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In an age of heightened accountability, data are seen as the driving force behind school- and program-level improvement. They are used by school systems to plot progress; plan and execute instructional interventions; and hold students, teachers, administrators, and school systems accountable. Meaningful data collection and analysis can help school systems make informed decisions about policies, programs, and individual students.

School systems are expected to continuously improve student achievement and ensure the effective use of resources. Evaluation is the means by which school systems determine how well their schools, programs, departments, and staff meet their respective goals. Central to any evaluation process is the collection of data that are then transformed into actionable insights to inform decision making. In particular, program evaluation is commonly defined as the systematic assessment of the operation and/or outcomes of a given program, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to the improvement of that program.1

Importance of Systematic Data-Driven Decision Making

In discussing data-driven decision making in schools, Ellen B. Mandinach, in *A Perfect Time for Data Use: Using Data-Driven Decision Making to Inform Practice*, writes that the use of data-driven decision making is not a new phenomenon. However, historically, “the process was neither systematized nor automated:”2 In describing the current trend for the use of data in education settings, Mandinach finds that:3

More recently, policymakers have begun to emphasize the need for a fundamental philosophical shift from data for compliance to the principles of data for continuous improvement. This perspective shifts the focus away from schools and districts achieving adequate yearly progress to helping all students learn.

Victoria Bernhardt, in *Using Data to Improve Student Learning in School Districts*, finds that “school districts that gather, analyze, and use information about their organizations make better decisions, not only about what to improve, but also how to institutionalize systemic improvement.”4

The Institute of Education Sciences recommends that educators use data as “part of an ongoing cycle of instructional improvement,” which is illustrated in the figure on this page.5

Schools can sometimes neglect one or more stages of this cycle. As Bernhardt notes, for instance, schools that gather data but do not comprehensively analyze them are at a disadvantage as their decisions can be based on assumptions rather than analysis. On the other hand, some schools struggle with data collection, and rely upon limited or external data, which create gaps in the analysis.6

**Expert Insights Q&A**

Dr. Ellen Mandinach
Author of *A Perfect Time for Data Use: Using Data-Driven Decision Making to Inform Practice*

On describing the importance of integrating data into decision making:

“Data use must become a totally integrated part of educators’ practice. This integration will help teachers make more informed decisions about their students. If we take data literally, data are more than test scores. We must think broadly about data – behavior, demographics, attendance, attitudes, perceptions, motivation, health, transportation, etc. Using all these sources of data will help teachers to obtain a comprehensive picture of not just how a student is doing but why. It will help them to identify strengths and weakness. It will help them to plan instructional steps.”
The Value of Program Evaluations

Struggling with Resource Constraints

Though school leaders understand the value of systematic data collection and analysis, school systems may not always have the tools to conduct and fully implement systemic, reoccurring, and rigorous analyses. Data analysts and evaluation specialists, for example, are integral to carrying out the data use cycle. Common responsibilities for these positions include:

- Plan, coordinate, and conduct activities related to assessment and testing programs at the school, system, or state level;
- Participate in the design and implementation of the assessment methodology and processes for research and evaluation studies;
- Conduct analysis of assessment and evaluation data;
- Coordinate the processing and delivery of specific assessment and surveying projects through the Instructional Technology department (or equivalent); and
- Participate in the presentation of assessment and evaluation findings.

Despite the integral nature of these specialists, an in-depth scan of online job postings for these positions in school systems nationwide revealed very few current postings, suggesting that school systems are still struggling to establish such roles.

Where postings were found, responsibilities for these roles were typically limited to two key purposes:

- Reporting
- Evaluation of school or system programming

These findings in many ways confirm the messaging that Hanover repeatedly hears: School systems want and need to focus on evaluation, and are facing increased evaluation and reporting requirements, but often are unable to dedicate the number of staff that are needed to focus primarily on this goal.

What does this mean for schools and school systems? Though school systems may not be hiring new employees to focus on data analysis, this important work still needs to be completed. To demonstrate how, with the appropriate support, school systems can implement systematic and rigorous data analysis and evaluation even without specialized staff, this white paper examines one process in particular — that of the program evaluation.

How Program Evaluations Help School Systems

Anderson and Postlethwaite, in research on program evaluations, find that “all education programs need to include an evaluation component if their success is to be determined, and if weaknesses in the programs are to be identified and corrected.” Program evaluations deliver data on the impact of school programs, which can be used for designing, implementing, and improving strategies that promote student achievement.

With regard to school- and system-level programs, evaluations are useful to:

- Improve program design, implementation, and effectiveness;
- Demonstrate a program’s support of the school system’s mission;
- Justify the costs of a program;
- Measure and explain program performance, outcomes, and impacts;
- Reveal program successes to supporters, funders, and stakeholders; and
- Share information about what works with colleagues and districts.

On describing the impact of structural gaps in data use on student achievement:

“When schools focus on one area, they miss the big picture. For example, by focusing only on improving behavior and attendance — one might miss the message that classes need to be more engaging and challenging. Instead, by focusing on all the data, school improvement plans are very different.”

Dr. Vickie Bernhardt
Author of Data Analysis for Continuous School Improvement
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Our research on how school systems prioritize and conduct program evaluations finds that:

- Research/Evaluation departments have multiple responsibilities, including (but not limited to) data procurement, management, and interpretation; research consultation to schools; coordination of outside research requests; and, in some cases, administering system-wide tests.
- These departments are typically small among surveyed school systems but are staffed with individuals highly trained in research methods.
- Much of the departments’ resources are spent complying with data requests of school system leaders and teachers rather than on formal program evaluations.
- Data warehouses serve as a foundation for the school systems’ evaluations and other accountability assessments.
- Satisfaction surveys are a common tool employed by school systems to assess stakeholders’ views on programs.
- Program evaluations often follow a school system’s textbook adoption cycle, which ranges from five to six years for surveyed school systems.
- External evaluators are contracted more frequently for programs that are funded by grants, though they often collaborate with internal staff.
- True experimental designs for program evaluations are not the norm. Exploratory and quasi-experimental research designs are more common due to limited time and resources.
- Timelines for carrying out program evaluations are not standard and tend to vary based on school leaders’ needs for such data.
- Funding for program evaluation constitutes a fraction of departments’ budgets—which are usually small to begin with—and school systems often do not budget for specific evaluations but instead draw from resources as needed.

To give a fuller sense of what the program evaluation entails, the remainder of this white paper walks through the seven stages of the program evaluation process, drawing upon Hanover’s extensive experience with this research tool.

Expert Insights Q&A

Dr. Lorin Anderson
Co-Author of Program Evaluation: Large-scale and Small-scale Studies

On describing successful evaluations:

Dr. Lorin Anderson identified the importance of alignment, described as ensuring “that objectives or standards, tests and other assessments, and instruction and teaching are clearly connected with one another.” To describe an example of misalignment, Dr. Anderson describes when “the state standards focus on analyzing material and the instruction focuses on memorizing material (that is, there is a misalignment between standards and instruction). Since the program evaluation quite likely focuses on the standards (not the instruction), the likely result is a generally negative evaluation.” Here, Dr. Anderson is highlighting the importance of alignment to better understand the negative evaluation and the distinctions between the standards and the instruction methods.
The Program Evaluation Cycle

Consider program evaluation as a process with multiple components. Below, we present our interpretation of the American Institutes for Research (AIR) program evaluation process model, describing each of the seven stages in this model.11

Program Evaluation Process Model

1. The “Big Picture”
   First, in formulating the “big picture,” administrators engage in the initial stages of the evaluation process. More specifically, administrators begin by specifying the purpose and the goals of the program under examination. The nature of the program and the administrators’ vision of what constitutes a successful outcome understandably influence the evaluation design. In turn, the purpose of the evaluation also matters. Evaluations produced for internal and external audiences often differ with regard to the types of information used and the methods through which the results ultimately are disseminated. Moreover, the amount of time and the level of financial and human resources available affect the potential scope of the evaluation.

2. Evaluation Questions
   Next, effective evaluations typically seek the answers to well-defined questions related to program implementation and program impact. The following questions, which can guide this evaluation planning phase, are included in Hanover’s Program Evaluation Planning Framework (link provided on Page 6).

   Step 1: What are you planning to evaluate? In order to ensure accurate records are maintained, list attributes of the program under evaluation on a dedicated planning document. This should include the program title and brief description of the program, program eligibility selection criteria, and potential confounding variables for the participating students (factors outside of the program under evaluation that may influence the program’s effects). Many times, identifying these criteria and variables can be challenging, and partners have consequently depended on Hanover’s program evaluation expertise during this stage of the planning process.

   Step 2: What is the purpose of the proposed evaluation? Clearly stating the purpose of the impending evaluation enables all individuals responsible for the process to share an understanding of why the evaluation is critical, and it enhances the focus on a single set of questions that need to be investigated. In this stage, it is critical to include specifics on why the program is being evaluated and the type of evaluation being planned. Further, as program evaluations can often be politically charged, we recommend obtaining an objective third-party analysis in order to mitigate the risk of bias or perceived bias.
Step 3: Who will use the evaluation? How will they use it? Not only is it important for the analysis to be completed by an organization with a reputable research background and from a neutral standpoint, it is also imperative that it addresses all of the questions that key stakeholders may have. After identifying audiences and stakeholders, it is important to work collaboratively to shape the questions being asked, determine the way in which the results will be communicated, and decide what the tone, applicability, and actionable advice of the results should look like. It should be noted that this collaboration sometimes requires primary research that can be time-consuming and expensive if done on an ad-hoc basis.

Step 4: What key research question(s) will the evaluation seek to answer? A common challenge Hanover hears from partners is how to create a comprehensive report that is actionable and digestible for decision makers and stakeholders who may not be intimately involved with the target program. Creating a list of questions can provide stakeholders with a focused scope and helps the evaluator prioritize analysis and recommendations in a summary report. Partners will typically task Hanover to assist with creating such a list of questions and the necessary data points to ensure the validity and reliability of the report.

Step 5: When is the evaluation needed? It is important to consult with administrators and staff tasked with conducting the evaluation and to assess realistic timelines and available resources. Does your school system possess the dedicated internal resources to prioritize, schedule, and proceed with the evaluation process in a timely fashion? For several partners, Hanover has served as the dedicated source for program evaluations, resulting in a significant increase in the number of distinct program evaluations completed within each academic year.

Step 6a: What stages are required for this evaluation? Step 6b: Who will be responsible for each stage? When will each stage be completed? By creating a map of the necessary stages of an analysis, and by assigning responsibilities and timelines to those stages, everyone can easily be held accountable as the evaluation progresses. This also makes it easier to pinpoint breakdowns within the process. This is the stage at which many organizations become overwhelmed. With several different people wearing multiple hats, it can become tricky to course-correct and complete a given evaluation on time.

Interested in downloading our free Program Evaluation Planning worksheet? Visit bit.ly/programevaluationplanning
Strategy in Action

GOAL:
To provide an analysis of academic achievement among different student groups following a summer program

THE REQUEST:
A school system sought an analysis of the effectiveness of a summer program in improving reading test scores in Pre-K through Grade 9.

IMPACT:
This program was designed to help students improve reading skills over the summer months. Hanover’s analysis evaluated the effect of the program on standardized test scores and provided detailed insights based on a multitude of other variables, such as free and reduced lunch status and number of absences during the program term.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS OF THE PROGRAM EVALUATION:
Hanover found that students who participated in the summer program were mostly demographically similar to students who did not participate in the summer program. In general, students had a higher average score on the fall reading exam than on the preceding spring reading exam. However, this increase was evident both in students who participated in the summer program and students who did not participate in the summer program. Furthermore, only one provider of reading tutorial services was associated with a positive and significant improvement on the state examination (+4.3 points).

STEPS MOVING FORWARD:
By applying an evidence-based approach to identify which tutoring service is most effective, the system can use this information to maximize its success in impacting student achievement.

• For one model that had a negative effect on students, the instruction materials alone cost close to $18,000 ($40 for 445 students) while the associated personnel costs ranged closer to $36,000 (15 teachers at $10/hr for 240 hours). The total cost-savings associated with removing the program would be close to $54,000 in total.

• In another model, the initial cost is $43,000 and continues at $716 per student. Enrolling a total of 193 students, the district spent a total of roughly $181,000 on an intervention proved to have a negative effect on student achievement.

• By removing programs proved to be detrimental to student learning, the district could save up to $235,000.

Expert Insights Q&A

Amir Rasool
Managing Content Director, Hanover Research, K-12 Education
arasool@hanoverresearch.com

When asked to provide insights into the use of program evaluations by our partners, Amir Rasool finds that:

"In working closely with our partners we see that school systems frequently request evaluations of vendor-provided instructional programs, but at times fail to recognize opportunities to evaluate “homegrown” programs and interventions that are developed internally. These evaluations commonly help inform resource allocation discussions and can help shape the effectiveness of vendor-provided and homegrown programs when executed on regular intervals. Through our structured, multi-step program evaluation process, Hanover delivers tailored evaluations that capture the unique context and system-specific components of a given program. Our capabilities help broaden the pool of evaluations that can be completed within our partner schools systems and are utilized to deliver data-driven insights for planning and continuous improvement purposes."
Third, administrators choose an evaluation design. The design specifies crucial details such as: the procedure used to assign classrooms or individual students to an intervention; the types of controls imposed, if any; and the strategies for collecting necessary data points. The most appropriate design frequently derives from the nature of the question(s) that the evaluation aims to answer. We outline a few of the most common evaluation designs as follows. Within each category, opportunities exist to tailor the design to meet the needs or capabilities of a particular school or system.

- **Experimental Design:** Randomly assign students to intervention and control groups. Collect performance data before and after introducing the intervention.

- **Quasi-Experimental Design:** No random assignment. Compare outcomes for intervention and non-intervention groups.
  - **Matched:** Match groups on other key characteristics thought to affect the outcome studied (e.g., age, gender, proficiency in English, disability, or socioeconomic status).
  - **Non-Equivalent Groups:** Compare outcomes for the intervention and non-intervention groups using statistical techniques to control for other confounding factors.

- **Non-Experimental Design:** No formation of intervention and non-intervention groups.
  - **Before-and-After Study:** Collect data on key measures before and after the intervention.
  - **Case Study:** Gather in-depth information on specific individuals, a single classroom, or a single school.

4. Evaluation Tools

Most effective evaluations rely on multiple sources of program information. Given that each source entails several advantages and disadvantages, expanding and diversifying the sources of information included in a design typically increases both the accuracy of the evaluation’s findings and the usefulness of the conclusions drawn. The figure on Page 9, based on our examination of a multitude of frameworks, describes the most common sources of data used to conduct program evaluations.

---

**Strategy in Action**

**GOAL:**
To support a school without a strong history in conducting program evaluations

**THE REQUEST:**
To help a school system determine the effect of participation in an academic program on measures of school engagement, successful learning outcomes, and involvement with rigorous programs such as AP and IB

**IMPACT:**
The school system needed to determine whether the specific academic program “changes the odds” for middle ground students who are either at-risk or underperforming with respect to college and career readiness standards. The program evaluation provided the school system with information necessary to move closer to its goal of having all students ready for college or a career upon graduation from high school.

**SPECIFIC FINDINGS FOR THE PROGRAM EVALUATION:**
The findings of the program evaluation suggested that prolonged and more recent exposure to the targeted academic program results in more positive learning and student engagement outcomes than shorter and less recent exposure. Hanover recommended that participation in the program be available to students over several years in high school, while also recommending that the curriculum from the middle school program be maintained, as it results in significant improvement in algebra scores.
# Common Evaluation Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Assessment Data | Measure performance levels before and after an intervention using valid and reliable assessments | - Flexibility in assessment type (e.g., standardized, locally-developed, or use of artifacts  
- Pre- and post-testing enables evaluators to quantify changes in achievement | - Potentially costly depending on the type of assessment used  
- Standardized tests not always reflective of program content  
- Performance also affected by factors other than the intervention  
- Grading of artifacts appears time consuming and susceptible to bias  
- Offers little or no insight into program processes  
- Detracts from time allocated to instruction |
| Surveys and Questionnaires | Quickly and easily obtain information in a non-threatening way | - Inexpensive to administer  
- Administer to large groups  
- Completed anonymously  
- Produce lots of data  
- Easy to analyze  
- Sample surveys and questionnaires often exist | - Do not always provide careful feedback  
- Wording potentially leads to biased responses  
- Impersonal  
- With surveys, need to address sampling issues |
| Interviews | Fully understand a person’s impressions or experiences or learn more about answers to surveys or questionnaires | - Flexible format (e.g., informal, semi-structured, or standardized)  
- Develop relationship with subject  
- Produce full range and depth of information  
- Allows subject more freedom in responses | - Time consuming  
- Potentially costly  
- Difficult to compare and analyze responses  
- Interviewer’s presence possibly biases the subject’s responses  
- Perhaps feels intrusive to the subject |
| Documentation Review | Gather impressions of how a program operates by examining internal and external documents such as forms, applications, finances, memos, minutes from meetings, etc. | - Relatively inexpensive  
- Unobtrusive  
- Good source of historical and background information  
- Provides a behind-the-scenes perspective, revealing unobservable details | - Time consuming  
- Information may be out-of-date, disorganized, or irrelevant  
- Information may be incomplete or inaccurate  
- Potentially biased if unfavorable documents destroyed |
| Observation | Obtain information by overtly or covertly observing a program in operation | - View a program while in progress  
- Ability to adapt as events occur  
- No need to rely on participants’ ability or willingness to provide information | - Time consuming  
- Expensive  
- Sometimes difficult to interpret behavior or determine motivation  
- Complex to categorize observations  
- If overt, observer’s presence perhaps influences actions of program participants  
- Susceptible to observer bias |
| Focus Groups | Engage a small group of people with similar characteristics, interests, or experiences in a discussion on a pre-determined set of topics (e.g., perceptions of program, feedback, etc.) | - Group dynamics provide useful information that individual data collection cannot  
- Useful in gaining insight into a topic that may be more difficult to gather through other data collection methods  
- Potentially efficient way to obtain a range and depth of information  
- Quickly generate common impressions | - Susceptible to facilitator bias  
- A few individuals can dominate or sidetrack discussions  
- Difficult to categorize and analyze responses  
- Does not produce valid information at the individual level  
- Information cannot be generalized to other groups |
5. Data Collection

Research emphasizes that internal or external staff tasked with data collection require training to increase accuracy, minimize bias, and respect privacy. Adequate training often includes at least five components:

- An orientation to the evaluation process;
- An explanation of the data collection instruments;
- A demonstration of how to use the instruments;
- A discussion of appropriate behavior; and
- A series of practice sessions

First, the facilitator introduces the objectives of the evaluation and the primary research questions. Then, the training explains how each method of data collection assists in answering such questions. Third, the facilitator shows how to use a given method to gather information. For example, in the case of a focus group protocol, the facilitator might engage the trainees in a role-playing scenario. Fourth, the facilitator shares accepted standards of professional behavior for evaluators when observing or interviewing program participants. He or she also underscores the importance of respecting participants’ rights to privacy and confidentiality. Lastly, a substantial amount of training time should involve the practice of collection methods. The feedback received during such practice sessions enables trainees to hone their techniques prior to engaging with program participants.

6. Data Analysis

Throughout the evaluation process, administrators face challenges relating to the most appropriate ways to store and analyze the data collected. In terms of data storage, evaluators are advised to take steps to keep data safe and confidential. With respect to analysis, the most suitable approach depends on the nature of the data obtained. The two major categories of data analysis are qualitative and quantitative.

Qualitative data usually detail attributes, properties, or experiences that prove difficult or impossible to measure or quantify. In order to interpret qualitative data, evaluators often follow a series of steps:

- Check and clean collected data;
- Develop codes to assist in arranging and analyzing the data;
- Organize collected data by individual, classroom, school, or other relevant variable;
- Review data to identify patterns based on the initial coding scheme;
- Revise codes, if needed;
- If applicable, reassess the data in the context of the modified codes;
- Connect patterns in the form of key relationships; and
- Consider alternative explanations

Next, evaluators analyze the quantitative data obtained. In the case of interventions, scores on standardized assessments often represent the most useful type of quantitative data collected. When processing the quantitative data, evaluators generally produce a set of descriptive statistics prior to conducting more sophisticated types of analyses. Descriptive statistics summarize the properties of variables in the dataset, including: frequency, mode, mean, median, percentile, range, variance, standard deviation, skew, and kurtosis.

Expert Insights Q&A

Dr. Christine Paulsen
Co-Author of A Guide for Education Personnel: Evaluating a Program or Intervention

On the components of program evaluations that are the most challenging for educators:

Dr. Christine Paulsen identified study design and the analysis and interpretation of data as particularly challenging as educators have often “collected a lot of data but are not sure how to deal with it all.” Additionally, Paulsen finds that “schools that are successful are ones that take the time to collect data – even informal data – from participants ‘early and often.’ This includes educators, other staff, students, and families. These formative evaluations don’t have to be complicated and they don’t have to be rigorous. But, in schools where they have taken the time to understand how programs are working (or not working) for their participants, they have been able to make crucial mid-course corrections and continuously find ways to enhance the programs without waiting until the end to learn that something wasn’t working. I think that schools sometimes overlook this important step and then they find that they wasted valuable time and resources with the wrong approach.”
The nature of the variables’ distributions potentially limits the types of statistical models and tests available. Inferential statistics, where appropriate, permit an evaluator to test for meaningful relationships between two or more variables. For an intervention, the evaluator seeks to determine whether exposure to the program leads to a significant change in academic performance, while controlling for other achievement-influencing factors (e.g., disability).

7. Final Report

At the end of the process, evaluators produce a final report. Although the nature of the report typically reflects the main audience (e.g., parents, practitioners, or policymakers), the document should be clear and concise. A condensed version containing key findings and recommendations also helps to focus attention on the salient points. In addition, distributing the results through a variety of channels increases the odds of reaching all stakeholders.

The Role of Systematic and Recurring Rigorous Data Analysis in Achieving School and System Goals

We know that effective program reviews and evaluations provide a framework for systematic and recurring rigorous analysis within a school system. Given that systems are evaluated on the premise of meeting annual goals, it is also clear that effective reviews and evaluations offer a key piece in continuous improvement efforts. Unfortunately, school systems commonly struggle to achieve the desired volume and quality standards set for program evaluations. In this context, the application of informed research and research methods can lead to more effective use of system resources and stronger outcomes relative to school and system goals via program evaluations.

Strategy in Action

GOAL:
To provide an external, evidence-based perspective to redirect the outcomes of a pre-existing program

THE REQUEST:
A school system sought analysis expertise to determine if their program goals—to help students more easily transition from middle school to high school—were effectively carried out through their freshman program.

IMPACT:
The targeted program was designed to help students make an easier transition into high school, and to prepare them for learning in high school and beyond. The program evaluation analysis evaluates the effect of the program on high school graduation, GPA, attendance, disciplinary incidents, AP credits, and standardized test scores.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS OF THE PROGRAM EVALUATION:
Hanover found that, overall, there is no strong evidence that students participating in the program performed significantly better on the established indicators than students who did not participate in the program. This finding created the basis for deep discussions at the administrative level about the program and its future.
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