Order Number 9211477

# Evaluation standards for selected student activity programs in Nebraska high schools

Mann, Kenton Bruce, Ed.D.

The University of Nebraska - Lincoln, 1991

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

# EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR SELECTED STUDENT ACTIVITY PROGRAMS IN NEBRASKA HIGH SCHOOLS

by

Kenton B. Mann

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska-Lincoln

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Interdepartmental Area of Administration,
Curriculum and Instruction

Under the Supervision of Professor Frederick C. Wendel

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 1991

DISSERTATION TITLE

Evaluation Standards for Selected Activity Programs

in Nebraska High Schools

BY

Kenton B. Mann

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

| APPROVED | DATE |
|---|---|
| Frederick C. Wendel<br>Signature | 11/21/91 |
| Dr. Frederick C. Wendel<br>Typed Name | |
| Ronald Joekel<br>Signature | 11/21/91 |
| Dr. Ronald Joekel<br>Typed Name | |
| Ward Sybouts<br>Signature | 11/21/91 |
| Dr. Ward Sybouts<br>Typed Name | |
| Alvah M. Kilgore<br>Signature | 11/21/91 |
| Dr. Alvah M. Kilgore<br>Typed Name | |
| Stanley Vasa<br>Signature | 11/21/91 |
| Dr. Stanley Vasa<br>Typed Name | |
| Signature | |
| Typed Name | |

GRADUATE COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

# EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR SELECTED STUDENT ACTIVITY PROGRAMS IN NEBRASKA HIGH SCHOOLS

Kenton B. Mann, Ed. D.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1991

Advisor: Frederick C. Wendel

The purpose for conducting this research was to identify the types of standards used in randomly selected Nebraska high schools for the evaluation of student activity programs. Four research objectives were designed to guide the study: (a) to examine the degree to which the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (1981) were determined to be appropriate for use in evaluation of activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (b) to identify which Joint Committee standards were implemented to evaluate activity programs, (c) to determine if a common set of evaluation standards was applied to activity programs by school officials, and (d) to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the school and the use of a formal instrument for evaluation of activity programs.

A sample population of 120 high schools was selected from all Nebraska high schools that were members of the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA) during the 1989-90 school year. Response rate for the survey was 71%.

Analysis of the data collected from the survey questionnaire supported the following conclusions: (a) The Joint Committee standards are appropriate for use in the evaluation of activity programs in Nebraska high schools. Each of the 30 standards presented in the survey questionnaire was reported to be appropriate by a majority of the respondents, (b) Survey respondents in this study reported very few, if any, of the Joint Committee standards to be implemented for activity program evaluation,

(c) Implementation rates for each standard within each high school class was compared to the implementation rate for the standard in the total population. A set of 10 standards composed of Propriety Standards and Accuracy Standards was found to be statistically significant in the analysis of the data, and (d) Nebraska school officials seldom use any type of a formal evaluation instrument to assess activity programs. Of the 85 respondents in the sample population, nine reported use of a formal instrument to evaluate athletic activity programs and three reported use of a formal instrument to evaluate non-athletic programs in their respective schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this study would not have been possible without the support of a number of people. I would like to acknowledge them and express my appreciation.

A special thank-you is expressed to Dr. Edgar A. Kelley who encouraged me to begin this study and served as my advisor until his relocation to the University of Western Michigan. His assistance and challenging encouragement has been greatly appreciated. A second note of sincere appreciation is also extended to Dr. Frederick C. Wendel who assisted me in the completion of this study as my advisor. His support with the transition and completion of the study enabled me to bring successful closure to this professional experience. I would also like to thank the members of my committee for their direction, advice, and support. Thank you Dr. Al Kilgore, Dr. Ron Joekel, Dr. Ward Sybouts, and Dr. Stan Vasa.

I want to acknowledge two special teachers who influenced my life. Mrs. Eva Craig was my elementary school teacher for seven years at Prairie Cottage School, District #145. She encouraged me to learn and wanted me to go to college. My grandmother, Florence Earnhart-Mann, instilled in me the value of an education and shared in my professional goals with her support and love.

Finally, to the special people that God has blessed me with as a family, thanks. Thank-you Cyndee for your patience and encouragement through this process. You continue to be a wonderful friend and great help-mate. To the three joy-providers in my life, thank-you Katie, Kenzie, and Kurtis. Dad is finally done with the dissertation!

K.B.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Context | 1 |
| | Statement of the Problem | 3 |
| | Research Objectives | 4 |
| | Definition of Terms | 4 |
| | Assumptions | 5 |
| | Limitations | 6 |
| | Significance of the Study | 6 |
| | Organization of the Study | 7 |
| II. | REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 8 |
| | Introduction | 8 |
| | Student Activity Programs | 8 |
| | Educational Evaluation | 16 |
| | Summary | 27 |

III. METHODS . . . . . 31

Introduction . . . . . 31

Sample Population . . . . . 31

Design and Instrumentation . . . . . 32

Data Analysis . . . . . 33

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . . 35

Introduction . . . . . 35

Research Design and Instrumentation . . . . . 36

Research Objective One . . . . . 38

Research Objective Two . . . . . 48

Research Objective Three . . . . . 56

Research Objective Four. . . . . 60

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . 65

Summary . . . . . 65

Conclusions . . . . . 74

Recommendations . . . . . 77

PAGE

REFERENCES . . . . . 80

APPENDIX A - Cover Letter and Survey Questionnaire . . . . . 84

APPENDIX B - Sample Evaluation Instruments . . . . . 90

APPENDIX C - Summary of Respondent Comments . . . . . 99

LIST OF TABLES


| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Evaluation Standards Developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Programs, Projects, or Materials | 23 |
| 2 | Percent of Nebraska High Schools in Which Joint Committee Evaluation Standards Are Determined to Be Appropriate | 47 |
| 3 | Percent of Nebraska High Schools in Which Joint Committee Evaluation Standards Are Implemented | 55 |
| 4 | Joint Committee Standards Implemented and Chi Square Test Results | 59 |
| 5 | Use of Formal Instruments to Evaluate Athletic and Non-Athletic Activity Programs in Selected Nebraska High Schools | 64 |

# Chapter I

# INTRODUCTION

## Context

Nearly 150,000 high school students participated in student activity programs in Nebraska during the 1989-90 school year. The Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA), which serves as the governing body for student activity programs in Nebraska high schools, sanctions twenty athletic events and five non-athletic activities that culminate in state level competition.

The role of student activity programs in secondary schools is clearly established and accepted by most educators. The 10th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward Public Schools (Gallup, 1978) indicated more than one-half of all parents who responded to the survey with children in school regarded student activity programs as being very important in the education of their children. While the law may recognize some type of distinction between student activity programs and what goes on in the classroom, for most purposes, student activity programs are considered to be a fundamental part of the educational process (Gluckman, 1975). Morano (1985) reported that along with academic programs, student activity programs do make up the total school curriculum which is designed to teach the skills and develop the abilities that will be needed to function successfully in society.

One of the earliest endorsements for student activity programs was issued by the National Education Association as a result of a study to examine the role of high schools in America and the importance of high schools to society as a whole. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Schools (1918) issued a report entitled *"The Cardinal Principles of Education"* that suggested secondary education programs should be

determined by the needs of the society to be served, the character of the individual to be educated, and the knowledge of educational theory and practice available. Seven basic principles were identified for secondary schools to implement. One of the principles called for the worthy use of leisure time and is considered to be one of the first endorsements of student activity programs by a professional organization in America. Altstetter (1935) declared student activity programs to be the pupil's contribution to school life and that these programs were definitely related to the school's function as a whole. McKown (1937) suggested that a school with only student activity programs would be as absurd as a school without them.

Student activity programs continued to gain credibility and acceptance as a part of the total school program during the next four decades in America. Ghoshen (1979) noted that one in three college students who responded to a survey about high school student activity programs considered these programs to be more important than course work. He also reported that 90% of the students who responded indicated personal achievement, fun and personal enjoyment, an outlet for individual needs and interest, development of leadership skills, and experiences not available in the academic school program as reasons for participation in student activity programs.

Student activity programs are quite similar to the courses and activities of the academic curriculum in a number of ways. For example, student activity meetings, practices, and sessions are usually scheduled by school officials as a part of the regular or extended school day. Activities, contests, and performances occur during a school's yearly academic calendar and most school districts have board of education policies that govern student conduct in these activities. Certified school personnel are frequently under contract with the school district to supervise, instruct, and coordinate student

activity programs. The role of student activity programs in the overall school program has become an established and accepted part of the secondary school curriculum.

The evaluation of educational programs and materials is also a common practice in most America schools. Formally and informally evaluating the various types of student activity programs and curriculum has also become an accepted practice in most secondary schools. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Joint Committee, 1981) defined educational evaluation as the systematic investigation of the worth or merit of some object. Joekel (1985) suggested that the evaluation of student activity programs should be a continuous process that occurs before, during, and after the activity. He concluded that no organization or activity could operate effectively without some type of evaluation.

If student activity programs are a legitimate part of the total secondary curriculum and if the definition of educational evaluation developed by the Joint Committee is accurate, a study of the evaluation practices in Nebraska high schools related to the standards used to evaluate student activity programs is a meaningful and worthwhile research topic. Information collected from a study of this nature could lead to a better understanding of student activity programs in Nebraska schools and provide useful information for future student activity program development and improvement.

## Statement of the Problem

The purpose for conducting this research was to identify the types of standards used in randomly selected Nebraska high schools for the evaluation of student activity programs.

## Research Objectives

The four research objectives designed for this study were as follows: (a) to examine the degree to which the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (1981) were determined to be appropriate for use in evaluation of student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (b) to identify which standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (1981) were implemented to evaluate student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (c) to determine if a common set of evaluation standards was applied to student activity programs by school officials in selected Nebraska high schools, and (d) to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the school and the use of a formal instrument for evaluation of student activity programs.

## Definition of Terms

Evaluation. The systematic investigation of the worth or merit of an object, e.g., a program, project, or instructional material.

High School. Secondary schools in Nebraska with grade configurations of 9-12, 10-12, or 11-12 that are members of the Nebraska School Activities Association in one of the following school size classifications:

Class A - the thirty-two schools having the greatest boy/girl enrollment in grades 9-12 based on Nebraska Department of Education enrollment data for the 1989-90 school year

Class B - the next sixty-four schools in the state of Nebraska with the largest enrollments based on Nebraska Department of Education enrollment data for the 1989-90 school year

Classes C1, C2, D1, and D2 - the remaining schools that are grouped into

four approximately equal groups beginning with the largest to the smallest based on Nebraska Department of Education enrollment data for the 1989-90 school year.

Nebraska School Activities Association. The organization in the state of Nebraska that monitors, coordinates student activities, and determines rules and guidelines by which student activity programs are conducted.

Student activity. Athletic events and activities offered by the school for high school students sanctioned by the NSAA that include boys baseball, girls and boys basketball, girls and boys cross country, football, girls and boys golf, girls and boys gymnastics, girls and boys soccer, girls and boys swimming, girls and boys tennis, girls and boys track, girls volleyball, wrestling, debate, journalism, play production, music, and speech.

Principal. The instructional leader in charge of high school programs and personnel. The principal is the chief administrative official at the building level.

Standard. A principle commonly agreed upon by experts in conducting an evaluation.

## Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for the purposes of this study: (a) The definition of student activity programs based on the athletic and non-athletic events sanctioned by NSAA is a comprehensive definition appropriate for use in this study, (b) The schools selected are representative high schools in the state of Nebraska, (c) The methods used to select the stratified random sample has provided a representative sample of Nebraska high schools, (d) The definition of a standard developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation is a

comprehensive definition appropriate for use in this study, (e) The definition of evaluation is a comprehensive definition appropriate for use in this study, and (f) The standard category classifications developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation of Utility, Feasibility, Propriety, and Accuracy are appropriate for use in this study.

## Limitations

This study was restricted by the following limitations: (a) This study was limited to high schools in the state of Nebraska that were members of the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA) therefore, findings are generalizable only to member schools in Nebraska; (b) The population in this study was confined to NSAA member schools as of January 1, 1990; (c) The findings of this study were limited to the practices and procedures associated with survey research and the use of a survey questionnaire; and (d) School officials reported accurate data related to the standards actually used for student activity program evaluation in their respective school districts.

## Significance of the Study

Many secondary schools in the state of Nebraska share affiliations with at least two common organizations. Those organizations are the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) and the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA). Both the NCA and NSAA offer membership based on requirements that include compliance with a set of criteria or guidelines. While both groups govern or approve portions of the total school program, neither organization has a comprehensive set of recommended program evaluation standards for student activity programs.

Cougherty (1978) found the evaluation of student activity programs by school

officials to be practically non-existent in most public schools in the United States. If this practice is common in high schools in Nebraska, and if accreditation and governance organizations like the NCA and NSSA do not have specific recommendations for evaluation of student activity programs, a study of the types of standards used to evaluate student activity programs is both important and necessary.

A study of the standards used to evaluate student activity programs in Nebraska high schools could lead to a better understanding of the role of student activity programs. Knowledge gained about the types of standards used by school officials for the evaluation of student activity programs could develop greater credibility for student activity programs as a part of the total school curriculum. A study of this nature has never been conducted among NSAA member schools and may serve to provide an additional means by which schools could improve their respective student activity programs.

## Organization of the Study

In Chapter I, the content, statement of the problem, research objectives, definitions of terms, assumptions, limitations, and the significance of the study have been addressed.

In Chapter II, the literature directly related to the development of student activity programs and educational evaluation processes that have been utilized to assess programs has been reviewed.

A description of the research procedures and methods used in this study is found in Chapter III. The findings of the study are included in Chapter IV and the conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

# CHAPTER II

# REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## Introduction

The total school curriculum that has developed in American schools during the past two centuries is composed of at least three definite units (a) the core curriculum of required academic subjects, (b) the elective curriculum of subjects and courses, and (c) the cocurriculum that includes the various activities, teams, clubs, and special interest groups that are provided by the school and are under the supervision of school personnel. These three curriculum units are well established in American schools and accepted as part of the total school program.

The evaluation of students, educational and administrative personnel, curricula, instructional materials, programs, and projects is an educational process that has also become an accepted part of the educational system in America (Nevo,1986). The Joint Committee on Standards for Evaluation defined educational evaluation as the systematic investigation of the worth or merit of some object (Joint Committee, 1981). The evaluation process is often applied to the curriculum of secondary schools but less often applied to the cocurrriculum of student activities.

This review of literature will include two parts: (a) the historical development of student activity programs in American schools and (b) the development of the educational evaluation process used to assess school programs and curriculum.

## Student Activity Programs

Student activity programs are sometimes referred to as cocurricular activities or extra-curricular activities. Otto (1975) reported that student activity programs

have also been called the third curriculum in relation to the other types of school curricula that include required courses and elective courses. Regardless of the terms or titles used to describe student activity programs, they have been considered part of the total school program for an extensive period of time.

Historically, student activity programs can be traced to some of the earliest organized systems of education. Citizens of Sparta were noted to prize the arts of leaping, running, and the use of a weapon as early as 700 B.C. Reading and writing were not emphasized in Sparta. Athens was called the School of Greece by Pericles in the mid 400s B.C. McKowen (1937) noted that athletic competitions, student clubs, debate, student participation in government, dramatics, and musical presentations were established and accepted practices in both Sparta and Athens. Upper-class Roman boys often attended schools that placed an emphasis on literature, rhetoric, oratory, and physical exercises. In these examples from early civilizations, the forerunner of modern student activity programs can be found as a part of the educational process.

During the period of time from 500-1000 A.D., the dissolution of the Western Roman Empire occurred. Formal education as it had been known continued to some degree. The emphasis on the liberal arts decreased with a resulting decline in the types of integrated perspectives often attributed to the arts. Latin was preserved as the language of communication by scholars and those public officials in higher offices.

The Scholastic Period is often dated from 1000-1300 A.D. Two significant educational developments occurred during this period. Elementary learning centers for both boys and girls became common in many urban cities. Instruction included reading, writing, mathematics, and religion. The second major development was the resurrection of interest, at institutions of higher learning, in the liberal arts curriculum that

included studies in dance, sculpture, and music (E. A. Kelley, lecture material, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, fall term 1979).

The forerunners of modern day cocurricular activities experienced significant development during the Renaissance, 1300-1500 A.D. A heavy emphasis continued to be placed on literature and reading but the fine arts and physical education also received curricular attention. The Reformation Period during the 1500s brought about a liberalizing trend in schools. Many primary schools expanded their curriculum to include experiences in social studies, music, physical exercise, and commercial ventures. In addition, compulsory attendance also became common as did public support for education during the Reformation Period (E. A. Kelley, lecture material, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, fall term 1979).

Internationally, the 1600s saw the extension and expansion of the natural and social sciences within a school's curriculum. Required attendance and public support for education continued as common characteristics of educational systems. In America, specifically in the New England Colonies, public support of education was very common. For example, public support for the Boston Latin Grammar School is recorded in 1635 and the same public support existed for Harvard College in 1636. The Massachusetts Bay Colony government passed legislation that required all towns of 50 or more families to establish an elementary school and a community of 100 or more families to establish a Latin Grammar school with public support in 1642 (World Book Encyclopedia, 1990).

Curtis and Bidwell (1977) cite the Boston Latin Grammar School as the first secondary school founded in America. The school began in 1635. The Boston Latin Grammar School provided academic training designed to prepare young men for the

Harvard College curriculum of Latin, Greek, and a study of grammar.

Benjamin Franklin is credited with the establishment of the Academy in 1751. Curtis and Bidwell (1977) note that Franklin recognized a growing need for including occupational preparation within the secondary school educational experience. The Academy included a Latin School and an English School which offered more practical courses related to business and industrial training. Students who attended the Academy were required to pay tuition as this school was not funded by the public.

Schools like the Latin Grammar School and the Academy were common in America well into the 1800s. The first high school was established in Boston in 1821. Six years later, the state of Massachusetts required all towns of 500 families or more to maintain a public high school with public funds. The number of high schools across America did not grow significantly until the Western frontier was closed with the territorial expansion of the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean near the end of the nineteenth century. Beginning in the late 1800s and into the 1900s, the number of high schools in the United States began to increase steadily.

Student activity programs in the United States also became a part of educational programs in the 1800s. Gholson (1985) described three separate eras of student activity program development in America that began in the late 1800s. Prior to this time, recognition of student activity programs in public schools was limited. The first era was a period of rejection of student activity programs by educators that extended approximately from the 1870s until 1900. The most common opinion among educational leaders during that time cited few, if any, benefits derived by extending personnel or financial resources into extra-curricular activities. During this same era, Gutowski (1988) reported that in Chicago area urban schools, special interest

clubs were spin-offs from secret societies in secondary schools that had been modeled after university fraternities and sororities. Special interest clubs of this type became the foundations of various secondary school student activity programs in later years. Common characteristics of high school clubs included a type of school spirit rooted in rivalry, an advancement within the social system of the school by participation in the student activity, and chronic problems with money, equipment, and the school's administration.

The development of student activity programs continued across the United States during the latter part of the nineteenth century. The first official student newspaper was published by the students of Hyde Park High School in Chicago in 1883. Organized athletic events were established in the Chicago Public Schools system for football, baseball, and track and field teams by the late 1880s.

In Nebraska, public school administrators first met in 1898 to discuss the concept of a state-wide activities organization. Though no official action occurred as a result of this meeting, student activity programs were recognized by educators of the state and became an educational issue. Nebraska educational leaders did address the issue of a state high school activities governing board in detail shortly after the turn of the century when a state athletic association was established (J. R. Riley, personal communication, November 6, 1989).

Student activity programs continued to develop from 1900 to 1920 in American high schools. During this period, a type of passive acceptance existed among school officials for student activity programs. One of the more significant events that occurred was a report issued in 1918 by the Commission to study the Reorganization of Secondary Schools. The report, *The Seven Cardinal Principles,* called for the basic objectives of

secondary education for every American boy and girl to be (1) health, (2) command of the fundamental processes, (3) worthy home membership, (4) vocation, (5) citizenship, (6) the worthy use of leisure time, and (7) development of an ethical character. The Commission suggested that the secondary educational program should be determined by the needs of the society to be served, the characteristics of the individual to be educated, and the knowledge of the educational theory and practices available (Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Schools, 1918). The National Congress of Parents and Teachers (1932) later determined the Seven Cardinal Principles not only to be the objectives of the high school, but also to be the objectives of all education.

The first college course devoted to the study of student activity programs was taught at Columbia University by Elbert Fretwell in 1918 (Founce, 1960). Fretwell, who became known as the "father of student activities," developed seven sign posts for student activity programs. He suggested the following guidelines related to student activity programs: (a) The school shall develop a constructive program of extra-curricular activities, (b) The plan of extra-curricular activities shall grow out of the life of the school, (c) The plan shall recognize that the pupil is a citizen of the school, (d) Teachers shall accept, whole heartedly, the responsibility for developing the school's extra-curricular program, (e) Extra-curricular activities shall be supervised, (f) Intelligent public opinion shall be developed in support of the school's extra-curricular program, and (g) The school principal is responsible for the extra-curricular program of the school (Fretwell, 1931, pp. 63-68).

A debate about student activity programs developed in Nebraska during the first quarter of the twentieth century. The Nebraska High School Athletic Association was founded by school officials for the governance of school athletic contests in 1910.

Nebraska school districts continued to join the Association, and in 1935, the membership voted to place all interschool activities under its control. The name of the organization was changed to the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA). The purpose of the NSAA (1987) was to (a) select, develop, and/or direct interscholastic events in recognized areas of school activities, (b) standardize and regulate the administration of these events, and (c) establish safeguards against the exploitation of school pupils in non-school events or activities ("NSAA Academics & Activities - Curriculum Partners", 1990). The NSAA has continued to function in the state of Nebraska and has recorded a membership of over 350 public and parochial schools in 1990. The beginning of the NSAA in the late 1800s and its development follow the national trend in the development and establishment of student activity programs described by Gholson (1985).

The final phase of student activity program development occurred from the mid 1920s into the early 1960s. During this period, the active acceptance of student activity programs as a part of the total school program by school officials and educational leaders was established. Coleman (1961), in a study of the social life of the teenager and its impact on education, reported a positive relationship between increased hours spent on homework, college expectations, and involvement in sports. State and national organizations like the NSAA and the National Federation of State High School Associations were formed during this same era for the purpose of managing and monitoring student activity programs in secondary schools. By the mid 1960s, the terms extra-curricular and cocurricular were used less frequently and references to high school activity programs were made by the general use of the term "student activity programs."

Student activity programs are accepted as a part of the total school program in America. A variety of terms have been used to describe student activity programs that include extra-curricular, cocurricular, and the third curriculum. Joekel (1985) declared that student activity programs are a practical extension of the school curriculum. These programs, according to Joekel, have traditionally provided students with avenues for expression and relevant experiences. Student activities are not at odds with academic pursuits but serve as the auxiliary laboratory for the total school curriculum.

Various accreditation agencies include student activity program criteria as a part of the overall curriculum. For example, the Commission of Schools of the North Central Association included a standard that suggested that schools maintain a diversified and balanced program of student activities designed to contribute to the educational development of the student. Exemplary criteria cited by the North Central Association include: (a) Schools with an enrollment of more than 500 students should have a half-time activities director, (b) Schools with an enrollment of 1000 or more should have a full-time activities director, (c) Board of education policies should coordinate and supervise fund raising activities for student activities, and (d) The district should provide financial support for student activity programs (North Central Association Commission on Schools, 1988).

Morano (1985) reported that student activity programs have become part of the regular school program because of their close relationship to academics and also because of their value in supplementing academics with leadership training skills. In Nebraska during the 1987-88 school year, the NSAA sponsored twenty athletic activities and five non-athletic activities for high school students that culminated in a

state contest. During the same 1987-88 school year, more than 145,000 Nebraska high school students participated in NSAA sanctioned events. According to Sybouts and Krepel (1984), school activities should not be considered as separate or apart from the total curriculum and therefore should undergo an evaluation process not separate from the total curriculum. Regardless of the terms used, student activity programs have become an established and accepted part of the total school curriculum in Nebraska and the nation.

## Educational Evaluation

Mankind has always used the process of evaluation to make judgments and arrive at decisions. The evaluation process can be traced back to the beginning of time. Patton (1981) cited the first act of evaluation from the Book of Genesis when, on the sixth day of creation, God looked upon His work and called it "good." Chinese officials conducted evaluations of public officials as early as 2000 B.C. Socrates used verbally mediated evaluations as a part of the learning process during his instruction in ancient Greece.

A definite process of educational program evaluation cannot be identified in America until the mid-1800s. Travers (1983) suggested that prior to the mid-1800s in America there were few practices that could be considered formal educational evaluation. Worthen and Sanders (1987) reported that formal evaluations of educational and social programs were almost non-existent until the mid-1800s.

The development of educational evaluation in America can be grouped into three general periods according to Worthen and Sanders (1987). These periods include the years from approximately 1838 to 1930, 1930 to 1966, and 1966 to the present. The foundations of educational evaluation were established in the late 1800s with the emergence of testing as a form of formal evaluation of school programs. The state

departments of education in Massachusetts and Connecticut began to collect data that were used to make educational decisions in the mid-1800s. The United States Education Bureau used a similar pattern of data collection related to student performance outcomes to gather information about schools. The United States Education Bureau continued to use various types of tests to evaluate programs well into the 1900s.

The Boston School Committee conducted the Boston Survey in 1845 which became the first use of printed tests for the assessment of student achievement. By 1847, the testing procedure had been discontinued because little, if any, use was made of the test results. Regardless, testing as a type of evaluation process in schools had become an established practice. Later, near the turn of the century from 1895 to 1905, Joseph Rice developed a testing instrument similar to the Boston Survey and applied these assessment procedures in a number of large school systems in America, (Worthen and Sanders, 1987). Testing had emerged as a primary method of evaluating schools by the early 1900s.

Haggerty (1918) described a survey of school officials that indicated schools made changes in classification of students, school organization, and methods of instruction based on the results of testing programs. He suggested that the testing process was a reliable type of evaluation and that schools should, in addition to testing of student performance, assess all areas of the total school program. Madaus, Ariasian, and Kellagham (1980) reported that surveys based only on student performance were used to diagnose system weaknesses, to standardize curriculum practice, to evaluate experiments, to assess the overall performance of a system, and also to make decisions about individual students. While surveys began to be used in schools for collecting various types of information, testing individual students continued to be the dominant

form of educational program evaluation used by schools in America during the first quarter of the 1900s.

Testing as a method to evaluate individual performance was not exclusively limited to education at the beginning of the twentieth century. The United States Army had developed two tests to evaluate personnel. The Army Alpha Test was used with literate personnel and the Army Beta Test was used with illiterate personnel for evaluation purposes. These tests were applied extensively during World War I. Test results aided Army officials in assignment of personnel to a variety of tasks and duties and as a type of performance assessment.

The practice of using testing as the main type of evaluation process continued well into the 1930s in American schools. Merwin (1961) suggested that testing programs led to changes in educational programs as well. The development of the New York Board of Regents examination in 1927 and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in 1929 were significant events that added credibility to the use of testing as a form of evaluation by school officials. More than half of the states in the United States used some form of state wide testing by 1935. The primary focus of this era was on individual student performance although many educational decisions were made as a result of the testing process.

A second stage in the development of educational evaluation extends from the mid-1930s to approximately 1966. The Eight Year Study was conducted in the late 1930s under the supervision of Ralph Tyler who became the director of the project in 1932. The focus of the Eight Year Study was on the outcome of schooling, specifically, on the performance of students from high school curricula considered to be more progressive as compared to the performance of students educated in schools based on the Carnigie-

unit curriculum. Smith and Tyler (1942) developed an evaluation manual from their efforts in the Eight Year Study that became the standard by which various evaluation strategies were measured for several years.

Tyler is credited with the development of an objectives-oriented approach to evaluation that has influenced education evaluation techniques for nearly four decades. The importance and meaning of educational evaluation was outlined by Tyler in the form of four fundamental questions to be answered in the evaluation process. These questions caused educators to discuss the importance and meaning of the general goals of education. The questions raised by Tyler were as follows: (a) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain, (b) What educational purposes can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes, (c) How can these educational experiences be efficiently organized by the school, and (d) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained (Tyler, 1950, pp 121-125). Tylerian evaluation is a term used frequently to describe the type of evaluation process that is based upon a given set of educational objectives.

During the 1930s accreditation agencies also grew in the United States. Charters, standards, and membership were common for both regional and national accreditation organizations. Glass (1969) reported that accreditation replaced the Western European school evaluation approach of school inspections most popular from the 1890s until the 1920s. As accreditation agencies became more established in the American educational system, a very broad and general type of evaluation process also became common practice by the member schools that included a given set of standards by which programs were assessed.

At least two additional major events occurred in America before 1966 that had a significant impact on educational evaluation. First was the successful launch of Sputnik

l by the Soviet Union in 1957 which, in turn, triggered the National Defense Act of 1958. A national focus was drawn on American schools and the purpose of the National Defense Act was to provide federal assistance in the establishment of funds for making low-interest loans to students who wanted to pursue their education at institutions of higher education in the United States. In general, the grant would provide 90 percent of the capital of these funds with the remaining 10 percent provided by the receiving educational institution. An indirect result of the National Defense Act of 1958 was a major increase in the types of curriculum available in mathematics and science. As these new curriculum emerged, judgments about their value, applicability, and general contribution were made by various educational leaders. Comparisons of this nature led to more extensive types of program and curriculum evaluation.

The second significant event prior to 1966 related to the development of educational evaluation was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The ESEA authorized a variety of educational research and development projects. Title I educational programs for disadvantaged youth were included in the ESEA and became the most expensive federal educational program in the history of the nation. Perhaps the greatest impact of the ESEA was its requirement that educational institutions be accountable for the federal monies they received. This type of accountability gave rise to required evaluation procedures for the assessment of projects, programs, and instructional materials as well as student performance. Project evaluations have since become a standard practice for both state and federal educational programs funded by governmental agencies.

The final period of major development in the history of educational evaluation extends from the mid-1960s to the present. In the late 1960s, educational evaluation

was driven more by political mandates than educational incentives. The federal government developed the Center for the Study of Evaluation at the University of California in Los Angeles in 1967. The National Institute of Education (NIE) was created in 1972 by the federal government. The NIE conducted specific research programs on evaluation in education. McLaughton (1980) noted that from 1968 to 1977 the budget of the Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation in the United States Office of Education grew by more than 1650 percent. This represents the greatest budget increase in the department's history.

Evaluation practices and methods began to become more formalized during the late 1960s and following years. Eisner (1966) stated that educational objectives needed to be clearly specified for at least three reasons: (a) Educational objectives provide goals toward which the curriculum is aimed, (b) Once clearly stated, educational objectives facilitate the selection and organization of the content of the curriculum, and (c) When specified in both behavioral and content terms, educational objectives make it possible to evaluate the outcomes of the curriculum. Tyler (1967) supported this same type of goal-based evaluation when he suggested that goals of the curriculum should be within the performance range of a large percentage of the school population. He defined the task of evaluation describing or measuring what the performance range exists and how the educational institution might improve students' chances of meeting the goal. The philosophies of Eisner and Tyler reflect the trend that had begun to develop among educators at the time related to the use and process of educational evaluation. The evaluation process became more exact as goals and educational objectives were identified and used as types of standards by which programs were assessed.

A Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation was formed in 1975.

Representatives from nearly every major professional educational association in the United States were involved in the work of the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee (1981) assumed that evaluation was an inevitable part of any human undertaking and suggested that formal evaluation could promote the understanding and improvement of education. Members of the Joint Committee agreed at the onset of the project that an organized set of educational standards should be developed and published. In 1981, the Joint Committee released the Standards for Evaluation of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials. This publication contained thirty standards recommended by the Joint Committee to be used to guide and govern educational evaluation efforts.

The Joint Committee organized the standards they believed to be most essential to evaluation around the four attributes of utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy. Eight utility standards were identified to determine whether an evaluation provided the practical information needs of a given audience. The second attribute, feasibility, included three standards that called for evaluations to be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal in a natural setting as compared to a laboratory setting. An additional eight standards were identified in the propriety category. These standards required that evaluators conduct their work in a legal and ethical manner with regard for those involved in and affected by the evaluation. Accuracy was the fourth category identified by the Joint Committee and included eleven standards. These standards were intended to ensure that the evaluation would reveal and convey accurate information about the subjects or object being studied. The merit or worth of a study could also be addressed by these standards. Table 1 contains a summary of the categories, definitions, and standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for the evaluation of educational programs, projects, and materials.

Table 1

Evaluation Standards Developed by
the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation

| Standard Category | Purpose of the Standard | Standard |
|---|---|---|
| Utility | to ensure that an evaluation will serve the practical informational needs of given audiences | Audience Identification<br>Evaluation Credibility<br>Information Scope & Selection<br>Valuation Interpretation<br>Report Clarity<br>Report Dissemination<br>Report Timeliness<br>Evaluation Impact |
| Feasibility | to ensure that an evaluation will be realistic, prudent, diplomatic and frugal | Practical Procedures<br>Political Viability<br>Cost Effectiveness |
| Propriety | to ensure that the obligations of the formal parties (what is to be done, how, by whom, when) to an evaluation are agreed to in writing so that these parties are obligated to adhere to all conditions of agreement or formally renegotiate it | Formal Obligation<br>Conflict of Interest<br>Full & Frank Disclosure<br>Public's Right to Know<br>Rights of Human Subjects<br>Human Interaction<br>Balanced Reporting<br>Fiscal Responsibility |
| Accuracy | to ensure that an evaluation will reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features of the object being studied that determine its worth or merit | Object Identification<br>Content Analysis<br>Defensible Information Sources<br>Valid Measurement<br>Descriptive Purpose & Procedures<br>Reliable Measurement<br>Systematic Data Control<br>Justified Conclusions<br>Analysis of Quantitative Data<br>Analysis of Qualitative Data<br>Objective Reporting |

Brown (1987) reported that educational evaluation practices flourished throughout the 1970s. Professional organizations devoted exclusively to evaluation, like the Evaluation Network and the Evaluation Research Society, were founded. Talmage (1982) found that evaluation literature grew rapidly and was readily available beginning in the mid-1970s. Literature related to educational evaluation also began to appear in various journals like *Evaluation, Evaluation and Program Planning, Evaluation in Planning and Policy Analysis, Evaluation Review, Evaluation Quarterly, and New Directions for Program Evaluation.*

Educational evaluation is an accepted, and often required, practice in schools in the United States. A commonly accepted definition of educational evaluation is the systematic investigation of the worth or merit of some object (Joint Committee, 1981). At least four functions of educational evaluation have been established. Scriven (1967) cited formative evaluation, relating to decision-making about the object being evaluated, and summative evaluation, relating to accountability, as two functions.

A third function of educational evaluation is known as the psychological or socio-political function. Cronbach (1980) explained this function as the process used to increase awareness of special activities, motivate desired personnel, or promote public relations. Dornbush and Scott (1975) described the fourth function as the administrative function. They suggest that this type of educational evaluation occurs only in formal organizations where superordinates evaluate subordinates. The administrative function of evaluation demonstrates authority and is a top-down process.

Evaluation in the educational setting in America has extended beyond student performance and school personnel. House (1986) suggested two major conclusions related to educational evaluation: (a) almost everything can be an object of evaluation

and the process should not be limited only to students or school personnel and (b) the clear identification of the evaluation object is an important part of the development of any evaluation design.

Tyler's objective-based evaluation model is still used by educators attempting to collect information about whether or not goals are actually attained. A number of additional evaluation models have been developed that are also used by educators in the 1990s. For example, Stake (1967) developed the Countenance Model which identified two sets of information to be collected related to the evaluated object. This included descriptive information that focused on the prior conditions that might affect outcomes and judgemental information related to various standards for outcomes.

Stufflebeam (1969) viewed evaluation as the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives. He developed the Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model that included four variables for the evaluation of objects: (a) the goal, (b) the design of the evaluation, (c) the process of implementation, and (d) the outcomes. The CIPP Model is used as an information collecting activity to assist in the decision-making process.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) outlined an evaluation model that called for five kinds of information: (a) descriptive data related to the evaluation object, its setting, and its surrounding conditions, (b) feedback from a relevant audience(s), (c) information about relevant issues, (d) data about values, and (e) the standards relevance to worth and merit assessment. Their model was an expansion of an evaluation model developed by Stake in the late 1960s. Stake (1972) cited the focus of the Responsive Education Model to be to address the concerns and issues of the "stakeholder" audience. Guba and Lincoln's expanded model is often used in responsive educational evaluation.

According to Conner, Atlman, and Jackson (1984), educational evaluation is making the transition from a period of late adolescence to adulthood. Speaking about the merits of educational evaluation of curriculum programs, Paddock (1989) cited reform movements and accountability as primary reasons for conducting curriculum program evaluations. Paddock proposed a three phase evaluation process that included the following sets: (a) Phase 1, Review of board of education policies related to the curriculum area or program being evaluated; (b) Phase 2, On-site visits and interviews conducted with program personnel by an external evaluator; and (c) Phase 3, Presentation of a final report about the curriculum or program being evaluated to the superintendent of schools at a public meeting. She contended that such a process would develop credibility and also provide a degree of accountability for the curriculum area or program being evaluated.

Evaluation of the curriculum areas, including the core curriculum, the elective curriculum, and the cocurriculum, is a legitimate means of gathering information about the total school program. Christensen (1978) suggested that activity programs required leadership and support, needed precise goals, and needed tools for planning ways to reach these goals. He suggested that school officials use the Management-By-Objectives/Results (MBO/R) model to improve student activity programs. According to Christensen, evaluation tools should be designed with the kind of answers wanted in mind and may take the form of surveys, tabulation of selected data, cost determinations, interviews or any combination of these forms of assessment. Educational evaluation in America has developed during the past two centuries and is still in the process of adapting to the changing needs and demands of the educational system.

## Summary

### Student Activity Programs

The history of student activity programs can be traced back to some of the earliest systems of organized education. As early as 400 B.C., a wide variety of student activities can be identified that were part of the educational systems of Athens and Sparta. In Athens, during the 400s B.C., athletic groups, student clubs, debate teams, and dramatic and musical performing groups were common elements in the schools.

Student activities also can be found in some of the earliest organized educational systems and institutions in America. The first secondary school in America, the Boston Latin Grammar School, was founded in 1635. Included in the school's curriculum was debate, a study of music, and rhetoric. In 1751, Benjamin Franklin established the Academy. This school had a primary focus on the occupational needs of students. Included as a part of the school's curriculum were various activities like music, debate, and physical fitness.

The growth and development of student activity programs in American schools was limited throughout most of the 1800s. Perhaps the most significant event in the history of American student activity program development occurred in 1918. The Committee to Study the Reorganization of Secondary Schools published a report entitled *'The Seven Cardinal Principles'* . The report outlined seven basic objectives of American education. Included in the list of seven objectives was a call for the wise use of leisure time by students. This objective is considered by many educators to be one of the most significant events in student activity program history.

Related to the growth and development of student activity programs in the state of Nebraska, discussion began among some of the leading educators in the state in 1898.

This type of discussion continued among the state's educators until 1935 when the Nebraska School Activity Association (NSAA) was founded. The purposes of the NSAA included (a) to select, develop, and/or direct interscholatic events in recognized areas of school activities, (b) to standardize and regulate the administration of these events, and (c) to establish safeguards against the exploitation of school pupils in non-school events or activities. The NSAA in the 1990s has a membership of more than 350 Nebraska high schools and sanctions 20 athletic contests and 5 non-athletic contests for high school students which culminate in a state contest or competition.

Educational Evaluation

The process of evaluation can be traced back to the very beginning of time. In the Book of Genesis, the author reports that God looked upon His work of creation on the sixth day and called it "good". Since that time, when decisions as to the merit, worth or value of an object are made, some type of evaluation is required. The formal process of educational evaluation that exists in America in the 1990s can be traced back to the mid-1800s. In the late 1840s, the use of printed tests to evaluate student achievement was a common form of school program evaluation. This practice continued in many schools in America well into the 1900s.

Ralph Tyler directed a study in the 1930s which became known as The Eight Year Study. The focus of this study was on the outcome of schooling based on student performance scores. Tyler developed a set of four questions related to educational evaluation. The questions he posed were: (a) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain, (b) What educational purposes can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes, (c) How can these educational experiences be efficiently organized by the school, and (d) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

(Tyler, 1950, pp 121-125). This set of questions has become the basis for a majority of the educational evaluation work that has occurred over the past 50 years.

In the 1960s, the process of program evaluation became linked with a type of accountability and fiscal responsibility. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) authorized a variety of educational research and development projects. Title I educational programs for disadvantaged youth were included in the ESEA and became the most expensive federal educational program in the history of the nation. The ESEA required educational institutions to be accountable for the federal monies they received. This type of accountability gave rise to required evaluation procedures for the assessment of projects, programs, and instructional materials as well as student performance. Project evaluations have since become a standard practice for both state and federal educational programs funded by governmental agencies.

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation was formed in 1975. This committee held a common belief that sound educational evaluation could promote understanding and improvement of education. The Joint Committee also concluded at the onset of the project that no set of standards existed that was adequate for educational evaluation efforts. The Joint Committee determined to develop and publish such a set of evaluation standards. A national panel of 29 evaluation experts drafted the initial set of standards which were reviewed by graduate students at Western Michigan University. A national review panel of 42 educators and social scientists reviewed the second draft of the standards. This set of revised standards was field tested by 23 evaluators and evaluation teams. The final product, published by the Joint Committee in 1981, listed a set of 30 evaluation standards that were cited as appropriate for evaluation of educational programs, projects, and materials.

Educational evaluation is an accepted, and often expected, part of the educational process in American schools in the 1990s. The use of a given set of evaluation standards is frequently implemented to determine the worth of merit of a particular program. Evaluation of activity programs is cited by Sybouts and Krepel (1984) as a necessary and on-going process that provides a means of accountability. Information presented as a part of the evaluation process is often used to assist school personnel in making decisions related to improvement of the program being reviewed.

# Chapter III

# METHODS

## Introduction

The purpose for conducting this research was to identify the types of standards used in randomly selected Nebraska high schools for the evaluation of student activity programs. A survey questionnaire was developed that presented 30 evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981). The survey was presented to randomly selected Nebraska high school principals. They were asked to indicate which of the standards, if any, they implemented in the evaluation of student activity programs in their respective high schools.

The four research objectives designed for this study were as follows: (a) to examine the degree to which the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) were determined to be appropriate for use in evaluation of student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (b) to identify which standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) were implemented to evaluate student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (c) to determine if a common set of evaluation standards was applied to student activity programs by school officials in selected Nebraska high schools, and (d) to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the school and the use of a formal instrument for evaluation of student activity programs.

## Sample

The population of this study consisted of high school principals of Nebraska high schools that were members of the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA). A total

of 120 high schools were randomly selected from the 353 Nebraska high schools that were members of the NSAA during the1989-90 school year. A total of 30 subjects were identified from the total population for each of the four high school classifications in the study to meet the minimum requirements necessary to establish the existence or non-existence of a statistical relationship according to Gay (1981). The stratified random sample of NSAA high schools included 30 Class A high schools, 30 Class B high schools, 30 schools from Class C-1 and C-2, and 30 schools from Class D-1 and D-2. The building principal in each selected high school received the survey questionnaire related to the evaluation of student activity programs.

## Design and Instrumentation

The design of this study was survey research. A review of related professional literature, the evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, and of the program criteria developed by the North Central Accreditation Association was conducted to formulate the questions included in the survey questionnaire. The questionnaire, a cover letter of explanation and a self-addressed return envelope were mailed to the principal of each selected high school.

The survey was composed of two sections. The first section was designed to collect demographic data about the respondent's high school that included NSAA school classification, high school grade configuration, North Central Association accreditation status, and the NSAA athletic activities and non-athletic activities offered by the high school during the 1989-90 school year.

The second section of the survey was composed of yes/no and short answer questions. These questions were used to determine if the Joint Committee evaluation standards existed in selected schools and if the standards were applied in the evaluation

of student activity programs. Specific questions were included in the second section of the survey to determine if an evaluation instrument had been developed or adopted by the high school, the person responsible for conducting evaluations of student activities, and the frequency of these evaluations. Additional questions related to formative and summative evaluation were also included in the survey questionnaire. Survey respondents were also asked to list any additional standards, other than those developed by the Joint Committee, that were used to evaluate student activity programs in their respective high schools.

A panel of educational professionals was asked to review the questionnaire and provide feedback related to its contend and application. The panel included a Nebraska superintendent of schools, 6 high school principals, an NSAA Board of Director member, and a University of Nebraska-Lincoln professor. Input from the panel was used to revise the survey and prepare the document for distribution and data collection.

The survey with a cover letter of explanation and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope was mailed to principals of selected high schools on October 9, 1990. A response date of October 19, 1990, was identified. Follow-up telephone calls were made from October 21, 1990 to October 25, 1990, to principals of selected high schools who had not yet responded to the survey.

## Data Analysis

The statistics used for data analysis in this study included descriptive statistics and application of the Chi Square technique. Descriptive statistics were used to report the percentage of survey respondents who used the 30 individual Joint Committee standards for evaluation of student activity programs in their respective high schools. The researcher formed two categories related to each standard: (a) implemented, and

(b) not implemented. After forming the categories, the researcher tabulated the data by high school class and counted the number of respondents that reported a given standard to be implemented in evaluation of activity programs in their high school and the number of respondents who reported that the standard was not implemented for activity program evaluation. Frequency counts for each standard were next converted to percentages and the Chi Square test was applied to the data. The null hypothesis was that no difference existed between the size of the Nebraska high school and the implementation of each standard. The .05 level of significance was used for the Chi Square test.

# CHAPTER IV

## Presentation and Analysis of Data

### Introduction

The purpose for conducting this research was to examine the types of standards used to evaluate student activity programs in randomly selected Nebraska high schools. A survey questionnaire was developed that presented 30 evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981). These standards represent the efforts of a national committee of educators, psychologists, legislators, professional evaluators, and representatives from a number of national educational organizations. The standards define the Joint Committee's recommendations for principles and guidelines that should govern evaluation efforts related to educational programs, projects, and materials. The survey was mailed to 120 randomly selected Nebraska high school principals. The principals were asked to indicate which of the standards they believed to be appropriate for evaluation of student activity programs and which of the stadards, if any, they implemented in the evaluation of student activity programs.

The four research objectives designed for this study were as follows: (a) to examine the degree to which the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) were determined to be appropriate for use in evaluation of student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (b) to identify which standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) were implemented to evaluate student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (c) to determine if a common set of evaluation standards was applied to student activity programs by school officials in selected Nebraska high

schools, and (d) to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the school and the use of a formal instrument for evaluation of student activity programs.

## Research Design and Instrumentation

A literature review of topics related to student activity programs and educational evaluation was conducted based on titles, authors, articles, papers, books, and dissertations identified by a computer search of published materials. The main focus of the literature review included the history and development of student activity programs and educational program evaluation standards.

Common themes found in the literature review included the general agreement of educators as to the role and purpose of student activity programs in the total school program, support for the educational value of student activity programs, and limited references to evaluation standards or guidelines for evaluation of student activity programs. Related to educational program evaluation, the work of Ralph Tyler originally presented in the Eight Year Study and support among educators for the formal evaluation of all types of educational programs by a given set of criteria were central themes in the review of literature.

A questionnaire was developed from the literature review that included the evaluation standards identified by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. This instrument was piloted with seven high school principals in the Southwest Conference of Nebraska High Schools. Feedback from the pilot survey led to the addition of a set of detailed instructions for respondents about completion of the survey and a change in the survey format. The revised survey format presented each standard immediately followed by a space to indicate if the standard was thought to be appropriate for use in student activity program evaluation by the respondent and a

second space for the respondent to indicate if the standard was or was not implemented in their respective high school.

A randomly selected sample of 120 Nebraska high schools with membership in the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA) during the 1989-90 school year was developed. The principal of each selected high school received a copy of the questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. Response rate for the survey questionnaire was 85 of 120 surveys returned or 71%. Response rates by high school classification from the sample population were: Class A, $n$ = 25 or an 83% response rate; Class B, $n$ = 26 or an 87% response rate; Class C, $n$ = 18 or a 60% response rate; and Class D, $n$ = 16 or a 53% response rate. The data collected from the questionnaire were compiled and analyzed to answer the four research objectives of this study. Principals who did not return the survey questionnaire by the requested response date received a follow-up telephone call. A second mailing of the survey questionnaire was made to all principals who indicated that they had not received the first survey questionnaire.

The questionnaire used to collect data in this study contained two sections. In the first section, respondents were asked to provide demographic data related to the size of their high school, the type of activity programs offered in their high school sanctioned by the NSAA, and their use of a formal instrument for the evaluation of activity programs. The second section included a list of the evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (1981). Respondents were asked to provide two responses related to these evaluation standards. They were asked to (a) indicate whether each standard was thought to be appropriate or inappropriate for use in evaluation of activity programs and (b) indicate whether each of the standards was

implemented or not implemented at the present time for the evaluation of activity programs in their respective high schools.

The data analysis procedures included a descriptive analysis of information collected from the survey. Response rates were reported as percent of responses within the high school classes as well as percent of responses from the total sample population for each of the 30 Joint Committee standards presented in the survey.

A Chi Square Test was also applied to the nominal data collected to determine if statistical significant differences existed between classes of Nebraska high schools in the sample population and the use of a given evaluation standard. Data collected from the survey questionnaire related to each of the four research objectives are presented in this chapter.

## Research Objective I

Each time a decision is made, some type of evaluation process has occurred. In a school setting, both formal and informal evaluation strategies are frequently used to make the various types of decisions required of school administrators. The success or effectiveness of student activity programs is often gauged in terms of a win-loss record or in terms of the accomplishments or achievements of individual activity participants. From an educational perspective, additional criteria may also be appropriate to consider when determining the worth or merit of a given student activity program. The standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) were proposed as a set of fundamental standards that could be utilized in the evaluation of educational programs, projects, and materials. These 30 standards were presented to selected school officials in the sample population in the survey questionnaire. Respondents were asked to consider each standard and determine if it was appropriate or

not appropriate for use in the evaluation of student activity programs.

The first research objective was to examine the degree to which the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (1981) were determined to be appropriate for use in evaluation of student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools.

Appropriateness of Evaluation Standards in Selected Nebraska High Schools

Utility Standards. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) developed eight standards for an educational evaluation related to the practical needs of a given audience. These standards were called Utility Standards. Each of the eight standards was presented to school officials in the sample population. Respondents were asked to indicate which of the standards, if any, they considered to be appropriate for use in evaluation of student activity programs.

Approval of the Utility standards by respondents was very common. Seven of the eight standards were reported to be appropriate for evaluation of student activity programs by 86% or more of the respondents. The Utility Standard reported to be appropriate for use in activity program evaluation by the greatest number of respondents in the sample population was "Evaluation Impact." The criteria of this standard require an evaluation to be planned and conducted in ways that encourage follow -through by members of the audiences. This standard was approved by 83 of 85, or 97%, of the respondents.

The Utility Standard reported as appropriate for use in evaluation of activity programs by the fewest respondents in the sample population was "Report Dissemination." The criteria of this standard require evaluation findings to be disseminated to clients and other right-to-know audiences so that they could assess and

use the findings. In the sample population, this standard was considered to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by 48 of 85, or 56%, of the respondents. Table 2 contains the a list of the Joint Committee standards, approval percentages for each standard by high school classification, and approval percentages for each standard in the total sample population.

A majority of school officials in each of the high school classifications of the study reported the Utility Standards to be appropriate for use in evaluation of activity programs. In Class A Schools, the "Evaluation Impact" standard was determined to be appropriate by the greatest number of respondents, 23 of 25, or 92% approved the standard. In Class B Schools, two Utility Standards were reported to be appropriate by all 26 of the respondents. The standards were "Evaluation Impact" and "Report Clarity." The criteria of the "Report Clarity" standard require an evaluation report to describe the object being evaluated and its context, the purposes and procedures of the evaluation, and the evaluation findings. In Class C schools, four of the Utility Standards were reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by 17 of 18, or 90%, of the respondents. These standards were (a) "Audience Identification," with criteria calling for the audiences involved in or affected by the evaluation to be identified so that their needs can be met, (b) "Evaluator Credibility," with criteria that requires the persons conducting the evaluation to be trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation so that the findings achieve maximize credibility and acceptance, (c) "Report Timeliness," with criteria that suggests that the release of reports to be timely so that audiences can best use the reported information, and (d) "Evaluation Impact." In Class D schools, all of the respondents approved three separate Utility Standards. The standards were "Audience Identification," "Report Timeliness," and "Evaluation Impact."

In each of the four high school classificaitons of the study, the "Report Dissemination" standard was reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by the fewest number of respondents. In Class A schools, 15 of 25 respondents, or 60%, reported the standard to be appropriate. Of the 26 responding school officials in Class B, 15 of 26, or 58%, reported the standard to be appropriate. In Class C schools, 9 of 18 respondents, or 50%, indicated the standard was appropriate for activity program evaluation while in Class D schools, 9 of 16, or 56%, of the respondents found the standard to be appropriate for activity program evaluation.

Feasibility Standards. The Joint Committee on Standards also identified standards for guiding an evaluation that were designed to keep an evaluation strategy realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal. These standards were called Feasibiltiy Standards and included the standards "Practical Procedures," "Political Viability," and "Cost Effectiveness." The criteria of "Practical Procedures" require the evaluation procedures to be practical so that disruption is kept to a minimum and the necessary information can be obtained. The "Political Viability" standard criteria call for an evaluation to be planned and conducted with anticipation of the different positions of various interest groups to assure their cooperation. "Cost Effectiveness" standard criteria require an evaluation to produce information of sufficient value to justify the resources expended in the evaluation process. In the sample population, 73 of 85, or 93%, of the respondents reported "Practical Procedures" to be appropriate for activity program evaluation; 77 of 85, or 90%, of the respondents approved "Political Viability;" and 50 of 85, or 59%, of the respondents reported "Cost Effectiveness" to an appropriate standard to use in evaluation of activity programs.

Within the high school classification groups of the study, "Practical Procedures"

was the Feasibility Standard approved by most of the respondents in Class A, B, and C schools. Approval rates were 22 of 25 respondents, or 88%, in Class A schools; 26 of 26 respondents, or 100%, from Class B school respondents; and 17 of 18, or 94%, of Class C school respondents. The Feasiblity Standard most often reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation in Class D schools was "Political Viability." All of the 16 Class D school respondents indicated this standard was appropriate for use in activity program evaluation.

The Feasibility Standard reported to be appropriate by the fewest respondents in each class was "Cost Effectiveness." This standard was determined to be appropriate for activity program evaluation in Class A schools by 14 of 25 respondents, or 56%. In Class B Schools, the approval rate was 10 of 26, or 38%, of the respondents. In Class C schools, 12 of 18, or 67%, of the respondents reported the standard to be appropriate. In Class D schools, the standard was approved by 12 of 16, or 75%, of the respondents.

Propriety Standards. A total of eight standards were developed by the Joint Committee which related to conducting an evaluation. The Propriety Standards criteria require that an evaluation be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation as well as those affected by the evaluation results. Within the total sample population, the Propriety Standard reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by the greatest percent of survey respondents was "Balanced Reporting." This standard requires an evaluation report to be complete and fair in its presentation of the strengths and weaknesses of the object under investigation. This standard was reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by 99% or 84 of 85 of the respondents in the sample population.

The Propriety Standard approved by the smallest percent of the sample

population was "Formal Obligation." This standard requires that formal parties to an evaluation agree in writing to what is to be done, how, and by whom and when before the evaluation begins. This standard was reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by 73% or 62 of 85 of the sample population respondents.

Among Class A officials, four of the eight Propriety Standards were reported to be appropriate by all of the respondents. The standards approved by all of the Class A school officials responding to the survey were (a) "Full and Frank Disclosure," with criteria for oral and written evaluation reports to be open, direct, and honest in their disclosure of pertinent findings; (b) "Public's Right to Know," with criteria for the formal parties to an evaluation to respect and protect the public's right to know within the limits of other related principles and statues; (c) "Fiscal Responsibility," with criteria related to the evaluator's allocation and expenditure of resources to reflect sound accountability procedures and otherwise be prudent and ethically responsible; and (d) "Balanced Reporting."

In Class B schools, all of the respondents approved two of the Propriety Standards. One of the standards was "Rights of Human Subjects." The criteria of this standard require an evaluation to be designed and conducted so that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are respected and protected. The other Propriety Standard approved by 100% of the Class B school respondents was "Balanced Reporting."

In Class C schools, the Propriety Standard that was reported to be appropriate by the greatest percent of the respondents was "Formal Obligation." Of the responding Class C officials, 17 of 18, or 94%, of the respondents reported this standard to be appropriate. In Class D schools, six of the eight Propriety Standards were approved by all of the respondents. The standards approved by all Class D school respondents were

"Formal Obligation," "Full and Frank Disclosure," "Public's Right to Know," "Rights of Human Subjects," "Balanced Reporting," and "Fiscal Responsibility."

The Propriety Standard reported to be least appropriate for activity program evaluation in Class A and Class C schools was "Human Interactions." This standard requires evaluators to respect human dignity and worth in their interactions with other persons associated with an evaluation. The standard was approved by 19 of 25, or 75%, of the Class A school respondents and by 14 of 18, or 78%, of the Class C respondents. The Propriety Standard reported to be appropriate by the fewest Class B respondents for evalaution of activity programs was "Conflict of Interest." The criteria of this standard requires conflict of interest to be dealt with openly and honestly so that it does not compromise the evaluation process and results. The approval rate among Class B school respondents was 16 of 26 responses, or 62%. The standards "Conflict of Interest" and "Human Interactions" were reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by the fewest respondents in Class D. These two Propriety Standards were reported to be appropriate by 14 of 16, or 87%, of the respondents.

Accuracy Standards. The Joint Committee on Educational Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) developed 11 standards with criteria requiring an evaluation to reveal and convey adequate information about the evaluation object in order to determine its worth or merit. These standards were called Accuracy Standards. The approval rates in the sample population for the various Accuracy Standards ranged from an approval high of 99% or 84 of 85 respondents to an approval low of 69% or 59 of 85 respondents. The Accuracy Standard with the highest approval in the sample population was "Justified Conclusions." The criteria of this standard require conclusions revealed in an evaluation to be explicitly justified so that the audiences could assess them. The

Accuracy Standard with the lowest approval in the sample population was "Analysis of Qualitative Information." Criteria of this standard requires qualitative information in an evaluation to be appropriately and systematically analyzed to ensure appropriate interpretation.

In Class A schools, three Accuracy Standards were approved by all of the respondents. The standards were "Valid Measurement," "Systematic Data Control," and "Justified Conclusions." The criteria of "Valid Measurement" requires the information-gathering instrument and procedures used be implemented in ways that will assure that the interpretations arrived at are valid for the given uses. The "Systematic Data Control" criteria require the data collected, processed, and reported in an evaluation to be reviewed and corrected so that results of the evaluation will not be flawed.

In Class B schools, two Accuracy Standards were approved by all of the respondents. These standards were "Justified Conclusions" and "Objective Reporting." The criteria of "Objective Reporting" requires an evaluation procedure to provide safeguards to protect the evaluation findings and reports against distortion by the personal feelings and biases of any party to the evaluation.

The Accuracy Standard that most respondents reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation in Class C schools was "Justified Conclusions." Ninety-five percent or 17 of 18 of the respondents in Class C schools approved this standard. In Class D schools, six Accuracy Standards were approved by all of the 16 respondents. These standards were (a) "Described Purposes and Procedures," which requires the purposes and procedures of an evaluation to be monitored and described in detail so that they can be identified and assessed; (b) "Defensible Information Sources," which requires the sources of information used in the evaluation to be described in enough

detail so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed; (c) "Valid Measurement;" (d) "Reliable Measurement," which requires the information-gathering instrument and procedures used to be chosen or developed and implemented in ways that will assure that the interpretations arrived at are valid for the given use; (e) "Systematic Data Control;" and (f) "Justified Conclusions."

The least approved Accuracy Standard in Class A and Class C schools was "Analysis of Qualitative Information." The criteria of this standard requires qualitative information in an evaluation to be appropriately and adequately analyzed to ensure supportable interpretations. Approval rates for the standard were 17 of 25, or 68%, of the respondents in Class A schools and 10 of 18, or 56%, of the respondents in Class C schools. The least approved Accuracy Standard in Class B and Class D schools was "Context Analysis." This standard's criteria requires the context in which the program being evaluated exists to be examined in enough detail so that likely influences on the object can be identified. These standard was reported to be appropriate by 19 of 26, or 73%, of respondents in Class B schools and 12 of 16, or 75%, of the respondents in Class D schools.

TABLE 2

Percent of Nebraska High Schools In Which Joint Committee Evaluation Standards Are Determined to Be Appropriate

| Type of Standard | % of Schools by Class In Which Standards Are Appropriate | | | | % of Schools in the Sample Population In Which Standards Are Appropriate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Class of High School | | | | |
| | A | B | C | D | |
| Utility Standards | | | | | |
| Audience Identification | 91 | 95 | 94 | 100 | 95 |
| Evaluator Credibility | 89 | 80 | 94 | 87 | 87 |
| Information Scope & Sequence | 84 | 88 | 87 | 87 | 86 |
| Valuation Interpretation | 84 | 90 | 88 | 87 | 87 |
| Report Clarity | 87 | 100 | 88 | 87 | 91 |
| Report Dissemination | 60 | 58 | 50 | 56 | 56 |
| Report Timeliness | 89 | 95 | 94 | 100 | 94 |
| Evaluation Impact | 92 | 100 | 94 | 100 | 97 |
| Feasibility Standards | | | | | |
| Practical Procedures | 89 | 100 | 94 | 87 | 93 |
| Political Viability | 84 | 90 | 88 | 100 | 90 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 56 | 38 | 67 | 75 | 59 |
| Propriety Standards | | | | | |
| Formal Obligation | 80 | 95 | 95 | 100 | 93 |
| Conflict of Interest | 86 | 62 | 81 | 87 | 73 |
| Full and Frank Disclosure | 100 | 95 | 94 | 100 | 97 |
| Publics Right to Know | 100 | 98 | 88 | 100 | 97 |
| Rights of Human Subjects | 89 | 100 | 94 | 100 | 96 |
| Human Interactions | 76 | 85 | 78 | 87 | 81 |
| Balanced Reporting | 100 | 100 | 92 | 100 | 99 |
| Fiscal Responsibility | 100 | 88 | 88 | 100 | 94 |
| Accuracy Standards | | | | | |
| Object Identification | 92 | 78 | 88 | 93 | 88 |
| Context Analysis | 79 | 73 | 76 | 74 | 76 |
| Described Purpose & Procedures | 89 | 95 | 92 | 100 | 94 |
| Defensible Information Sources | 95 | 90 | 92 | 100 | 94 |
| Valid Measurement | 100 | 95 | 92 | 100 | 97 |
| Reliable Measurement | 95 | 95 | 92 | 100 | 96 |
| Systematic Data Control | 100 | 90 | 94 | 100 | 96 |
| Analysis of Quantitative Information | 81 | 76 | 76 | 85 | 80 |
| Analysis of Qualitative Information | 68 | 81 | 56 | 79 | 69 |
| Justified Conclusions | 100 | 100 | 94 | 100 | 99 |
| Objective Reporting | 89 | 100 | 89 | 87 | 93 |

Note. Sample Population = 120; Responses by Class of High School: A=25, B=26, C=18, D=16.

## Research Objective II

Student activity programs are common in secondary school programs in the state of Nebraska. The type of Joint Committee evaluation standards used to evaluate the various student activity programs in Nebraska high schools was the focus of this research objective. The 30 standards developed by the Joint Committee for Educational Evaluation (1981) were presented in the survey questionnaire to officials of high schools selected at random from all Nebraska high schools. Respondents were asked to indicate if each standard was implemented or not implemented in the evaluation of student activity programs in their respective schools.

The second research objective of this study was to identify which standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) are implemented to evaluate student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools.

### Implementation of Standards in Selected Nebraska High Schools

Utility Standards. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) identified eight Utility Standards for an evaluation related to the practical needs of the given audiences. The "Evaluation Impact" standard, which requires that an evaluation be planned and conducted in ways that encourage follow-through by members of the audiences affected was the Utility Standard implemented by the greatest percent of respondents. In the sample population, 33 of 85 of the respondents, or 38%, reported using this standard to evaluate student activity programs.

The least implemented Utility Standard was "Evaluator Credibility." This standard requires the persons conducting the evaluation to be trust worthy and competent to conduct the evaluation. In the sample population, 18 of 85 of the respondents, or 21%, reported this standard to be implemented. Table 3 contains the Joint Committee

standards, implementation percentages for each standard by high school classification, and implementation percentages in the total sample population.

Within the high school classification categories, all of the eight Utility Standards were implemented by respondents from Class A, B, and C schools. In Class D schools, seven of the eight standards were implemented. The "Audience Identification" standard, which requires audiences involved in or affected by the evaluation to be identified, was not implemented by any Class D high school respondent.

The Utility Standard implemented by the most respondents in Class A schools was "Audience Identification." Among Class A officials, 11 of 25 respondents, or 43%, reported using this standard to evaluate student activity programs. In Class B schools, three Utility Standards were implemented by 12 of 26, or 46%, of the respondents. These standards were "Audience Identification," "Report Timeliness," which requires the release of reports to be timely so that audiences can best use the reported information, and "Evaluation Impact," which requires that an evaluation be planned and conducted in ways to encourage follow-through by the members of the various audiences. In Class C schools, these same three standards were also the most implemented Utility Standards. "Audience Identification," "Report Timeliness," and "Evaluation Impact" were each implemented by 6 of 18, or 33%, of the respondents from Class C. "Evaluation Impact" was the Utility Standard implemented by most Class D respondents. In 5 of 16, or 31%, of Class D schools in the random sample population, this standard was used to evaluate student activity programs.

The "Evaluator Credibility" standard was implemented least in Class A, B, and C schools. According to this standard, persons conducting the evaluation are to be both trustworthy and competent to perform the evaluation so that the findings achieve

maximum credibility and acceptance. In Class A schools, 5 of 25, or 20%, of the respondents reported implementation of the standard. In Class B schools, 8 of 26, or 31%, of the respondents implemented the standard. In Class C schools, 3 of 18, or 17%, of the respondents implemented the standard. The "Audience Identification" standard was the standard implemented least among Class D school officials. None of the 16 Class D respondents reported implementation of this standard for student activity program evaluation.

Feasibility Standards. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) defined three standards intended to help develop an evaluation that would be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal. These standards were entitled Feasibility Standards. The highest rate of implementation among respondents was 36% for a single Feasibility Standard. The "Political Viability" standard was reported to be implemented by 30 of 85, or 36%, of the respondents in the sample population. This standard requires the evaluation to be planned and conducted with anticipation of the different positions of the various interest groups involved in the evaluation to ensure their cooperation. The "Practical Procedures" standard requires that evaluation procedures be practical, disruptions kept to a minimum, and the needed information is collected. This standard was implemented by 30 of 85, or 35%, of the respondents. The remaining Feasibility Standard, "Cost Effectiveness," was implemented by 20 of 85, or 24%, of the respondents in the sample population. This standard requires the evaluation to produce information of sufficient value to justify the cost of resources expended during the evaluation process.

The "Political Viability" standard was implemented by the greatest number of Class A respondents, 11 of 25 or 44%. Class B respondents implemented the "Practical

Procedures" standard most frequently. Eleven of 26 respondents or 42% reported implementation of the standard. In Class C schools, each of the Feasibility Standards were implemented by 8 of 18 or 44% of the respondents. Class D respondents implemented the "Practical Procedures" standard most frequently. Four of 16 or 25% of the respondents in Class D schools indicated that this standard was implemented for evaluation of student activity programs in their respective schools.

The least implemented Feasibility Standard in both Class A schools and Class B schools was "Cost Effectiveness." The standards was implemented by 4 of 25 , or 16%, of the respondents in Class A Schools and 7 of 26, or 27%, of the respondents in Class B schools. In Class C schools, all three of the Feasibility Standards were implemented by 8 of 18, or 44%, of the respondents. In Class D schools, "Political Viability" and "Cost Effectiveness" were the least implemented standards. These standards were implemented by 2 of 16, or 13%, of the Class D school respondents.

Propriety Standards. The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) developed eight standards related to the implementation of an evaluation process. According to these standards, evaluations were to be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation as well as those affected by the results. These standards are Propriety Standards. The highest rate of implementation among all respondents was 35 of 85, or 41%, of the responses, and the lowest rate of implementation was 5 of 85 responses, or 6%. Two of the Propriety Standards were reportedly implemented by 41% of the respondents in the sample population. The first standard was the "Public's Right to Know" standard. This standard requires formal parties to an evaluation to respect and assure the public's right to know within the limits of various principles and statutes. The second standard,

"Fiscal Responsibility," requires the allocation and expenditure of resources to reflect sound accountability procedures.

The Propriety Standard implemented least among the sample population was "Conflict of Interest." This standard requires that potential conflict of interest be dealt with openly and honestly so as not to compromise the evaluation process or results. Six percent of the sample population reported implementation of this standard in student activity program evaluation.

The Propriety Standard, "Fiscal Responsibility," was most frequently implemented by school officials in classes A, B, and D. In Class A schools, 13 of 25 respondents, or 52%, reported implementing this standard for student activity program evaluation. Implementation was reported by 14 of the 26 Class B respondents, or 54% for "Fiscal Responsibility." Implementation by Class D officials was 6 of 16 respondents, or 38%. The "Rights of Human Subjects" standard was the most frequently implemented standard in Class C schools. Implementation by 8 of 18 of respondents, or 44%, was reported.

The Propriety Standard implemented in the smallest percent of Class A schools was "Conflict of Interest." This standard requires conflict of interest to be dealt with openly and honestly so that it does not compromise the evaluation process or results. None of the 25 respondents in Class A schools reported using this standard. In Class B schools, 2 of 26 respondents, or 8%, reported implementing this standard. Among Class C schools in the sample population, the lowest rate of implementation for a standard was 3 of 18 respondents, or 17%. Three separate Propriety Standards were implemented at this level. The standards were (a) "Formal Obligation," (b) "Full and Frank Disclosure," which requires oral and written evaluation reports to be open, honest, and direct in the

disclosure of pertinent findings, and (c) "Public's Right to Know." In Class D schools, three standards were not implemented by any of the 16 respondents. These standards were"Formal Obligation," "Conflict of Interest," and "Full and Frank Disclosure."

Accuracy Standards. The final group of standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation included 11 standards related to evaluation results and findings. According to these standards, an evaluation should reveal and convey adequate information about the evaluation object in order to determine its worth or merit. These standards are Accuracy Standards. "Systematic Data Control," a standard that requires data collected, processed, and reported in the evaluation to be reviewed and corrected so that the evaluation results will not be flawed, was implemented by 32 of the 85 respondents, or 38%. This was the most implemented Accuracy Standard in the sample population.

The least implemented Accuracy Standard among all respondents was "Justified Conclusions." Among respondents in the sample population, 11 of 85, or 13%, reported this standard to be used for student activity program evaluation. The "Justified Conclusions" standard requires that conclusions reached in the evaluation be explicitly justified so that audiences can assess them.

Within each of the high school classes, "Systematic Data Control" was the Accuracy Standard implemented most frequently in Class A, B, and C schools. The implementation rate in Class A schools was 14 of 25, or 56%, of the respondents. In Class B schools, the implementation rate was 12 of 26, or 46%, of the respondents. The standard was implemented by 8 of 18, or 44%, of the Class C respondents. In Class D schools, the standard implemented by the greatest percent of respondents was "Objective Reporting." This standard requires that evaluation procedures provide safeguards to

protect evaluation findings and reports against distortion by personal feelings or biases of any party to the evaluation. Among Class D respondents, 3 of 16, or 19%, of the school officials reported implementing this standard in student activity programs evaluation.

The Accuracy Standard implemented by the fewest respondents in Class A schools was "Reliable Measurement." This standard requires information-gathering instruments and procedures to be implemented in ways that will assure that the information obtained is sufficiently reliable for its intended use. "Reliable Measurement" was the Accuracy Standard implemented by 4 of 25, or 16%, of the Class A respondents. In Class B schools, "Justified Conclusions" was the least implemented Accuracy Standard. This standard was implemented by 4 of 26, or 15%, of the Class B respondents. In Class C schools, "Context Analysis" was the least implemented Accuracy Standard. This standard requires the context in which the program, project, or material exists to be examined in enough detail so that its likely influences on the object of the evaluation can be identified. Only 1 of 18, or 5%, of the Class C respondents reported implementing this standard. Seven of the 11 Accuracy Standards were not implemented by any of the Class D school respondents. These standards were (a) "Context Analysis," (b) "Described Purposes and Procedures," which requires the purposes and procedures of the evaluation to be monitored and described in detail so that they can be identified and assessed, (c) "Defensible Information Sources," (d) "Valid Measurement," which requires the information-gathering instrument and procedures used in the evaluation will assure that the interpretations arrived at are valid for the given uses, (e) "Reliable Measurement," (f) "Systematic Data Control," and (g) "Justified Conclusions."

TABLE 3

Percent of Nebraska High Schools In Which Joint Committee Evaluation Standards Are Implemented

| Type of Standard | % of Schools by Class in Which Standard Is Implemented | | | | % of Schools in the Sample Population in Which Standard Is Implemented |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Class of High School | | | | |
| | A | B | C | D | |
| Utility Standards | | | | | |
| Audience Identification | 43 | 46 | 33 | 0 | 31 |
| Evaluator Credibility | 20 | 31 | 17 | 15 | 21 |
| Information Scope & Sequence | 26 | 40 | 23 | 20 | 27 |
| Valuation Interpretation | 32 | 35 | 19 | 20 | 27 |
| Report Clarity | 40 | 43 | 31 | 18 | 33 |
| Report Dissemination | 24 | 33 | 19 | 27 | 26 |
| Report Timeliness | 42 | 46 | 33 | 27 | 37 |
| Evaluation Impact | 40 | 46 | 33 | 31 | 38 |
| Feasibility Standards | | | | | |
| Practical Procedures | 26 | 43 | 44 | 25 | 35 |
| Political Viability | 44 | 42 | 44 | 13 | 36 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 16 | 27 | 44 | 13 | 24 |
| Propriety Standards | | | | | |
| Formal Obligation | 24 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 13 |
| Conflict of Interest | 0 | 8 | 19 | 0 | 6 |
| Full and Frank Disclosure | 21 | 25 | 17 | 0 | 16 |
| Publics Right to Know | 45 | 43 | 17 | 7 | 28 |
| Rights of Human Subjects | 47 | 50 | 44 | 20 | 41 |
| Human Interactions | 30 | 28 | 26 | 18 | 25 |
| Balanced Reporting | 49 | 35 | 29 | 13 | 33 |
| Fiscal Responsibility | 52 | 54 | 21 | 38 | 41 |
| Accuracy Standards | | | | | |
| Object Identification | 53 | 45 | 35 | 13 | 34 |
| Context Analysis | 32 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 20 |
| Described Purpose & Procedures | 32 | 25 | 18 | 0 | 20 |
| Defensible Information Sources | 42 | 25 | 29 | 0 | 25 |
| Valid Measurement | 21 | 25 | 23 | 0 | 18 |
| Reliable Measurement | 16 | 25 | 18 | 0 | 15 |
| Systematic Data Control | 56 | 46 | 44 | 0 | 38 |
| Analysis of Quantitative Information | 41 | 34 | 21 | 8 | 27 |
| Analysis of Qualitative Information | 21 | 23 | 12 | 4 | 15 |
| Justified Conclusions | 26 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 13 |
| Objective Reporting | 42 | 40 | 29 | 19 | 32 |

Note. Sample Population = 120; Responses by Class of High School: A=25, B=26, C=18, D=16.

## Research Objective III

Most Nebraska high schools, regardless of the size of the student population of the high school, offer many of the student activity programs governed and sanctioned by the Nebraska Schools Activities Association. The evaluation process used by school officials, frequency of evaluations, the persons involved in the evaluation process, and the standards used to evaluate activity programs varies from school to school. The Joint Committee on Educational Standards (1981) developed a list of 30 evaluation standards that were determined to be appropriate for evaluation of educational programs, projects, or materials. These standards were presented to school officials in the sample population of Nebraska high schools. Respondents were asked to indicate which, if any, of the standards were used to evaluate student activity programs in their respective schools. The third research objective of this study was to determine if a common set of evaluation standards was applied to student activity programs by school officials in selected Nebraska high schools.

A Chi Square Test was applied to the nominal data collected from the survey respondents. The test was implemented to determine if statistical significant differences existed between classes of Nebraska high schools in the sample population and the use of a given evaluation standard. The Chi Square Test, $X^2$ ($df = 3$, $N = 85$), $p \leq .05$, was applied to each of the 30 Joint Committee standards. Table 4 contains a list of the Joint Committee standards and the Chi Square Test results, degrees of freedom, and level of significance for each standard. The .05 level of significance was chosen as the criterion for the statistical significance in the analysis of the data.

The researcher tabulated the data by high school class and counted the number of respondents that reported a given standard to be implemented in evaluation of activity programs in their high school and the number of respondents who reported that the

standard was not implemented for activity program evaluation. Frequency counts for each standard were next converted to percentages and the Chi Square test was applied to the data to determine if there was a significant difference in implementation rates among high school classes and the total sample population. From the analysis of the data for each of the 30 Joint Committee standards, a set of 10 standards was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. This set of 10 standards did not include any Utility Standards which related to the practical information needs of a given audience or any Feasibility Standards which had criteria that required an evaluation to be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal. The set of standards that were found to be statistically significant was composed of six Propriety Standards with criteria that call for an evaluation to be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation as well as those affected by its results and four Accuracy Standards that related to the identification and examination of the object being considered in the evaluation.

The Propriety Standards. Propriety Standards included criteria that require that an evaluation be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for those involved in and affected by the evaluation. The six Propriety Standards that were found to be statistically significant in the analysis of the data were (a) "Formal Obligation," with criteria that requires formal parties to an evaluation to agree in writing on what is to be done, how, by whom and when before the evaluation begins; (b) "Public's Rignt to Know," a standard with criteria that requires parties to an evaluation to respect and assure the public's right to know within the limits of related principles and statutes; (c) "Rights of Human Subjects," a standard with criteria requiring the evaluation to be developed and conducted so that the rights and welfare of human subjects are respected and protected; (d) "Human Interaction," a standard with criteria that calls for

evaluators to respect human dignity and worth in their interactions with other persons associated with the evaluation; (e) "Balanced Reporting," a standard with criteria require the evaluation to be complete and fair in its presentation of the strengths and weaknesses of the object under investigation so that strengths can be build upon and problem areas addressed; and (f) "Fiscal Responsibility," a standard with criteria that calls for the evaluator's allocation and expenditures of resources to reflect sound accountability procedures and otherwise be prudent and ethically responsible.

The Accuracy Standards. The Joint Committee developed 11 different standards with criteria that required a formal evaluation to reveal and convey technically adequate information about the object being studied that determine its worth or merit. In analysis of the data, four of the Accuracy Standards were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. These standards were (a) "Object Identification," a standard with criteria that requires the object of the evaluation (i.e. the program, project, or material) to be clearly identified in the evaluation report; (b) "Defensible Information Sources," a standard with criteria that suggests that the sources of information used in the evaluation to be described in enough detail so that the adequacy of the information can be assessed; (c) "Analysis of Quantitative Information," a standard with criteria that requires quantitative information in the evaluation to be appropriately and adequately analyzed to ensure supportable interpretations; and (d) "Analysis of Qualitative Information," the standard that has criteria calling for qualitative information in the evaluation to be appropriately and adequately analyzed to ensure supportable interpretations.

TABLE 4

Joint Committee Standards Implemented and
Chi Square Test Results

| Type of Standard | $X^2$ | df | Level of Significance |
|---|---|---|---|
| Utility Standards | | | |
| Audience Identification | 3.44535 | 3 | .3279 |
| Evaluator Credibility | 4.80833 | 3 | .1864 |
| Information Scope & Sequence | 1.53671 | 3 | .6739 |
| Valuation Interpretation | 0.59095 | 3 | .8989 |
| Report Clarity | 1.45708 | 3 | .6922 |
| Report Dissemination | 5.74214 | 3 | .1249 |
| Report Timeliness | 5.70480 | 3 | .1269 |
| Evaluation Impact | 1.91446 | 3 | .5903 |
| Feasibility Standards | | | |
| Practical Procedures | 0.71377 | 3 | .8700 |
| Political Viability | 2.04830 | 3 | .5624 |
| Cost Effectiveness | 3.90710 | 3 | .2717 |
| Propriety Standards | | | |
| Formal Obligation | 12.04438 | 3 | .0072* |
| Conflict of Interest | 2.86814 | 3 | .4124 |
| Full and Frank Disclosure | 4.97803 | 3 | .1734 |
| Publics Right to Know | 8.89273 | 3 | .0380* |
| Rights of Human Subjects | 8.74272 | 3 | .0329* |
| Human Interactions | 10.14726 | 3 | .0182* |
| Balanced Reporting | 9.74778 | 3 | .0209* |
| Fiscal Responsibility | 9.28093 | 3 | .0258* |
| Accuracy Standards | | | |
| Object Identification | 8.40934 | 3 | .0383* |
| Context Analysis | 5.88950 | 3 | .1171 |
| Described Purpose & Procedures | 6.12957 | 3 | .1051 |
| Defensible Information Sources | 9.27180 | 3 | .0259* |
| Valid Measurement | 4.00233 | 3 | .2612 |
| Reliable Measurement | 1.79928 | 3 | .6151 |
| Systematic Data Control | 7.57025 | 3 | .0558 |
| Analysis of Quantitative Information | 11.37120 | 3 | .0099* |
| Analysis of Qualitative Information | 9.74778 | 3 | .0208* |
| Justified Conclusions | 3.98427 | 3 | .2632 |
| Objective Reporting | 7.13131 | 3 | .0678 |

*$p \leq .05$

Note. Sample Population = 120; Responses by Class of High School: A=25, B=26, C=18, D=16.

## Research Question IV

Student activity programs in Nebraska high schools have become a clearly established portion of the total school program often referred to as extra-curricular activities. These types of student activities have also been called the third curriculum in conjunction with the academic and elective curriculum. During the 1989-90 school year, over 150,000 Nebraska high school students participated in student activity programs sanctioned and governed by the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA). How these activity programs were evaluated by school officials in each of the individual high schools was uncertain. Respondents were asked to indicate their high school NSAA classification, if they used a formal evaluation instrument to assess athletic activity programs, and if they used a formal evaluation instrument to assess non-athletic activity programs. The selected school officials in the sample population were also asked to return a copy of any formal activity program evaluation instrument used in their respective high schools.

The fourth research objective of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the high school and the use of a formal instrument for the evaluation of student activity programs.

### Use of a Formal Evaluation Instrument

Respondents to the survey questionnaire reported limited use of formal evaluation instruments for assessment of athletic and non-athletic activity programs. A formal evaluation instrument for athletic program assessment was reportedly used by 13 of 85, or 15%, of the respondents in the sample population. The use of a formal evaluation instrument for the assessment of non-athletic programs was reported by 3 of 85, or 4%, of the sample population respondents. Table 5 contains information related

to the use of formal instruments for evaluation of activity programs in the sample population. The information includes classification of the Nebraska high school, the number and percent of respondents by high school class that use a formal evaluation instrument to assess athletic programs, and the number and percent of respondents in the sample population that use formal instruments to assess non-athletic activity programs.

Class A Schools. Officials from the largest Nebraska high schools in the sample population reported the most frequent use of formal instruments to evaluate student activity programs. In Class A schools, 5 of 25 of the respondents or, 20%, reported using a formal instrument to evaluate athletic activity programs. A formal instrument was reported to be used to evaluate non-athletic activity programs by 3 of 25, or 8%, of the Class A school respondents.

Class B Schools. In Class B schools, respondents to the survey questionnaire also reported limited use of a formal instrument to evaluate student activity programs. A formal instrument was used by school officials in 5 of 26, or 19%, of the Class B schools for evaluation of athletic activity programs. Non-athletic programs were reported to be evaluated with a formal instrument by 1 of 26, or 4%, of the Class B high school respondents.

Class C Schools. Respondents in Class C only reported use of a formal instrument in the evaluation of athletic activity programs. The use of a formal instrument to evaluate athletic activity programs was reported by 2 of 18, or 11%, of all Class C respondents. None of the 18 Class C survey respondents reported using a formal instrument to evaluate non-athletic activity programs in their respective Nebraska high schools.

Class D Schools. The use of a foraml instrument in the evaluation of athletic and non-athletic programs among the sample population respondents was reported to occur least often in Class D schools. In these Nebraska high schools, formal evaluation instruments were reportedly used to evaluate athletic activity programs by 1 of 16, or 6%, of the respondents. Use of a formal evaluation instrument to assess non-athletic activity programs was not reported by any of the 16 Class D survey respondents.

Formal Evaluation Instrument Samples

Respondents to the survey were asked to return a copy of any formal evaluation instruments used for assessment of activity programs in their respective schools if such instruments did exist. A total of nine instruments were returned from the 85 respondents to the survey questionnaire. Class A school respondents returned three evaluation instruments, Class B respondents returned five evaluation instruments, and one instrument was received from a Class C respondent. Class D school officials in the sample population did not return any evaluation instrument samples.

Each sample instrument that was received from survey respondents related to evaluation of activity personnel. None of the nine instruments that was returned with the survey questionnaire by the respondents related to activity program evaluation. The content of five of the nine instruments that were received was identical. The items contained in the evaluation forms were consistent with samples of personnel evaluation items and criteria found in the literature. Different school system names did appear at the top of each of the five samples and the format of the instruments varied slightly. However, the content of each of these samples was exactly the same. Each of the instruments included (a) a Likert-type rating scale; (b) a personnel section for rating personal characteristics, professional qualifications, performance and related

responsibilities of the activity sponsor or coach; (c) a section for general comments; and (d) signature lines for the evaluator and evaluatee. Samples of each of the different evaluation instruments received during the collection of data are presented in the Appendix.

Two of the nine evaluation instruments included an additional form entitled, 'Extra-Curricular Annual Report'. This form contained a number of columns in which to record various types of information about selected athletic activity programs. Information related to the number of participants per grade level per activity for each secondary school grade (7-12) could be recorded with information about the number of coaches per activity, coaching salaries paid per activity, material costs of the program, transportation costs of the activity, cost of officials for the activity, staff and police costs related to the activity, receipts from the activity, and the per-pupil cost of the activity. A copy of "Extra-Curricular Annual Report" is presented in the Appendix.

An activity summary report for non-athletic programs was also included with one of the evaluation instruments. The type of information that could be reported on this form included: (a) the club/activity name, (b) name of the sponsor or head coach, (c) how often the activity met, (d) a list of organization officers, (e) a space for noting the highlights of the year related to the activity, and (f) a space to list the name, grade of student, and award of those participants who received special awards during the activity season. A copy of this form is also presented in the Appendix.

TABLE 5

Use of Formal Instruments to Evaluate Athletic and Non-Athletic Activity Programs in Selected Nebraska High Schools

| Type of Evaluation Instrument | Class of High School | | | | Sample Population |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A | B | C | D | |
| Athletic Program Instrument | | | | | |
| Number of Responses | 5 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 13 |
| Percent of Responses | 20% | 19% | 11% | 6% | 15% |
| Non-Athletic Program Instrument | | | | | |
| Number of Responses | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Percent of Responses | 8% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% |

Note. Sample Population = 120; Responses by Class of High School: A=25, B=26, C=18, D=16.

# CHAPTER V

## Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The findings from the literature and the study are presented in this chapter. Conclusions presented in this chapter are based upon the findings of the study. Recommendations are also presented in this chapter. A review of Chapters I, II, and III and the findings presented in Chapter IV are included in the summary section. The four research objectives of the study are addressed in the conclusions section. Implications related to the evaluation of student activity programs by high school officials in the state of Nebraska are addressed in the recommendations section.

### Summary

The purpose for conducting this research was to identify the types of standards used for the evaluation of student activity programs in randomly selected Nebraska high schools. Conclusions that are presented in this chapter are based on responses to the survey questionnaire that was developed to collect data related to the four research objectives. The four research objectives designed for this study were as follows: (a) to examine the degree to which the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) were determined to be appropriate for use in evaluation of student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (b) to identify which standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) were implemented to evaluate student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools, (c) to determine if a common set of evaluation standards was applied to student activity programs by school officials in selected Nebraska high schools, and (d) to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the school and the use of a formal instrument for evaluation of student activity programs.

The Procedures

The literature reviewed related to two main themes; (a) the history and development of student activity programs and (b) the various types of standards used for educational program evaluation. A computer search produced titles, authors, related articles, papers, and books on the development of student activity programs and evaluation standards.

The role and purpose of student activity programs, or extra-curricular activties, as a student learning experience included in many school programs was supported in the literature. In addition to the academic curriculum and the elective curriculum, student activity programs are considered to be a part of the total school program in American high schools.

A second theme found in the literature related to the evaluation of education programs by a set of given standards. Evaluations of this type were frequently implemented to collect data that were used for program improvement by providing relevant information to various parties involved in or affected by the program. The literature reviewed related to student activity programs and evaluation of educational programs with given sets of standards was used to guide and develop this study.

The sample population of this study included 120 Nebraska high schools with membership in the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA) during the 1989-90 school year. The NSAA designates 6 high school classes which are based on the student population of the high school. The NSAA high school classes include Class A, Class B, Class C-1, Class C-2, Class D-1, and Class D-2. From the NSAA member schools, 30 schools were randomly selected from Classes A and B. Fifteen high schools were selected at random from each of the NSAA classes of C-1, C-2, D-1, and D-2. Due to the large

number of schools in these high school classes, Class C-1 and Class C-2 school data were recorded as Class C information and Class D-1 and Class D-2 school data were recorded as Class D information in the study. Principals of each of the randomly selected high schools received a survey questionnaire that was used for the collection of data in the study.

A survey questionnaire based upon the 30 educational evaluation standards identified by the Joint Committee (1981) was developed and sent to principals of high schools in the sample population. Of the 120 surveys sent to principals of selected Nebraska high schools, 85 were returned for a response rate of 71%. The 85 surveys that were received included respondents from each high school class of the study. The officials from high schools in the sample population returned survey questionnaires as follows: Class A schools, $n$=25; Class B schools, $n$=26; Class C schools, $n$=18; and Class D schools, $n$=16. The data collected from the survey questionnaire were analyzed and used to answer the four research objectives of this study.

The data analysis procedures included a descriptive analysis of information collected from the survey questionnaire. Responses were reported as a percent of responses within the high school class and percent of responses from the total sample population for each of the 30 Joint Committee standards presented in the survey questionnaire.

A Chi Square Test was applied to the nominal data collected from the survey respondents. The test was implemented to determine if statistical significant differences existed between classes of Nebraska high schools in the sample population and the use of a given evaluation standard. The Chi Square Test, $X^2$ ($df = 3$, $N = 85$), $p \leq .05$, was applied to each of the 30 Joint Committee standards. The researcher formed two

categories related to each standard: (a) implemented, and (b) not implemented. After forming the categories, the researcher tabulated the data by high school class and counted the number of respondents that reported a given standard to be implemented in evaluation of activity programs in their high school and the number of respondents who reported that the standard was not implemented for activity program evaluation. Frequency counts for each standard were next converted to percentages and the Chi Square test was applied to the data. The null hypothesis was that no difference existed between the size of the Nebraska high school and the implementation of each standard.

The Findings

A prominent theme found in the literature was the rationale developed by Ralph Tyler for education evaluation. He suggested that educators should define their objectives, collect relevant data, and determine if the objectives had been met. Tyler (1950) posed a set of four questions that have caused educators to discuss the importance and meaning of the general goals of education for the past several decades. The questions raised by Tyler included: (a) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain, (b) What educational purposes can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes, (c) How can these educational experiences be efficiently organized by the school, and (d) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? (Tyler, 1950, pp 121-125). Each of these questions can be applied to student activity programs and their place within the total school program.

The review of literature also included the work of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981). The Joint Committee was guided by an assumption that sound evaluation procedures could promote a greater understanding and improvement of educational programs. Thirty different evaluation standards were

developed by the Joint Committee to be used to assess educational programs, projects, and materials. The application of these standards and their implementation in assessing the goals and objectives of student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools was the focus of this study.

Based upon the data collected and analyzed, the following findings can be reported for each of the research objectives of this study:

Research Objective I was to examine the degree to which the standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (1981) were determined to be appropriate for use in evaluation of student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools.

Each of the 30 individual evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational evaluation was reported to be appropriate for evaluation of student activity programs by a majority of the respondents in the sample population. The greatest level of approval for a single standard was 99%, or approval by 84 of 85 of the respondents. An additional 16 of the Joint Committee standards were reported to be appropriate for evaluation of student activity programs by 90% or more of the survey respondents. The lowest approval rate for a standard in the sample population was 56%, or approval by 47 of the 85 respondents.

Within high school classes of the study, all of the standards were determined to be appropriate for use in the evaluation of student activity programs by a majority of the respondents. Class A respondents reported unanimous approval for seven standards. Among Class B schools in the study, 7 of the 30 Joint Committee standards were approved by all 26 of the respondents. In all, 19 of the 30 Joint Committee standards were reported to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by 90% or more of all Class

B school respondents. Of the 18 Class C respondents, 17, or 95%, indicated only one standard to be appropriate for activity program evaluation. Fifteen of the 30 Joint Committee standards were indicated to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by 90% or more of all Class C respondents. None of the 30 standards was approved by all 18 of the Class C respondents. Among Class D schools in the sample population, sixteen of the Joint Committee standards were reported to be appropriate for evaluation of activity programs by all of the respondents.

In summary, a majority of all survey respondents reported each of the Joint Committee standards to be appropriate for evaluation of student activity programs. Within the classes of the study, high school officials also indicated most of the Joint Committee standards to be appropriate for evaluation of student activity programs in their respective schools.

Research Objective II was to identify which standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Education Evaluation (1981) were implemented to evaluate student activity programs in selected Nebraska high schools.

The analysis of data indicated a limited rate of implementation of Joint Committee standards for evaluation of student activity programs among respondents in the sample population. The percent of respondents who reported implementation of the standards within the sample population ranged from a high of 41%, 35 of 85 respondents, to a low of 6%, 5 of 85 respondents. Within the sample population, 18 of the 30 Joint Committee standards were reported to be implemented by less than 30% of all of the respondents.

Among the high school classes of the study, implementation of the Joint Committee standards for evaluation of student activity programs was also somewhat limited. The

greatest implementation of a single standard among Class A respondents was reported by 14 of 25, or 56%, of the respondents for an Accuracy Standard, "Systematic Data Control." The lowest implementation of a standard in Class A schools was 0%. None of the 25 Class A respondents reported using Propriety Standard "Conflict of Interest" for student activity program evaluation.

Among Class B high schools in the study, the standard implemented most frequently was a Propriety Standard, "Fiscal Responsibility." Of the 26 Class B respondents, 14, or 54%, reported using this standard for activity program evaluation. The least implemented standard in Class B schools was also a Propriety Standard. The standard, "Conflict of Interest," was implemented by only 2 of 26, or 8%, of the Class B school respondents.

The greatest implementation of a single standard among Class C school officials was reported by 8 of 18, or 44%, of the respondents. Five different standards were implemented in Class C schools at this rate. The standards were three Feasibility Standards, "Practical Procedures," "Political Viability," and "Cost Effectiveness;" one Propriety Standard, "Rights of Human Subjects;" and one Accuracy Standard, "Systematic Data Control." The lowest implementation rate among Class C school respondents was reported by 1 of the 18 respondents, or 5%, for an Accuracy Standard, "Context Analysis."

In Class D schools, the highest implementation reported for a given standard was 38%. "Fiscal Responsibility," a Propriety Standard, was implemented by 6 of the 16 Class D school respondents. Of the 30 Joint Committee standards presented in the survey questionnaire, Class D respondents reported 11 of the standards were not used at all to evaluate student activity programs in their respective high schools.

In summary, the implementation of the Joint Committee standards for evaluation of student activity programs in the sample population of Nebraska high schools of the study was limited. None of the 30 standards was implemented by more than 41% of the sample population while 18 of the standards were reported to be implemented by 30% or less of all survey respondents. Implementation of evaluation standards within each of the high school classes of the study was also limited.

Research Objective III was to determine if a common set of evaluation standards was applied to student activity programs by school officials in selected Nebraska high schools.

A Chi Square Test was applied to the nominal data collected from the survey respondents. The test was implemented to determine if statistical significant differences existed between size of Nebraska high schools in the sample population and the use of a given evaluation standard. The Chi Square Test, $X^2$ ($df = 3$, $N = 85$), $p \leq .05$, was applied to each of the 30 Joint Committee standards. In the analysis of the data, 10 different Joint Committee standards were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. This set of standards included six Propriety Standards and four Accuracy Standards. The Propriety Standards included were: "Formal Obligation," "Public's Right to Know," "Rights of Human Subjects," "Human Interaction," "Balanced Reporting," and "Fiscal Responsibility." The remaining four standards were Accuracy Standards and included the following: "Object Identification," "Defensible Information Sources," "Analysis of Quantitative Information," and "Analysis of Qualitative Information."

In summary, while survey respondents did report implementation of some of the Joint Committee standards for evaluation of student activity programs in their respective high schools, the utilization of a common set of standards in the sample

population was limited. Of the 30 standards developed by the Joint Committee, only ten standards were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level in the analysis of the data. This set of standards included six Propriety Standards and four Accuracy Standards. There were no Utility Standards or Feasibility Standards found to be statistically significant in the analysis of the data.

Research Objective IV was to determine if there was a relationship between the size of the school and the use of a formal instrument for evaluation of student activity programs.

Use of a formal instrument to evaluation student activity programs in Nebraska high schools was reported by a limited number of survey respondents. From the sample population of the study, 13 of the 85 respondents, or 15%, reported the use of a formal instrument to evaluate athletic activity programs and 3 of the 85 respondents, or 4%, reported the use of a formal instrument to evaluate non-athletic activity programs in their respective schools.

A relationship between the size of the high school and the use of a formal instrument for activity program evaluation did exist in the sample population. Officials in larger high schools were found to use formal evaluation instruments more frequently than did officials in smaller high schools of the sample population to evaluate student activity programs. The limited practice of using a formal instrument for activity program evaluation was consistent among high school classes for both athletic and non-athletic activities.

Implementation of a formal instrument to evaluate student activity programs occurred most frequently in larger schools of the sample population. In Class A schools, 5 of 25 of the respondents, or 20%, reported use of a formal instrument to evaluate

activity programs. The use of a formal instrument to evaluate non-athletic activity programs was reported by 2 of the 25 Class A respondents, or 8%. In Class B schools, 5 of 26, or 19%, of the respondents reported using a formal instrument for activity program evaluation and 1 of the 26 respondents, or 4%, reported using a formal instrument to evaluate non-athletic activity programs. In Class C schools, 2 of the 18 respondents, or 11%, reported that they used a formal instrument to evaluate athletic activity programs while none of the respondents reported using a formal instrument for non-athletic activity program evaluation. One Class D respondent, or 6% of all Class D officials who returned the survey questionnaire, indicated use of a formal instrument to evaluate athletic activity programs and none of the respondents reported using a formal instrument for non-athletic activity program evaluation.

## Conclusions

The conclusions presented in this section of the chapter are limited to the research findings. Based on these findings presented in Chapter IV, the conclusions are these:

1. The Joint Committee standards are appropriate for use in the evaluation of student activity programs in Nebraska high schools. Agreement on the Joint Committee standards applicability to activity programs could be used to develop a standard activity program evaluation model. Each of the 30 Joint Committee standards presented in the survey questionnaire was reported to be appropriate by a majority of the respondents. Nineteen of the standards were found to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by 90% or more of the 85 survey respondents.

Within high school classes of the study, based on school size, strong support was also evident for use of the Joint Committee standards in the evaluation of student activity

programs. Among Class A schools, all of the standards were reported to be appropriate by a majority of the respondents. Twelve of the 30 standards were approved by 90% or more of the Class A respondents while five of the standards were approved by all 25 of the reporting Class A school officials.

In Class B schools of the study, all of the Joint Committee standards were reported to be appropriate for evaluation of student activity programs by a majority of the respondents. Nineteen of the 30 standards were approved by 90% or more of the respondents. Seven of the Joint Committee standards were approved by all of the 26 Class B school respondents.

Each of the 30 Joint Committee standards was found to be appropriate for activity program evaluation by a majority of Class C respondents. Fifteen of the Joint Committee standards were approved by 90% or more of the 18 Class C reporting officials, however, none of the standards were approved by 100% of the respondents.

In Class D schools, each of the 30 Joint Committee standards was approved by a majority of the respondents. Seventeen of the standards were reported as appropriate for activity program evaluation by 90% or more of the respondents. Sixteen of the 17 standards were approved by all 16 of the Class D respondents.

2. The high rate of approval for the Joint Committee evaluation standards has not resulted in a corresponding high rate of implementation of the standards by Nebraska high school officials in the assessment of activity programs. Survey respondents in this study reported very few, if any, of the Joint Committee standards to be used for activity program evaluation.

Within the sample population, only two of the Joint Committee standards were reported to be implemented by more than 40% of the respondents. The remaining Joint

Committee standards were reported to be implemented by 38% or less of 85 survey respondents. Implementation of evaluation standards was also limited among classes of high schools in the study. In Class A schools, only three of the Joint Committee standards were implemented by more than half of the 25 respondents. In Class B schools, only two of the standards were implemented by more than half of the respondents. Among Class C and D school respondents, none of the 30 Joint Committee standards was implemented in either class by more than half of the respondents. The highest implementation a standard in Class C schools was 44%, or 8 of 18 respondents, and the highest implementation of a standard reported in Class D schools was 6 of 16 respondents, or 38%.

3. A basis of support for an activity program evaluation model that incorporates the Joint Committee standards existed among Nebraska school officials. A set of 10 Joint Committee standards were identified by the analysis of the data. These standards were found to be statistically significant when the implementation rate for each of the Joint Committee standards among the high school classes in the study was compared to the implementation rate for each of the given standards within the total survey population. The set of standards that were statistically significant included Propriety Standards and Accuracy Standards. All of the Utility Standards and Feasibility Standards were excluded from the set of statistically significant standards.

4. Nebraska school officials seldom use any type of a formal evaluation instrument to assess activity programs. Of the 85 respondents in the sample population, nine reported use of a formal instrument to evaluate athletic activity programs and three reported use of a formal instrument to evaluate non-athletic programs in their respective schools.

A tendency related to the use of formal evaluation instruments was found to exist

among the sample population of Nebraska high schools. For athletic and non-athletic activity programs, in larger Nebraska high schools, officials tend to use formal evaluation instruments more frequently than do officials in smaller Nebraska high schools for program evaluation.

## Recommendations

The preceding conclusions support the following recommendations:

1. The 30 standards developed by the Joint Committee should be implemented by school officials in Nebraska high schools for the evaluation of both athletic and non-athletic activity programs.

The standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) are a comprehensive set of evaluation standards designed to be used to provide evaluation information about a particular program and to be used to determine the overall effectiveness of the program. These standards were reported to be applicable to student activity programs for the purposes of evaluation and assessment by a large majority of respondents in the sample population. A high level of agreement among Nebraska school officials related to the appropriate application of the Joint Committee standards for activity program evaluation should generate support for implementation of the Joint Committee standards in activity program evaluation.

2. Nebraska high school officials should formally evaluate student activity programs in secondary schools. The evaluation process should include implementation of the evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee as part of a formal evaluation process that occurs on a regular basis for each student activity program offered by the school.

The practice of formally evaluating student activity programs by school officials

in Nebraska high schools is very limited at the present time. While respondents indicated that a majority of the evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee were appropriate for activity program evaluation, very few of the respondents indicated that they actually implemented the standards or had any type of a formal evaluation instrument.

3. A formal evaluation model that could be used to assess student activity programs should be developed. The evaluation model should include the 30 standards developed by the Joint Committee on Educational Standards (1981) for assessment of educational programs, projects, and materials.

The Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA) should develop a formal evaluation model for student activity program assessment. This instrument should be recommended to NSAA member schools for activity program evaluation. The NSAA model should contain the various Utility, Feasibility, Propriety, and Accuracy standards developed by the Joint Committee.

As an incentive for NSAA member schools which do adopt and implement the evaluation model, the NSAA should provide special public recognition to the schools. The type of recognition or acknowledgement used by the NSAA could include a type of special certification or rating citation similar to those used by various academic accreditation agencies. Publication of the NSAA member schools which have implemented the evaluation model should occur in the NSAA Bulletin and in the sports or activity program that is distributed at NSAA state contests.

4. The status of evaluation of student activity programs in Nebraska high schools should be monitored and reviewed. Within the next four to six years, this study should be repeated to determine if there is greater implementation of evaluation standards and

use of a formal evaluation instruments to assess student activity programs by officials in Nebraska high schools.

# REFERENCES

## REFERENCES


Altstetter, M. L. (1935). Essentials of a program of extra-curricular activities. The School Review, 43, 371-373.

Brown, R. D. (1987). Program evaluation; agenda for discussion of issues and for future research. In J.A. Glover & R.R. Ronning (Ed.), Historical Foundations of Educational Psychology. (pp. 237-243). Plenum Press, New York.

Coleman, J. S. (1961). The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Schools, The. (1918). Cardinal principles of education. Bulletin No. 35. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Commission on Schools; North Central Association, The. (1987) Standards for secondary schools. (pp. 24-25). Boulder, CO: North Central Association.

Conner, R. F., Altman, D. G., & Jackson, C. (Eds.). (1984). Evaluation Studies Review Annual. (Vol. 9). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Cronbach, L.J., Ambron, S. R., Dornbusch, S. M., Hess, R. D., Hornick, R. C., Phillips, D. C., Walker, D. E., and Weiner, S. S. (1980). Toward Reform of Program Evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Curtis, T. E., and Bidwell, W. W. (1977). Curriculum and Instruction for the Emerging Adolescent. New York. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Dornbasch, S. M. and Scott, W. R. (1975). Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dougherty, J. W. (1978). Supervision and evaluation of teaching in extra-curricular activities. NASSP Bulletin, 6, 31-34.

Eisner, E. W. (1966). Educational Objectives: Help or Hindrance?. A paper presented at the fifteenth annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill.

Faunce, R. C. (1960). Extra-curricular activities. In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, edited by Harris, C. W. New York: Macmillian Co.

Fretwell, E. K. (1931). Extra-Curricular Activities in Secondary Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gallup, G. H. (1978). The 10th annual Gallup poll of the publics' attitudes attitudes toward the public schools, Kappan Magazine, Sept 1978, 40.

Gay, L. R. (1981). Educational Research. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

Gholson, R. E. (1975). Student achievement and cocurricular activity participation. NASSP Bulletin, 69, 17-20.

Gholson, R. E. (1979). Extra curricular activities: different perceptions but strong support. Kappan Magazine, Sept 1979, 67-68.

Glass, G. V. (1969). The growth of evaluation methodology. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research.

Gluckman, I. B. (1975). Legal aspects of student activities. NASSP Bulletin, 69, 10-16.

Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective Evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gutowski, T. W. (1988). Student initiative and the origins of the high school extra-curriculum. History of Education Quarterly, 28 (1), 49-72.

Haggerty, M. E. (1918). Specific uses of measurement in the solution of school problems. The Measurement of Educational Products: Seventeenth Yearbook. National Society for the Study of Education. Part II. Bloomington, Ill: Public School Publishing Co.

Haensly, P. A. & Lupkowski, A. E. (1986). The role of extra-curricular activities in education. The High School Journal, 37(4), 111-119.

Joekel, R. G. (1979). A Handbook for the Student Activity Adviser. NASSP, Reston, VA.

Joekel, R. G. (1985). Student activities and academic eligibility requirements. NASSP Bulletin, 69 (483), 3-9.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, The. (1981) Standards for Evaluation of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Madaus, G., Airasian, P., & Kellagham, T. (1980). School Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1980). Evaluation and alchemy. In J. Pincus (Ed.), Educational Evaluation in Public Policy Setting. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

McKown, H. C. (1937). Extra-Curricular Activities. New York: MacMillian Co.

Merwin, J. C. (1969). Historical review of changing concepts of evaluation. In R. W. Tyler (Ed.) Educational Evaluation's New Roles, New Means. The sixty-eight yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. (pp 6-25). Part II. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, D. F. & Trump, J. L. (1979). Secondary School Curriculum Improvement. New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Morano, R. (1985). Student activities. NASSP Bulletin, 69 (483), 1-4.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers (1932). Educating for Seven Point Lives. Washington, D.C.: The Congress.

National Defense Education Act of 1958. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nebraska School Activities Association. (1987). Academics and Activities - Curriculum Partners. Lincoln, NE: NSAA.

Nevo, D. (1986). The conceptualization of educational evaluation: an analyzed review of literature. In House, E. R., New Directions in Educational Evalaution. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Otto, L. B. (1975). Extra-curricular activities in the educational attainment process. Rural Sociology, 40. 162-176.

Paddock, M. L. (1989). Formal Curriculum Audits. The Educational Digest. Feb, 35-36.

Patton, M. Q. (1981). Creative Evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Scriven, M. (1967). The methodolgy of evaluation. In Stake, R. E. (Ed), Curriculum Evaluation. American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Evaluation, No. 1. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Smith, E. R. & Tyler, R. W. (1942). Appraising and Recording Student Progress. New York: Harper Brothers.

Stake, R. E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation, Teachers College Record, 68, 523-540.

Stake, R. E. (1972). Responsive evaluation. Unpublished manuscript.

Stake, R. E. (1975). Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsiveness Approach. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1969). Evaluation as enlightenment for decision making. In Beatty, W. H. (Ed), Improving Educational Assessment and an Inventory for Measures of Behavior, Washington, D.C., National Education Association.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). Educational evaluation and decision making. In S. Isaac & W. B. Michael (Ed.), Handbook in Research and Evaluation. (pp 1-3). San Diego, Ca: EdITS Publishers.

Sybouts, W. and Krepel, W. J. (1984). Student Activities in the Secondary Schools. Westport, Conneticut: Greenwood Press.

Talmage, H. (1982). Evaluation of programs. In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. (5th Edition). New York: The Free Press.

Travers, R. (1983). How Research Has Changed American Schools. Kalamazoo, MI: Mythos.

Tyler, R. W. (1950). Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tyler, R. W., Gagne, R. M., and Scriven, M. (1967). Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.

Tyler, R. W. (1970). Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.Revised. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

World Book Encyclopedia, (1990).

Worthen, B. R. & Sanders, J. R. (1987). Educational Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines. New York: Longman.

# APPENDIX A

## Cover Letter and Survey Questionnaire

October 9, 1990

Dear Colleague:

Student activity programs are an important part of the total school program that involve a number of Nebraska high school students. I am conducting a study of types of evaluation standards used in Nebraska high schools to assess student activity programs for my doctoral dissertation. The purposes of my study are (1) to determine the various types of standards that principals in Nebraska recommend for use in the evaluation of student activity programs and (2) to identify the standards that are actually used to evaluate student activity programs.

A total of 120 schools have been selected at random from the Nebraska School Activities Association (NSAA) categories of Class A, Class B, Class C-1, Class C-2, Class D-1, and Class D-2. Your school has been selected and included as a part of the survey population for this study. The information that you provide will be a very important portion of the data collected.

Enclosed you will find a survey related to evaluation standards for student activity programs and a self-addressed return envelope. I would greatly appreciate receiving your professional responses to the items included in the survey by Friday, October 19, 1990.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and input.

Sincerely,

Kent B. Mann, Principal
Lexington High School

This survey is part of a study related to the evaluation of student activity programs in the state of Nebraska. In particular, the study seeks to determine what types of standards educators recommend for use in evaluations as well as what types of standards school officials actually apply in the evaluation of student activity programs.

The responses, from high school building principals in Nebraska, to the items listed below are very important. In Section I of the survey, you are asked to provide demographic data about your high school. Section II of the survey presents a variety of types of standards related to evaluation. Your reactions to these items should indicate if you consider each item to be appropriate for use in student activity program evaluation and if the item is presently utilized in your high school for student activity program evaluation.

## Section I-Demographics

Please respond to each of the items below by placing an (X) in the blank that most accurately describes your high school.

1. High school 1989-90 Nebraska School Activities Association classification:

Class A____Class B ____ Class C-1 ____Class D-1____ Class C-2 ___Class D-2____

2. High school grade configuration for the 1989-90 school year:

grades 9-12_____ grades 10-12_____ grades 11-12_____

3. Accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools during the 1989-90 school year?

yes_____ no_____

4. Nebraska School Activities Association athletic events offered during the 1989-90 school year:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseball | ____ | Boys Golf | ____ | Boys Tennis | ____ |
| Boys Basketball | ____ | Girls Golf | ____ | Girls Tennis | ____ |
| Girls Basketball | ____ | Boys Gymnastics | ____ | Boys Track | ____ |
| Boys Cross Country | ____ | Girls Gymnastics | ____ | Girls Track | ____ |
| Girls Cross Country | ____ | Boys Soccer | ____ | Volleyball | ____ |
| Football | ____ | Girls Soccer | ____ | Wrestling | ____ |
| | | Boys Swimming | ____ | | |
| | | Girls Swimming | ____ | | |

5. Nebraska School Activities Association non-athletic events offered during the 1989-90 school year:

Debate___ Music___ Play Production___ Journalism___ Speech___

6. Your school uses a formal instrument for the evaluation of athletic activity programs:

yes_____ no_____

If "yes" please return a copy of the instrument.

7. Your school uses a formal instrument for the evaluation of non-athletic activity programs:

yes_____ no_____

If "yes" please return a copy of the instrument.

## Section II - Evaluation Standards & Procedures

This section contains items related to evaluation standards. Two responses are requested for each item. Your first response should indicate if you believe the item to be (**A-Appropriate** or **NA -Not Appropriate**) for use in student activity program evaluation. Your second response to the item should indicate (**Yes-the item is presently used for activity program evaluation** or **No-the item is not presently used for activity program evaluation**) in your high school. Please circle an "A" or "NA" response in the Appropriate column as well as a "Yes" or "No" response in the Implemented column for each of the following items.

Key: A = Appropriate; NA = Not Appropriate; Yes = is used to evaluate activity programs; No = is not used to evaluate activity programs

| | Appropriate | | Implemented | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The evaluation provides information related to the activity program for use by | | | | |
| a. sponsors/coaches/directors | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. school administrators | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| d. parents of student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 2. The person(s) conducting the evaluation has a positive level of credibilitywith activity program personnel and participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 3. Information collected in the evaluation addresses pertinent questions about | | | | |
| a. the program being evaluated | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. the needs and interests of student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 4. The criteria used as the basis for making value judgements about the findings of the evaluation are clearly defined. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 5. The evaluation report describes | | | | |
| a. the evaluation rationale | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. what was done in the evaluation | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. what information was obtained | A | NA | Yes | No |
| d. what conclusions were reached | A | NA | Yes | No |
| e. what recommendations were made | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 6. Evaluation findings are provided to | | | | |
| a. school administrators | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. members of the board of education | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. sponsors/coaches/directors of the activity | A | NA | Yes | No |
| d. student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| e. parents of student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| f. the public | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 7. Student activity program evaluations are made annually after the conclusion of each activity or sports season. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 8. The student activity program evaluation is planned and conducted in such a way that findings will be utilized by | | | | |
| a. sponsors/coaches/directors | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. school administrators | A | NA | Yes | No |

| | Appropriate | | Implemented | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. The student activity evaluation procedures are practical and can be carried out with reasonable effort. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 10. The student activity evaluation is planned and conducted without pressure or influence from various special interest groups. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 11. The costs of the student activity program evaluation are considered prior to the start of the evaluation. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 12. The guidelines for conducting the student activity program evaluation are described in writing and include | | | | |
| a. objectives of the evaluation | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. how is the evaluation is to be conducted | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. who is to conduct the evaluation | A | NA | Yes | No |
| d. when the evaluation is to be conducted | A | NA | Yes | No |
| e. how the results will be utilized | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 13. Possible sources of conflict of interest, if they exist on the part of the person conducting the evaluation, are noted in the final evaluation report. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 14. A final written report is issued that is open, direct, and honest with disclosure of all pertinent findings. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 15. Persons affected by the evaluation are informed about | | | | |
| a. how and why the evaluation was conducted | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. the evaluation findings | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 16. The evaluation process does not violate any professional ethics or legal codes. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 17. The student activity program evaluation process includes an opportunity for concerns to be identified by | | | | |
| a. sponsors/coaches/directors of the activity | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. parents of student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 18. The evaluation report is complete and fair in its presentation of data related to | | | | |
| a. the strengths/weaknesses of the activity program | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. characteristics of the activity program | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. limitations of the activity program | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 19. Accurate records are maintained and reviewed about the student activity program that include | | | | |
| a. expenditure of funds for the activity | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. personnel costs for the activity | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. student time spent participating in the activity (practice, competition or performance, etc.) | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 20. A comprehensive description of the student activity program being evaluated identifies persons related to the activity that include | | | | |
| a. sponsors/coaches/directors | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |

| | Appropriate | | Implemented | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21. The context in which the student activity program exists is described in the evaluation report and includes | | | | |
| a. where the activity occurs | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. when practices/meetings are held | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 22. Evaluation procedures are clearly described. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 23. The sources of information used in the evaluation are clearly described and included in the final evaluation report. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 24. The information-gathering instrument used in the evaluation is a valid evaluation instrument. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 25. The information-gathering instrument and procedures insure that data collected are reliable. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 26. The person(s) conducting the student activity program evaluation is properly trained to carry out the evaluation. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 27. Quantitative information is collected for | | | | |
| a. student demographics (age, grade, gender, etc.) | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. attitudes of participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. behavior of participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| d. degree of student participation | A | NA | Yes | No |
| e. student activity program outcomes | A | NA | Yes | No |
| f. participant accomplishments | A | NA | Yes | No |
| g. cost of the student activity | A | NA | Yes | No |
| h. equipment required for the student activity | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 28. Qualitative information is included in the evaluation report as a summary of facts and interpretations in narrative form from multiple sources that include | | | | |
| a. sponsors/coaches/directors of the activity | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. parents of participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 29. The evaluation objectives identified prior to the start of the student activity program evaluation are answered by the final evaluation report. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 30. The final evaluation report is based on impartially assembled data that is not slanted in order to promote a biased position. | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 31. The student activity program | | | | |
| a. has a stated philosophy based on learning theory | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. addresses various individual student needs | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. is consistent with total activity program goals | A | NA | Yes | No |
| d. relates to the total school curriculum | A | NA | Yes | No |
| e. has a written set of objectives or statement of purpose | A | NA | Yes | No |

| | Appropriate | | Implemented | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32. Yearly goals are written for the student activity program by | | | | |
| a. sponsors/coaches/directors and school administrator(s) | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. sponsors/coaches/directors and student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. sponsors/coaches/directors | A | NA | Yes | No |
| d. student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| e. school administrator(s) | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 33. Board of Education policies governing the student activity program are communicated to | | | | |
| a. sponsors/coaches/directors | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. parents of student participants | A | NA | Yes | No |
| d. the high school instructional staff | A | NA | Yes | No |
| e. the public | A | NA | Yes | No |
| 34. The student activity program evaluation includes personnel information that describes | | | | |
| a. selection of sponsors/coaches/directors | A | NA | Yes | No |
| b. training of sponsors/coaches/directors | A | NA | Yes | No |
| c. certification of sponsors/coaches/directors | A | NA | Yes | No |

35. List any additional standards or criteria that you use for the evaluation of student activity programs in your high school that have not been identified above. If more space is necessary, please attach an additional sheet.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Would you like a summary of the survey results? yes _____ no _____

Thank you for responding to this survey.
I greatly appreciate your assistance and input related to
student activity program evaluation standards and procedures.

Please return this information
in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope by

**Friday, October 19, 1990**

to

Kent B. Mann, Principal
Lexington High School
13th & Adams
Lexington, NE 68850

# APPENDIX B

## Samples of Evaluation Forms Received

The evaluation forms included on the following pages are examples of the types of formal evaluation instruments that respondents returned with their survey questionnaires. A total of nine separate instruments were received. On five of these forms, the evaluation criteria were exactly the same with the only difference in the forms being the name of the high school given in the heading. Sample 1 on the following page contains these criteria. The additional samples contain various criteria received from survey respondents who returned evaluation instrument samples with the survey questionnaire.

# EVALUATION FORM - Sample 1

| | |
|---|---|
| Coach Evaluated | Assignment |
| College Major | College Minor |
| Classes Taught | |
| Clinics Attended | Experience in Coaching (Yrs/Sport) |

Rating Scale: S = Satisfactory NI = Needs Improvement U = Unsatisfactory

| Personal Characteristics | Rating | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Grooming and dress (school, practice, and games) | S | NI | U |
| 2. Emotional control and poise | S | NI | U |
| 3. Enthusiasm | S | NI | U |
| 4. Language | S | NI | U |
| **Professional Qualities** | | | |
| 1. Cooperation with administration | S | NI | U |
| 2. Rapport with coaching staff | S | NI | U |
| 3. Respect for, and support of, other school programs | S | NI | U |
| 4. Professional growth (clinics, school) | S | NI | U |
| 5. Public relations (news media, faculty and community | S | NI | U |
| 6. Conduct during athletic contests | S | NI | U |
| **Coaching Performance** | | | |
| 1. Organization (team preparation, practice, and game) | S | NI | U |
| 2. Knowledge of the sport | S | NI | U |
| 3. Innovativeness (use of new coaching techniques and ideas) | S | NI | U |
| 4. Supervision and administration of the locker and training rooms | S | NI | U |
| 5. Knowledge of rules (sport, eligibility, NSAA) | S | NI | U |
| 6. Conduct of players (coach's control) | S | NI | U |
| **Related Responsibilities** | | | |
| 1. Care of equipment (issuance and storage) | S | NI | U |
| 2. Clerical duties (inventory, budget, eligibility, program information, and season summary) | S | NI | U |

COMMENTS:

GENERAL REMARKS (strengths and/or weaknesses):

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Signature of Athletic Director | Signature of Head Coach | Signature of Principal |

___ Rebuttal ___ Rebuttal Waived ___ Recommended ___ Not Recommended

# EVALUATION FORM - Sample 2

Name _____ School _____ Position _____

Rating Scale: S = Satisfactory P = Problem US = Unsatisfactory NO = Not Observed

## I. Professional and Personal Relations

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Cooperates with Building Principal | S | P | US | NO |
| 2. Cooperates with District Athletic Director | S | P | US | NO |
| 3. Rapport with Coaching Staff of his school | S | P | US | NO |
| 4. Organization of Staff | S | P | US | NO |
| 5. Relationship with Participants | S | P | US | NO |
| 6. Relationship with Student Body | S | P | US | NO |
| 7. Relationship with Faculty | S | P | US | NO |
| 8. Relationship with Parents and Community | S | P | US | NO |
| 9. Relationship with News Media | S | P | US | NO |
| 10. Relationship with Game Officials | S | P | US | NO |
| 11. Relationship with Opponents | S | P | US | NO |
| 12. Conduct during games | S | P | US | NO |
| 13. Conduct during tournaments | S | P | US | NO |
| 14. Attendance at District and League Meetings | S | P | US | NO |
| 15. Attends coaching clinics, etc | S | P | US | NO |
| 16. Ability to motivate staff and players toward desired goals | S | P | US | NO |

Comments on the above items:

## II. Coaching and Related Areas

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Caliber and Quality of Instruction | S | P | US | NO |
| 2. Teaches Fundamental Skills | S | P | US | NO |
| 3. Handling of Athletic Injuries | S | P | US | NO |
| 4. Care of Equipment | S | P | US | NO |
| 5. Supervision of Participants and Team Discipline | S | P | US | NO |
| 6. Organization of Practice Sessions | S | P | US | NO |
| 7. Pre-Season Planning | S | P | US | NO |
| 8. Supervision of Managers | S | P | US | NO |
| 9. Management of Budget | S | P | US | NO |
| 10. Follows Purchasing Procedures | S | P | US | NO |
| 11. Game Organization | S | P | US | NO |
| 12. Follows District, League and State Policies | S | P | US | NO |
| 13. Willing to devote time and energy to coaching duties | S | P | US | NO |

Comments on the above items:

## III. Related Information

1. Areas of Strength _____
2. Areas Needing Improvement _____
3. Recommendations _____

_____ _____

Signature of Coach Date Signature of Principal Date

_____

Signature of Evaluator Date

# EVALUATION FORM - Sample 3

Name of Coach _____ Sport _____

Scale of 1 - 5 with 5 highest competency.

## A. ADMINISTRATION

1. Care of equipment (issue, inventory, etc.) ..... 1 2 3 4 5
2. Organization of staff ..... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Organization of practices ..... 1 2 3 4 5
4. Compliance with deadlines (eligibility reports, record reports, entry forms, rosters, physicals, student contracts, etc.) ..... 1 2 3 4 5
5. Public relations (Booster club, T.V., radio, parents, bulletin announcements, newspapers) ..... 1 2 3 4 5
6. Supervision ..... 1 2 3 4 5
7. Knowledge of State and NSAA rules ..... 1 2 3 4 5

## B. COACHING PERFORMANCE

1. Knowledge of fundamentals and the sport ..... 1 2 3 4 5
2. Concern for athletic safety ..... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Game preparation ..... 1 2 3 4 5
4. Conditioning ..... 1 2 3 4 5
5. Conduct of Coach (during practices and games) ..... 1 2 3 4 5
6. Appearance (of self and team) ..... 1 2 3 4 5
7. Discipline (team execution, team conduct, etc.) ..... 1 2 3 4 5

## C. RELATIONSHIPS

1. Rapport with staff ..... 1 2 3 4 5
2. Rapport with others ..... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Rapport with Administration, Staff, and Activity Director ..... 1 2 3 4 5

## D. PROFESSIONALISM

1. Membership in Nebraska Coaches Association ..... 1 2 3 4 5
2. Attends clinics and meetings ..... 1 2 3 4 5
3. Subscribes to periodicals ..... 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

Date _____ Activity Director's Signature _____ Coach's Signature _____

## EVALUATION FORM - Sample 4

NAME_____ ASSIGNMENT_____
SCHOOL_____ YEAR_____
Years coaching at school_____

Strengths:_____

_____

Areas needed to be improved and suggested recommendations:_____

_____

It is recommended to the administration and Board of Education that the above coach:

_____ Be offered a contract for the next school term
_____ Not be offered a contract for the next school term
_____ Be placed on notice for the next school term

Coach's Comments:_____

_____

E=Exemplary S=Satisfactory NI=Needs Improvement

A. Performs the responsibilities of the assigned activity to the best of their ability, conducts themselves in a professional manner and adheres to high standards..... E S NI

B. Knows, understands and complies with the rules and regulations of our school, conference, state and national governing bodies for the activity..... E S NI

C. Possesses an adequate knowledge of the activity which they are sponsors or coaches. Activity demonstrates adequate organization such as written practice plans being used in practices..... E S NI

D. Appreciates and promotes all school activities as well as their own. He/she volunteers to assist in various capacities in the total program..... E S NI

E. Follows the chain of command in all activity matters concerning such things as budget, lettering, practice schedules, meetings, transportation, contests and events, and absences from school for both themselves and for participants..... E S NI

F. Constantly seeks self-improvement through reading, workshops, clinics, and through endeavors associated with their activity..... E S NI

G. Establishes rapport with their participants, treats them with respect and in a fair and professional manner. Realizes that he/she is responsibility for participants health, safety and well-being..... E S NI

H. Establishes and maintains a comfortable working relationship with fellow activity personnel, faculty, administration and community personnel including parents..... E S NI

I. Is professional in all of their dealings. Keeps "In-house" problems in-house. Does not ridicule participants, staff or other faculty members. Approaches things from a positive point of view..... E S NI

Activity Director Signature:_____ Date:_____

Coach's Signature:_____ Date:_____
(signature signifies above material has been discussed)

## EVALUATION FORM - Sample 5

Name_____ School_____
Assignment_____ School Year_____

I. Statement of personal goals and/or program goals as they relate to your coaching assignment.

_____
_____ Date_____

II. Pease state to what degree you have achieved your goals.

_____
_____ Date_____

III. Athletic Director's Evaluation (1=Competent 2=Needs Improvement 3=Not Applicable)

A. PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS:

1. Cooperates with the Athletic Director in regard to submitting participant lists bus times, year-end reports and program information.....1 2 3
2. Meets all criteria as outlined in Job Description.....1 2 3
3. Provides training rules to team members in writing and follows due process.....1 2 3
4. Develops rapport with the athletic coaching staff.....1 2 3
5. Is appropriately dressed at the practices and contests.....1 2 3
6. Participates in in-service meetings, clinics and other activities to improve coaching.....1 2 3
7. Develops sound public relations. Cooperates with newspapers, T.V., radio, Booster Club and interested spectators.....1 2 3
8. Understands and follows rules and regulations set forth by all governing agencies.....1 2 3
9. Participates in Parent's Night, Banquets, Award Nights and Pep Assemblies.....1 2 3
10. Develops rapport with other teachers, coaches and administrators.....1 2 3
11. Promotes all sports in the athletic program attempting to foster school spirit.....1 2 3
12. Cooperates and communicates with parents during the entire year.....1 2 3

Other_____1 2 3

B. COACHING PERFORMANCE:

1. Develops respect by example in appearance, manners, behavior, language and conduct during a contest.....1 2 3
2. Is well versed and knowledgeable in matters pertaining to the sport.....1 2 3
3. Has individual and team discipline and control.....1 2 3
4. Develops a well organized practice schedule which utilizes his/her staff and team to its maximum potential.....1 2 3
5. Establishes the fundamental philosophy , skills and techniques to be taught by the staff...1 2 3
6. Develops integrity within the coaching staff, and works to make better coaches.....1 2 3
7. Is fair, understanding, tolerant, sympathetic and patient with team members.....1 2 3
8. Is innovative using new coaching techniques and ideas in addition to sound, already proven methods of coaching.....1 2 3
9. Is prompt in meeting team for practices and games.....1 2 3
10. Shows an interest in athletes in off-season activities and classroom efforts.....1 2 3
11. Provides leadership and attitudes that produce positive efforts by participants.....1 2 3
12. Knows the medical aspects of the position including first aid, injury policies, working with team doctor and/or family physician.....1 2 3
13. Delegates authority and responsibility while remaining accountable for such delegation..1 2 3
14. Provides an atmosphere of cooperation in being receptive to suggestions and giving credit to those responsible to success.....1 2 3
15. Uses all possible ethical means of motivation, emphasizes values of competitive athletics, acceptable personal behavior, decision making and lasting values to each individual.....1 2 3
16. Utilizes practice time for both individual and team development.....1 2 3
17. Provides adequate athlete supervision immediately before and after practice sessions..1 2 3

Other_____1 2 3

## EVALUATION FORM - Sample 5
## (continued)

C. RELATED COACHING RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Is concerned about the care of equipment, including issue, collection, inventory and storage..... 1 2 3
2. Is cooperative in sharing facilities..... 1 2 3
3. Shows self-control and poise in areas related to coaching responsibilities..... 1 2 3
4. Displays enthusiasm and exhibits interest in coaching..... 1 2 3
5. Keeps Athletic Director informed about unusual events..... 1 2 3
6. Encourages all potential athletes to participate in a sport, provided they aren't involved in another sport at the same time during that particular season..... 1 2 3

Other_____ 1 2 3

ATHLETIC DIRECTOR'S REMARKS _____

_____

_____

COACH'S REMARKS _____

_____

_____

_____
Evaluator's Signature Date

_____
Coach's Signature Date

END OF THE YEAR ACTIVITY REPORT - Sample 6

TO: ALL ACTIVITY SPONSORS

FROM: _____, Activities Director

We will need a report with the following information, due before you check out of school:

CLUB NAME: _____

SPONSOR: _____

HOW OFTEN DID YOU MEET? _____

OFFICERS:

President: _____

Vice President:_____

Secretary: _____

Treasurer: _____ _____

Other: _____

LIST HIGHLIGHTS OF THE YEAR: (attache sheet of any additional information)

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

NAME AND GRADE OF STUDENTS WHO RECEIVED SPECIAL AWARDS:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Please list the names and grade level of all members in alphabetical order on the back of this sheet, so that this information can be posted in the student's cumulative folder. Thank you.

ACTIVITY ANNUAL REPORT - Sample 7

| Program | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | G11 | G12 | Coaches # | Coach Salary | Material Cost | Trans Cost | Official Cost | Staff Police Cost | Receipts | PPC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Football | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cross Country (B) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cross Country (G) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Volleyball | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Golf (B) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Golf (G) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tennis (B) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tennis (G) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Swimming (B) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Swimming (G) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wrestling | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Basketball (B) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Basketball (G) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Track (B) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Track (G) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseball | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Soccer (B) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Soccer (G) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| First Aid/Misc | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Equip. Manager | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Open Gym | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intra. Director | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

# APPENDIX C

## Summary of Comments from Respondents

## Summary of Comments Returned with the Survey Questionnaire

Comments from Class A respondents:

"You have opened our eyes by showing how little evaluation we do."

"We do evaluations on all personnel involved in our activity programs. We discuss many of the criteria listed but a formal program format is not done."

"We do not have an evaluation instrument for the activities but we do have an evaluation form for the coaches. Although we have no other formal instrument we keep various records for the NSAA and ourselves which help us continually evaluate the effectiveness of our activity programs."

"No formal evaluation in one form is used for program evaluation. Coaches and sponsors are evaluated, data is recorded for number of coaches, cost related to the activity, number of participants. Final activity reports are submitted to the Activities Director that highlight participants, awards, suggestions. A final activities summary report in narrative form is submitted to the Superintendent."

Comments from Class B respondents:

"You have covered all material!"

"Our present activity program includes statements in a participation code, coaches evaluation, athletic budget, and activity budget. I wish you well."

"We don't have any program evaluation in place, just a coaching evaluation."

Comments from Class C respondents:

"Since we do not have a specific instrument for the evaluation of activity programs, I have not indicated appropriate or implemented. I am sure they are all appropriate to investigate the program but since we have no specific instrument, they are not implemented as such."

Comments from Class D respondents:

"In our school such evaluations would be impossible and impractical. We rely on the NASSP, NSAA, etc. for guidlelines."

"In a school our size, we have too damn many things to do and plan just to have activity programs let alone worry about trying to evaluate them!"