decides the approach to an investigation/style of report/content of report?

12) Have you felt autonomous? To what extent could you specify conditions on the release and use of evaluation reports? Do you feel you had control over the release of data collected from you?

Section D: Critique of the theory - insider and outsider views.

1) (All) Could you comment on the role of teacher-evaluator. What safeguards could be employed to limit partiality?

2) (All) Who would be unacceptable as a teacher-evaluator?

3) (All) Whose interests are served by this style of evaluation? Any comments?

4a) (xE,N) What do you understand the procedures for accountability to be?

4b) (E,N) What procedures for accountability would you expect?

5) (H,T) What are your views of the ethics of this evaluation approach?

6) (All) How would you establish whether the evaluation was biased?

7a) (xE,N) Do you think the evaluation is being effective?

7b) (E,N) How would you judge the effectiveness of the evaluation?

8) (All) What criteria do you consider should be used in judging the validity of this approach to evaluation?
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9) (xE) Do you consider the evaluation to be 'credible, trusted, true' (House, 1980)

10) (All) What do you see as the successes and failures of this model?

11) (E) How would you establish whether the success or failure was a function of a) the model, b) the individual, c) the LEA support, d) procedures?

12) (xE,N,T) Is the evaluation relevant to your interests?

13) (xE,N) What do you feel about the evaluation of educational courses? (Do you welcome it? Have mixed feelings? Find it a waste of time?)

Section E: External Consultant's role

1) (All) What should be the role of an external consultant?

2) (All) What would you expect an external evaluator to discover/include which the teacher-evaluators would not? How would their approach be different?

3) (E,N) How could one recognise a 'trained' evaluator? Does one undergo an apprenticeship? Have a particular qualification? What would be the criteria for a teacher to act as an evaluator and for the work to be valid? (qualities, attributes, qualifications, under supervision of an academic?)

4) (All) How does the teacher-evaluator role differ from that of external evaluator? What do you see as the advantages/disadvantages of being an insider?

5a) (H,T,C,L) Do you see external evaluators as more impartial?

5b) (E,N) Do you feel the external evaluator becomes 'part' of what is being evaluated?

Section F: Critique of the practice - insider and outsider views

Documents

1) (All) Names of documents read?

2) (All) What was your opinion of the documents? ('readable, coherent' House, 1980, p104)

3) (All) What criteria do you use for judging the documents?

4) (All) Do you note any evidence of bias?
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5) (All) What changes would you expect from the documents?
6) (xE,N,T) What changes have resulted?
7) (All) What has been left out in the reports?

Feedback sessions

1) (C,H) Have you attended any?
2) (C,H) What use were they? Comments?

Informal feedback

1) (C,H,L) Have you had any?
2) (C,H,L) What was its nature?
3) (C,H,L) What impact/use was it?

Changes

1) (H,C,T,L) How could the evaluation be of more use? What would you change?

Section G: Discussion of findings

1) (All) Do you consider that this approach could be used elsewhere? What do you see as the constraints?
2) (All) What do you think of this approach to evaluation? How could it be improved?
3) (xE) Can you identify any unintended outcomes?

Any other comments?
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ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT

BESG : Borough Evaluation Steering Group
CARN : Classroom Action-research Network
CPVE : Certificate of Pre-vocational Education
EAG : TVEI evaluation advisory group
ESG : Education Support Grant
FTE : full-time equivalent
GRIST : Grant-related Inservice Training
INSET : inservice training
LEA : Local Education Authority
MSC : Manpower Services Commission
NFER : National Foundation for Educational Research
ROSLA : Raising of the School Leaving Age
SCDC : School Curriculum Development Committee
TEC/VOC : technical vocational options within TVEI
TRIST : TVEI related Inservice Training
TVEI : Technical Vocational Education Initiative