A STUDY OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION

IN TEXAS' SENIOR INSTITUTIONS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

North Texas State University in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

JoLynn Loyd-Skidmore, M.S.

Denton, Texas

August, 1983

Skidmore, JoLynn Loyd, A Study of Academic Program
Evaluation in Texas' Senior Institutions. Doctor of
Philosophy (Higher Education), August, 1983, 121 pp., 19
tables, bibliography, 32 titles.

The problem with which this study is concerned is to
determine the status of academic program evaluation in
Texas' senior colleges and universities. The purpose of
the study is to determine current procedures, timelines,
participants, and use of results of academic program evalu-
ation in the surveyed institutions.

The presidents of the seventy-three senior colleges and
universities in Texas were contacted for permission to con-
duct the study. Fifty-four presidents gave their permission
and supplied designated contact individuals, forty-six of
whom responded for a 62 per cent response rate. The twenty-
item survey instrument, which was designed to fulfill the
purpose of the study, was evaluated by experts in the field
of academic program evaluation at the senior institutional
level. All data are reported by frequency, percentage, and
rank ordering because these data indicate frequency of use
and degree of importance.

The data findings indicate that the most important goal
of academic program evaluation is to upgrade academic pro-
grams. In their investigations, the majority of the

responding institutions use accrediting agency standards and the standards of the discipline being evaluated. Annual evaluations are reported most frequently, and the primary purposes are for course and faculty evaluations and program continuance or termination. The majority of the institutions use the department-wide method of evaluation and make formal reports from questionnaire and interview responses from administrators, faculty, and students. Evaluation is usually initiated by a vice president or dean, but the president makes final judgments. Although such evaluation reports are rarely published, access to the reports is given to administrative officials, faculty, trustees, and accrediting agencies.

Both the literature review and the findings of this study indicate that academic evaluation procedures and reports are neither standardized nor given wide dissemination. It is concluded, however, that as technology and research increase the specialty areas within each discipline, the role of academic program evaluation in higher education will become increasingly important.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the last two decades, major social changes have
occurred within institutions of higher education. As a
result, academic program evaluation has become of primary
importance to college administrators. A brief summary of
these changes will serve to illustrate this point.

The 1960s was the decade in which the elitist ivory
towers of higher education began to crumble. During this
decade, the post-World War II baby boom students hit the
college campuses; the 1968 college enrollment of 6,758,000
students was double the 1957 enrollment (9, p. 20). Through
sheer numbers, the students of the 1960s gained power.
Part of this power was the result of the personality that
typified the 1960s student.

The college-age males of the 1960s could either be
drafted to fight in the Vietnam War or go to college.
Many such men went to college but rarely was their goal
to gain an enlightened mind. In most cases these students
were concerned about the impersonal organization of human
life. They had grown up during an era of economic prosper-
ity, but they did not want to put material expansion above
moral, emotional, intellectual, and aesthetic values.

1

Many actively sought a greater closeness with people in general (11, p. 181).

For these reasons, the 1960s were rampant with student activism, dissent, and disruption. [For instance, when Martin Luther King, Jr., was murdered in 1968, students protested and demonstrated to show their shock, guilt, and indignation (13, p. 1)]. As a result, college administrators, who alone had made major program evaluation decisions, were forced to allow students an active voice in institutional policy to avoid confrontations in the form of sit-ins, boycotts, takeovers, and demonstrations (8).

The decade of the 1970s saw a further reinforcement of the college population. Between 1970 and 1978, there was a 46 per cent enrollment increase (13, p. 7). Much of the credit for the increased enrollment, however, should go to the student activists of the 1960s. They paved the way with government help for the acceptance by colleges of black students, female students, and senior citizens (13, pp. 17-19).

The profile for the 1970s college student is a sharp contrast to that of the radical, activist, hostile 1960s student. The 1970s student was more career oriented, better groomed, concerned with material success, concerned with self, and practical (8, p. 7). He was probably over twenty-two years old, attending college on a part-time basis,

likely to attend more than one college over an interrupted period of time, likely to be employed, and likely to drop out before completing his degree (13, p. 7; 8, p. 6).

For the college administrator, these new students had to be included in decisions involving changes in academic programs. However, even though the 1970s students were serious about their studies, many were not about to be hampered by university curfews, dress codes, or dormitory restrictions. These students wanted the open doors to new job opportunities which the baccalaureate degree could provide, and, therefore, they were not particularly interested in getting close to society in general. They had grown up with an unpopular war; they had seen, through the media, national leaders assassinated, riots at the Democratic National Convention, Kent State students killed by the National Guard, and the Watergate political scandal. During their lifetime, the great society envisioned by Lyndon Johnson had faded while Gerald Ford promised to end a long national nightmare (8, p. 13).

The tribulations of these prior decades set the stage for the inherited problems of colleges and universities in the 1980s. In the 1950s and 1960s, institutions had grown quickly to accommodate the large influx of students. However, the physical growth and program expansion of the 1960s had to be paid for in the 1970s when inflation worsened and the country fell into a deep recession. Then,

as the future began to look brighter with the recession easing, a taxpayers' revolt began in California that stretched its tentacles across the United States. Funding became a crucial problem for college administrators, which was exacerbated by declining enrollments (13, pp. 6, 88) both of which had to be considered in an evaluation of academic programs.

The student of the 1980s is much more achievement oriented than his 1960s counterpart. On the other hand, he also tends to believe that what he thinks does not count for much, political leaders do not care what happens to him, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, and the government wastes money (8, p. 10). He wants the privileges that a college degree can grant him, and he knows that if one school will not accept him another one will.

In other words, institutions that twenty short years ago had both ample students and funds now must compete with other institutions for fewer students and limited funds. The available funding must be dispersed on some equitable basis; retaining students who are enrolled, accounting to external agencies for validity, preparing marketing analysis data of student characteristics, and evaluating academic programs have become the primary tasks of the 1980s college administrator (13, pp. 171, 175). Educators who always assumed the product they produced

was acceptable will now have to substantiate that assumption. For these reasons academic program evaluation has become one of the jargons of the decade.

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this study is concerned is to determine the status of academic program evaluation in Texas senior colleges and universities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine current procedures, timelines, participants, and use of results in academic program evaluation for both public and private Texas senior colleges and universities.

Research Questions

In order to accomplish the purpose of the study, the following research questions were formulated.

1. What are the goals, objectives, and purposes for conducting academic program evaluation?

2. How frequently does academic program evaluation occur?

3. What methods of academic program evaluation are most often utilized by the institutions?

4. Who participates in the evaluation process?

5. What are the institutional characteristics most related to systematic program evaluation?

6. How are the results of academic program evaluation utilized?

Background and Significance of the Study

Academic program evaluation is defined by Craven (4, p. vii) as the "process by which information about particular aspects of an academic program are used to arrive at judgments about a range of decision alternatives concerning the installation, continuation, modification, or termination of that program." It is not a new term that suddenly appeared in the jargon of higher education. According to Harcleroad, "academic program evaluation in the United States began on September 23, 1642" (7, p. 1) when the first graduating class of Harvard College was issued a public final examination by an external Board of Overseers. Thus began the first effort by American educators to formulate a formal judgment concerning the effectiveness of their academic programs.

During these early years much of the emphasis on academic program evaluation became buried under pressing financial needs, political problems, building plans, student life, and faculty activities (7, p. 4). For approximately 200 years, state legislatures and governing boards appear to have dominated the control of academic program decisions. However, with the rise of student populations at colleges and universities, efforts by state legislatures to maintain

strong control on academic programs weakened (7, p. 9).
The circle has now made a full revolution. Academic program
evaluation cannot become buried under other concerns. Dis-
enchanted taxpayers are applying pressure for greater
institutional accountability. There is also skepticism
about the value-added qualities of formal higher educational
experiences (10, p. 21).

Furthermore, groups who are concerned about energy,
environment, welfare, and urban causes place low priority
on the budgetary needs of higher education (7, p. 18).
This leaves administrators little choice but to initiate
measures in which institutional needs and allocation of
resources can be allocated in the most timely, efficient,
and cost effective manner (10, p. 21). An administrator
who is not armed with a current, thorough evaluation of
academic programs will be hard pressed to make the difficult
decisions that must be made under the circumstances of
reduced resources.

According to Anderson and Ball (2, pp. 3-4), there
exist six purposes for conducting social services program
evaluation. The following list represents a modification
of Anderson and Ball's list for use in direct applications
to academic program evaluation. First, academic program
evaluation assists in decisions concerning the installation
of new programs; these decisions include but are not
limited to ascertaining the need and demand for an academic

program, testing its conception and technical accuracy, and appraising the adequacy of resources for implementation. Second, academic program evaluation contributes to decisions concerning program continuation, expansion, or certification; in most situations this involves evaluating the overall effectiveness or quality of a program. Third, academic program evaluation contributes to decisions involving program modification; this concern involves the teachers and the teaching methods and whether or not the objectives of the program are being achieved. Fourth, academic program evaluation assists in obtaining evidence to rally support or opposition to a program; in many ways support evidence coincides with the second purpose, and opposition evidence concerns a desire to kill or terminate a program.

Once a decision has been made regarding the purpose of academic program evaluation, the components of the evaluation process are assembled. Munitz and Wright (10, p. 22) delineate five components of academic program evaluation. The first component is program objectives which are derived from the institutional mission, and they identify the ability of the academic program to fulfill certain requirements. Second, the resources must be enumerated; these resources include the available human, financial, and physical assets necessary to fulfill program objectives. Third, the processes must be evaluated; processes are the sequences of classroom and laboratory activities whereby

faculty and students come together for discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge. Such processes are often referred to as the "heart of the program" (10, p. 22). Fourth, the results must be evaluated; this includes evaluation of the tangible and intangible products that occur when resources are applied to processes in pursuit of objectives within the context of specific combinations. Fifth and finally, feedback of the evaluation process must occur; participants in the process should be informed of the results, and the decisions that are made should be based on these results.

No single plan exists for conducting academic program evaluation at all institutions of higher education. The major reason for this lies in the diversity of philosophies and mission statements that form the basis of each institution. A brief overview of two existing procedures for academic program evaluation will illustrate this point.

In the first example, a project was undertaken by researchers at New York University to assess a master's degree program in business administration (MBA) (14, p. 354). Prior to this research, most efforts to improve courses and curricula had focused on program needs as determined by an accrediting agency, faculty, or groups other than students. Since several student evaluation instruments (1, 5, 6, 12) exist that are reliable and reasonably free of bias, the researchers decided to use

course evaluations by students to ascertain academic program
(business administration courses) effectiveness. Although
it was recognized that student evaluations could only be
utilized as one aspect of the evaluation process, the
researchers were confident that the insights from students,
who are the recipients of the program, could provide valuable
information into the academic program evaluation process.
They developed and validated an instrument for this purpose
entitled The Course-Faculty Inventory (14, p. 354).

Through subsequent data gathering, the researchers at
New York University are confident of the validity of their
instrument. By administering this inventory at the end
of each semester, the researchers have been able to compile
a continuing academic program evaluation database about
specific courses, specific instructors, and the overall
academic program. This information has proved valuable
by assisting administrators in making program modifications
(14, pp. 353-363).

Another example of program evaluation procedures
was conducted at the University of Houston Central Campus
(10, pp. 31-38). Their approach was developed as part
of a reaccreditation self-study for the Southern Association
of Colleges and Schools. First, the researchers developed
a fourteen-item criteria by which to evaluate each academic
program. Next, they interviewed program deans in order
to obtain key insights into each academic program. With

this data collected, they evaluated each of the programs, and these priority rankings were applied into a matrix design to mesh the academic programs with resource allocations. The thorough assessment of each program was essential in determining any program continuance, modification, or termination. The matrix design is unique in that it allows an effective disbursement of resources in conjunction with program needs (10, pp. 31-38).

These two studies represent academic program evaluations that were initiated primarily by the institution. However, the Coordinating Board for the Texas College and University System (3, p. 1) recognizes the importance of the academic program evaluation process, and on January 25, 1980, it called for a systematic review of all existing degree programs in Texas public senior colleges and universities. The Texas Coordinating Board is currently reviewing doctoral-level programs in the state.

The significance of this study lies in the fact that Texas, as one of the largest states in the United States, has always been a leader in the field of education. As such, the ways in which it deals with accountability and funding reductions are of much concern. Academic program evaluation lies at the heart of these concerns.

Summary

Chapter I presented pertinent reasons for the increasing importance of academic program evaluation to college

administrators. The statement of the problem, purpose of the study, and the research questions were presented.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature that is relevant to the study. Methodology and procedures for data analyses are included in Chapter III along with descriptions of the population sample, the survey instrument, and procedures of data collection. As they relate to the research questions, the data findings are the subject of Chapter IV. Summary, conclusions, and recommendations for future research comprise Chapter V.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aleamoni, L. M., and R. E. Spencer, "The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire: A Description of its Development and a Report of Some of its Results," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 33 (1973), 669-684.

2. Anderson, Scarvia B., and Samuel Ball, The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1978.

3. Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, "Policy Guidelines for Statewide Academic Program Review," unpublished document, 1980.

4. Craven, Eugene C., "Editor's Notes," New Directions for Institutional Research: Academic Program Evaluation, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980, pp. vii-viii.

5. Doyle, K. O., Jr., Student Evaluation of Instruction, Lexington, Lexington Books, 1975.

6. Freedman, Richard D., Stephen A. Stumpf, and Kenneth M. Krieger, "Business Students Perceptions of Subject Matter, Their Learning, Evaluation of Courses, and School Comparisons," unpublished paper, the 38th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco, August, 1978.

7. Harcleroad, Fred F., "The Context of Academic Program Evaluation," New Directions for Institutional Research: Academic Program Evaluation, edited by E. C. Craven, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980, pp. 1-20.

8. Levine, Arthur, When Dreams and Heroes Died, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

9. Mayhew, Lewis B., Legacy of the Seventies, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1977.

10. Munitz, Barry A., and Douglas J. Wright, "Institutional Approaches to Academic Program Evaluation," New Directions for Institutional Research: Academic

Program Evaluation, edited by E. C. Craven, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980, pp. 21-42.

11. Sanford, Nevitt, "The College Student of 1980," *Campus 1980*, edited by Alvin C. Eurich, New York, Delacorte Press, 1968, pp. 176-199.

12. Schwab, D. P., "Manual for the Course Evaluation Instrument," University of Wisconsin-Madison, Graduate School of Business and Industrial Relations, 1976.

13. Stadtman, Verne A., *Academic Adaptations*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

14. Stumpf, Stephen A., "Assessing Academic Program and Department Effectiveness Using Student Evaluation Data," *Research in Higher Education*, 11, No. 4 (1979), 353-363.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature examines research that is
relevant to the study of academic program evaluation.   The
five sections that comprise this chapter cover (a) the
concept of evaluation, (b) current approaches to program
evaluation, (c) procedures related to program evaluation,
(d) the importance of program evaluation to higher educa-
tion, and (e) recent research on program evaluation.

The Concept of Evaluation

Although evaluation is not new to higher education, the
mere fact that it exists does not mean that the field has
been clearly delineated.   Anytime new knowledge develops
and creativity occurs, some form of evaluation takes place.
However, after reviewing the literature, Craven (7) states
that little is to be found on the subject of academic pro-
gram evaluation in higher education.   He emphasizes that the
literature of other fields such as management contains an
abundance of information but "no common philosophy, focus
or terminology in higher education or agreement about how
to conduct an evaluation has occurred in higher education"
(7, p. 433).

Some of the earlier definitions of evaluation tend to equate evaluation with measurement. In these views evaluation is limited to program variables for which science has developed measurement instruments. As such, evaluation, according to Craven (7, p. 433), is a determination of the congruence between program performance and objectives. This definition disregards value judgments and sees evaluation more as a professional judgment.

In recent years the process of focusing the field of evaluation has become more refined. Worthen and Sanders (27, p. 17) state that evaluation is much too complex to be reduced to a simple matter of stating behavioral objectives, building a test, and analyzing data. A thorough evaluation will contain these elements in addition to a dozen or more distinct activities. Worthen and Sanders state that "evaluation is the determination of the worth of a thing" (27, p. 19). Dressel, according to Craven's (7, p. 433) review, adds to this definition "the process whereby the judgment is made."

A synthesis of these two definitions produces Craven's definition which is currently the most comprehensive. According to Craven,

> program evaluation is the process of specifying, defining, collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information about designated aspects of a given program and using that information to arrive at value judgments among decision alternatives regarding the installation, continuation, modification, or termination of a program (7, p. 434).

Worthen (26, pp. 14-15) states that there are two
generally accepted types of program evaluation. The first
type is formative evaluation, which is conducted during
the operation of a program for the purpose of providing
evaluative information to program directors for the improve-
ment of a program. Formative evaluation is most often used
for program initiation, but it can also lead to program
modification, termination, or continuation because it
results in immediate feedback for revisions.

The second type of evaluation as reported by Worthen
is summative evaluation. Summative evaluation is conducted
at the end of a program for the purpose of judging the worth
or effectiveness of that program for the potential users
for whom it was developed. Summative evaluation leads to
information that deals with accountability decisions (26,
pp. 14-15). Anderson and Ball (2, p. 3) make a distinction
between formative evaluation, which is used for developing
new programs, and summative evaluation, which assesses the
overall effectiveness of operating or ongoing programs.

Worthen (26, pp. 14-15) further distinguishes between
types of program evaluation based on whether the evaluator
is an employee of the program or an employee of an outside
agency. An internal evaluator is an employee of the pro-
gram, and such a person probably knows more about this
project than an outsider. Worthen states, however, that
this closeness may bias the internal evaluator's objectivity.

On the other hand, the external evaluator, who is an employee of an outside agency, may be capable of greater objectivity but may not have access to as much information. To help alleviate some of these handicaps, Worthen recommends that a comprehensive evaluation plan should include a formative evaluation by an internal evaluator and a summative evaluation by an external evaluator.

Program Evaluation Approaches

Craven (7, p. 435) concludes that approaches to academic program evaluation have primarily developed during the last twenty years in three major institutional areas--school and social action programs, government and industry, and higher education. School and social action program approaches began in 1965 with passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This act requires that every project that is funded under its auspices be evaluated in order to continue receiving federal funds.

School and Social Action Programs

One of the first approaches to evaluation, according to Craven (7, p. 435), was to equate the excellence of a program with the perceived quality of its inputs. Some typical inputs include the academic achievement levels of incoming students, the academic accomplishments and reputation of the faculty members, the adequacy of program-related special equipment and physical facilities, and the level of

program funding. However, since inputs are limited by their definition, only limited decision-making needs can be met with this approach.

According to Worthen (26, pp. 18-19), the second approach to program evaluation developed in direct response to input evaluation. This approach deals with program outputs and evaluations. Goal-directed evaluation is probably the most common type of evaluation practiced in education. Worthen describes six basic steps that are utilized by the evaluator in goal-directed evaluation. First, broad goals for the program are established; second, specific objectives are formulated for the attainment of each goal; third, each objective is stated in measurable terms; fourth, performance measures are either selected or developed for each objective; fifth, the program is conducted to attain the objectives; finally, performance on each objective is measured to see if expected outcomes have been achieved.

Craven (7, p. 436) discusses several limitations of the goal-directed evaluation approach. One of the limitations of this approach is that program goals or objectives are often accepted as given and are not subject to evaluation. Furthermore, this approach depends on the specificity of the program objectives, which must be stated so that the degree of goal attainment can be measured. Finally, this approach is limited because of

its narrow focus; it only considers outputs and no evaluation is made of inputs.

According to Craven (7, p. 436), the third approach is a process-oriented approach. One of the best models for this approach is the countenance model that was developed by Robert Stake (19). This model consists of two matrices, one for program description and the second for judgment. Stake divides each matrix into three rows--for antecedent information, for transaction information, and for outcome information. Antecedents are defined as conditions that exist prior to program implementation which could affect program outcomes, and outcomes are broadly defined as covering the full range of program consequences. The descriptive matrix contains the gathered information on the intents and the observations of program antecedents, transactions (processes of the program), and outcomes. The judgment matrix contains information concerning the standards and the judgments made with respect to the antecedents, transactions, and program outcomes. Program rationale is reported as well as the underlying philosophy and basic purpose of the program, and this forms the basis for evaluating program intents in the descriptive matrix.

The comprehensive approach is the final approach that has been developed for program evaluation within the institutional area of school and social action programs.

This approach is appropriately named since it can respond to a variety of decision-making needs (7, p. 437).

Worthen and Sanders (27, p. 20) state that the primary goal of any academic program evaluation plan is to assist decision-makers in choosing between various alternatives. For higher education, Worthen and Sanders (27, p. 135) conclude that these decision alternatives revolve around four types of decisions which are categorized as planning, structuring, implementing, and recycling decisions. Planning decisions are made to determine the objectives of the academic program; structuring decisions are used to design procedures for the academic program; implementing decisions are made to utilize, control, and refine procedures of the academic program; recycling decisions are made to judge and react to attainments of the academic program.

Stufflebeam (21, pp. 130-133) developed his CIPP (Context-Input-Process-Product) model in response to each of these decision-making needs through a description of four decision settings. The first decision setting is metamorphic, which is directed toward large-scale program changes that require complete information and expertise. (Since the likelihood is slim of this information and expertise being available, Stufflebeam considers the metamorphic decision setting as only a theoretical decision setting.) Stufflebeam defines the homeostatic decision setting as the one that can be used to restore a program

to its intended plan of operation; this would involve small changes, which are based on a large pool of program information, in order to keep the program in balance. Stufflebeam's third decision setting is called the incremental decision setting, and it is designed to seek continued program improvements. The changes within this setting are small, and little information is available to assist the evaluator. The final setting is identified by Stufflebeam as neomobilistic, which seeks broad program changes even though little information or expertise is available to assist the evaluator.

Stufflebeam (21, pp. 133-135) concludes that since planning decisions specify program objectives, they, therefore, determine the decision setting in which program decisions are to be made. Structuring, implementing, and recycling decisions can occur in any of the decision settings.

Stufflebeam (21, p. 136) states that for each of the decision types there is a corresponding type of evaluation. Context evaluation supports the planning decision. Since the goal for this decision area is to provide rationale for the determination of program objectives, this is the most basic form of evaluation. Specifically, context evaluation defines the relevant environment, describes the actual and desired conditions that pertain to the environment, identifies unmet needs and unused opportunities,

and, finally, diagnoses the problems that prevent needs from being met and opportunities from being used.

According to Stufflebeam (21, p. 136), the method begins with a conceptual analysis to identify and define the limits of the domain to be served and its major sub-parts. Next, empirical studies are performed to identify unmet needs and unused opportunities; this involves both empirical and conceptual analysis as well as an appeal to theory and authoritative opinion. These analyses aid judgments regarding the basic problems to be solved. The results of these decisions usually appear in the introductory sections of proposals.

Input evaluation, the second type of evaluation in the CIPP model, supports the structuring decision. Stufflebeam (21, pp. 136-137) says that the purpose of input evaluation is to provide information for determining how to utilize resources in order to achieve project objectives. According to Stufflebeam, this purpose is accomplished by identifying and assessing the relevant (a) capabilities of the responsible agency, (b) strategies for achieving project objectives, and (c) designs for implementing a selected strategy.

Methodology of input evaluation varies greatly depending on whether a large or small degree of change is indicated. Although Stufflebeam (21, p. 137) concludes that specific methods for input evaluation are lacking in

the field of education, the most prevalent practices include committee deliberations, appeals to professional literature, the employment of consultants, and pilot experimental projects.

Process evaluation, the third type of evaluation in the CIPP model, supports implementing decisions. Periodic information is provided to those who are responsible for implementing plans and procedures. Stufflebeam (21, p. 137) identifies the three main objectives of process evaluation, which are to detect or predict defects in the procedural design or during implementation to provide information for program decisions, and to maintain a record of the procedure as it occurs.

According to Stufflebeam (21, p. 138) features of process evaluation methodology include provision for a full-time process evaluator, instruments for describing the process, regular consultations between the process evaluator and project personnel, and frequent updating of the process evaluation design. In summary, Stufflebeam states that process evaluation provides project decision-makers with the information that is needed for anticipating and overcoming procedural difficulties, for making pre-programmed decisions, and for interpreting project outcomes.

Product evaluation, the final type of evaluation identified by Stufflebeam (21, p. 138) in the CIPP model, supports recycling decision. Stufflebeam states that the

purpose of product evaluation is to measure and interpret
attainments not only at the end of the project cycle but
as often as possible during the project term. Stufflebeam
says that features of product evaluation methodology
include devising operational definitions of objectives,
measuring criteria associated with the objectives of the
activity, comparing these measurements with predetermined
absolute or relative standards, and making rational inter-
pretations of the outcomes using the previously recorded
context, data, and process evaluation information. In
this change process, this evaluation provides information
that support decisions to continue, terminate, modify or
refocus a change activity, and for linking the activity
to other phases of the change process.

Government and Industry

The second set of evaluation approaches derives from
government and industry. There are three evaluation models
associated with this institutional area.

The first approach is the Planning, Programming, and
Budgeting System that is commonly referred to as PPBS.
According to Craven (7, p. 439), the purpose of PPBS is
to improve planning and management decisions by allocating
resources to those program alternatives that promise to
attain program objectives, which are consistent with
established program or institutional goals, in an effective
and efficient manner.

PPBS has four phases. The first phase is the planning phase in which program needs are identified and ranked and program goals and objectives are set to meet those needs. Programming is the second phase in which alternative program plans are specified that will contribute to the accomplishment of the program objectives. In the third phase, budgeting, a financial plan is prepared for each of the program alternatives. The final phase of PPBS is evaluation in which certain program alternatives are selected for implementation and the outputs and processes of those program alternatives are evaluated. This evaluation is made with respect to program goals, objectives for effectiveness, and efficient use of budgeted resources (7, p. 439).

Some researchers (4, 5, 7) conclude that PPBS has limited use in higher education. Craven (7, pp. 439-440) criticizes PPBS's emphasis on long-range planning and concludes that it is difficult to measure the outputs of higher education especially as they relate to the quality of education. Barak and Berdahl (5, pp. 16-17), who support this conclusion, say that the measurement problem leads to the difficulty of generating interest in higher education for multiyear budgetary concerns. Furthermore, Barak and Berdahl state, the current, precise nature of the production functions in higher education is not known.

The second approach is zero-based budgeting (ZBB).
ZBB, as described by Craven (7, p. 440), contains two
techniques. In the first ZBB technique, alternative
courses of program action, which are tied to different
funding levels, are related to an assessment of costs
and benefits in a series of "decision packages." In the
second ZBB technique, the decision packages are ranked
in order of priority by the institution.

Theoretically, according to Craven (7, p. 440), ZBB
appears to provide decision-makers with a priority ranking
from which to choose an appropriate decision strategy.
In practice, it causes excessive budgetary and political
upheaval. It is Craven's opinion that ZBB does not provide
budget makers with the necessary tools to make proper
decisions.

Management by objectives (MBO), the final government
and industry approach, is one of the more discussed if
not practiced (or at least initiated) approaches. In
the MBO approach, Craven (7, p. 440) says that each level
of administration is responsible for developing objectives
which are compatible with the goals of the larger organiza-
tion as stated by the chief administrative officer. Once
the objectives are established, the priorities and required
resources for accomplishing them are determined. After
program implementation, overall goal achievement can be
assessed, and each person's performance can be evaluated

and rewarded on the basis of how well program objectives were attained.

Craven (7, p. 440) concludes that the MBO approach can be very valuable for administrators. It allows each person within the institution to contribute to the overall goals. Craven believes, however, that the achievement potential of the institution may be limited by the established goals; in other words, people may achieve their objectives and not strive beyond that attainment.

Higher Education

The final approach to academic program evaluation comes from higher education. In effect, the researchers who use this approach have not taken packaged approaches from other institutional areas but have designed an evaluation approach that is tailored to fit the needs of higher education.

The first approach represents a common core of procedural steps as developed by Craven (7, pp. 441-443). In this approach Craven describes the first step as the designation of an individual or group as the responsible agent for the evaluation procedure. Within the program of self study, the second step, information is accumulated concerning context, need, programs, curriculum, students, faculty and staff, finances, facilities and capital equipment, academic support services, and recommendations.

Once the evaluation chairperson reviews the material,
Craven (7, pp. 441-443) says, two things can occur. If
no problems are indicated, the evaluation ends. If problems
are indicated, a special evaluation team may be appointed
to deal with the problems. The team reviews the self-
study report, conducts an on-site evaluation, interviews
program faculty and students, and observes program processes
and facilities. Next, the program unit itself may review
and comment on the evaluation team's report. Finally,
the evaluation findings are publicly disclosed.

A second evaluation design is by Stufflebeam (21, pp.
145-148), according to whom the first step in this design
is to focus the evaluation. When focusing the design,
the evaluator spells out the ends for the evaluation and
designs policies within which the evaluation will be con-
ducted.

Collection of information is the second step. First,
however, the evaluator must identify the sources for the
information to be collected. The sources should include
(a) the origins of the information (students, faculty,
administrators), (b) the present state of the information
(recorded or unrecorded), and (c) instruments must be
specified and the methods identified for collecting the
needed information. Organization of information, the
third step, provides the format for classifying information

and designating means for coding, organizing, storing, and retrieving information (21, pp. 145-148).

Analysis of information, the fourth step, provides for descriptive or statistical analysis of the information that is to be reported to decision-makers. This step also includes interpretations and evaluation recommendations (21, pp. 145-148).

The fifth step is identified as reporting the information. The purpose of this step is to insure that decision-makers have access to the needed information for making program decisions. The step also insures that the information will be in a useful form. In order to accomplish this, audiences for the reports should be identified and defined, the format for reports and reporting sessions should be specified, and a master schedule of evaluation reporting should be provided (21, pp. 145-148).

The final step, administration of the evaluation, provides an overall plan for executing the design. This is accomplished by defining the overall evaluation schedule, defining staff requirements and plans for meeting these requirements, specifying means for meeting policy requirements for conduct of the evaluation, and evaluating the potential of the evaluation design for providing information that is valid, reliable, credible, timely, and pervasive. Furthermore, this step specifies a schedule

for periodic updating of the evaluation design and provides
a budget for the total evaluation program (21, pp. 145-148).

Weiss (24, p. 6) has developed an evaluation approach
that dwells heavily on goal orientation. The first step
of this approach is to define the goals of the program.
Lenning (14, p. 278) defines goals as the standards whereby
program success can be judged, and as such, they provide
a source of legitimacy for program activities. Goals
are comprehensive in that they provide a definition of as
well as an order to program needs, and they further define
the units of program outcomes and identify the program's
clientele. Goals, in effect, provide congruence between
the program, the institution, and the society of which
it is a part.

According to Weiss (24, p. 6), the second step is
to translate goals into measurable indicators of goal
achievement. This entails delineating some specific out-
comes to evaluate goal attainment. Weiss identifies the
third step as collecting data on specified goal indicators
for those who are exposed to the program. The fourth
step is collecting data for those who are not exposed
to the program.

Finally, says Weiss (24, p. 6), comparison is made
between the data in steps three and four, the program
participants and the nonparticipants, in terms of goal

criteria. An interpretation is then made among the degrees of success attained by participation in the program.

In direct response to Weiss' emphasis on goals, Scriven (18, pp. 1-4) describes his goal-free evaluation process. Part of the rationale behind Scriven's goal-free evaluation process is that goals must be evaluated like anything else and should not be taken as set entities. Furthermore, Scriven believes that goals are generally little more than rhetoric and seldom reveal the real objectives of the program. Also, goals are often manifest functions of a program whereas the latent functions, which are usually not stated, may be the true desirable outcomes. However, according to Scriven, probably the most advantageous aspect of goal-free evaluation is that it reduces bias and increases objectivity because the evaluator does not begin the evaluation with a preconceived notion of the outcomes. Instead, the evaluator is able to identify all the evaluation priorities and subsequently provides an open analysis of the outcomes.

Program Evaluation Procedures

Barak and Berdahl (5, p. 10) allocate responsibility for academic program evaluation to state-level agencies. Initially, this responsibility was for new programs but it has been expanded to include existing programs. The authors note that the Texas Coordinating Board has

planning responsibilities through statutory power over four-year and two-year public institutions. According to Millard (15, pp. 69, 81), the responsibility for planning includes program approval authority as well as budget review and recommendation authority. The major goal of the program review authority is the elimination of duplication, preservation, and strengthening of quality in addition to institutional and program consolidation or elimination.

Within the program evaluation procedure, Stake and Denny (20, p. 373) identify the evaluator's task as that of gathering information about the worth of an academic program in order to improve its management. The evaluator must show a relationship between the effects of the program on teacher performance, administrative arrangements, and community attitudes, plus how the program compliments and obtrudes upon other parts of the total curriculum.

Evaluation is most productive when it occurs continuously. Too often it is used as a long-shot "pass-fail" decision (22, p. 56). For this reason, many academicians are suspicious of evaluation projects; they assume that criticism is being directed at their programs, and they react by being very protective and cautious about disclosing information freely. Cronbach and others (8, p. 185) state that such distrust can harm the evaluation process, and they believe that it can be eliminated if participants

are told the rationale, the design, and the procedures
for the evaluation and are subsequently allowed access
to the formal evaluation report which is submitted at
the end of the evaluation. If all this is not possible,
an informal, verbal briefing may possibly serve the same
purpose.

Most educators do not realize that an unfavorable
evaluation report rarely deals a deathblow to a program.
Granted, it often means that expansion of the program
will be reduced (8, p. 158). However, since evaluation
rarely shows final, unequivocal findings, the evaluator
as well as the participants must be open to the small,
ambiguous, and minor changes that are indicated (25, p. 3).

Barak and Berdahl (5, pp. 26-34) identify the following
factors that may be considered by a state-level agency
before a new program is approved for offering at an
institution. First, a program description is formulated
for presentation which could range from a simple statement
to a comprehensive documented report. The second factor
is a statement of purposes and objectives of the program
(what the program plans to achieve and how it interrelates
with the institutional mission). The third factor for
consideration is a needs analysis that includes but is
not limited to the need for the program in a particular
geographical area, student demand for the program, manpower
needs, and duplications of the program at other institutions.

Cost analysis is the fourth consideration factor, according to Barak and Berdahl (5, pp. 35-37), for a new program proposal. This evaluation establishes the total projected cost of the program for a given period of time (in Texas, the cost projection is for four years). The fifth factor for consideration is resource analysis. This analysis includes human resources such as faculty, staff, and administration as well as facilities and support services. The sixth factor to be considered is program accreditation which includes a listing of accrediting requirements by the accrediting agency, the resources needed to achieve accreditation, and a timetable for meeting the requirements. The final factor identified by Barak and Berdahl for consideration is financial aid. This requires a determination of the adequacy of financial aid for students who will enroll in the program.

Millard (15, p. 90) reports that the evaluation procedure for existing programs has a different focus. These evaluations may be conducted by state agencies, but it is becoming increasingly more common for institutions to initiate their own academic program evaluations of existing programs. Millard identifies several factors to be considered. Certainly, finance is one concern although efficiency, accountability, and quality are also concerns. Financial considerations mean that existing resources must be utilized in the most effective manner,

and low-quality programs must be eliminated to provide the effective use of resources. Furthermore, there must be some consumer protection measure to protect students from programs of questionable value (15). The desire is also present to improve the mechanics of existing programs--to examine administration in relation to theories taught through program strategies and techniques. A determination is then made of which are the most efficient (5, p. 56; 24, pp. 16-17).

Barak and Berdahl (5, p. 68) enumerate some of the criterion used for existing program evaluations. These include the number of program graduates per year, the number of students enrolled in the program, the size of classes, the cost of the program per graduate, and faculty workload. According to Barak and Berdahl, an evaluation would also be made of the program's quality through its reputation as exhibited by the graduates. General student interest and demand trends for the program would also be considered.

Importance of Program Evaluation

During the 1960s an abundance of the literature on evaluation revolved around the recurrent theme of discontent. According to Alkin, Daillak, and White (1, pp. 14-16), completed evaluations were not used in the decision-making process. As a result, evaluation was a headache

for researchers. However, it is twenty years later and
the evaluation process is still present. Therefore, these
authors believe that there must have been some successful
evaluations during those years that were not published.

The importance and value of academic program evalua-
tion cannot be overstated. Cronbach (8, pp. 156-158)
states that although the faults in a program will be
exposed through an effective evaluation plan, the benefits
of the program will also be brought out. The faults can
be used in a constructive modification of the program
to produce its greatest effectiveness. The benefits can
be used as documentation to encourage support for the
program. For this reason, a continuing successful academic
program evaluation plan acts to preserve the system by
assisting in the smooth accommodation of programs. Eval-
uators do not evaluate to stagnate; they evaluate with
the agreement to change.

Barak and Berdahl (5, p. 1) identify several financial
factors that affect academic program evaluation. One
factor is the reduction in categorical federal programs
of institutional aid with a corresponding shift in student
tuition assistance. Another is the diminishing proportion
of support allocated to higher education in state budgets.
Couple these factors with the ravages of inflation plus
the decline in the birth rate, and the purposes of academic
program evaluation become a priority for higher education.

In short, financial retrenchment need not mean loss of viability or quality of academic programs. However, according to Glenny (10, pp. 30-31), program evaluation will probably be instrumental in assigning funding priorities in addition to cancelling some courses and programs. The process of elimination, though, will be much more organized.

Planned program evaluation, as reported by Weiss (25, p. 2), takes more time and costs more than intuition, opinion, or trained sensibility; however, when the outcomes to be evaluated are complex and hard to observe, the decisions that follow are of such a priority that the costs are worth it. Indeed, in a study by the Carnegie Commission of over 1200 college presidents (10, p. 30) the only area in which they predicted future personnel increases is in the area of program evaluation personnel. Two conclusions are drawn from this survey. The first is the importance that college presidents place on academic program evaluation. Second, the presidents see a need for trained personnel to conduct the evaluation projects. The responsibility of academic program evaluation has ascended from being a task that is merely tacked onto a job description to being a description for a job (10, p. 30).

Although financial considerations have provided the greatest impetus for higher education to formulate academic program evaluation procedures, Harcleroad (12, pp. 48-49)

enumerates many other purposes for evaluation. For example, evaluation of a new program proposal needs to consider the relationship of the new program to the institution's mission statement. The mission statement of a higher educational institution helps to establish the formal boundaries for the program because such statements represent the enthusiasm of the creators for the long-range growth of the institution; therefore, any academic program that does not support the mission statement of the institution should not be considered. According to Harcleroad, other considerations for evaluating new program proposals include societal need, advancement of knowledge, potential student demand, potential demand for graduates in the work force, costs of the program, and potential quality.

Raizen and Rossi (17, p. 97) identify lack of utilization of evaluation results as one of the greatest complaints in regard to academic program evaluation. Among their criticisms are that few policy changes result from evaluation, and few programs are terminated or initiated as a result of evaluation.

Weiss (25, pp. 114-115) lists several possible reasons why evaluation results appear to be poorly utilized. One reason could be the evaluators' perceptions of their role in the utilization process. Evaluators often are described as academic researchers by job description. As such, many stop short of drawing any workable conclusions when they

report evaluation results. However, according to Weiss, poor utilization is not always the fault of the evaluator; sometimes the institution resists change, and with this obstacle, feasibility may be a problem. Many institutions enjoy a contented status quo; others cannot afford the suggested changes. Acceptability of the results may also be an institutional problem in the sense that the suggested new practices may not fit in with the current social values of the institution. Ideology may be an institutional obstacle, so that the conclusions of the evaluation may conflict with the basic values of the institution and therefore be ignored.

Inadequate or inappropriate dissemination of evaluation results may be another reason for the limited use of evaluation findings. Weiss (25, pp. 121-127) says that the people who need to utilize the results may not have access to them. There also could be a problem with the evaluation findings so that future action is obscured by a gap between evaluation results and a clear course of action; the data may say little more than that the program is not achieving the desired results. The final obstacle to utilization of evaluation results is the tendency of much evaluation to show little or no positive effect. Often the old, traditional programs are not evaluated as are the new, innovative programs. Therefore, when results are negative,

there is a negative effect on the creative innovators in the department.

In spite of these obstacles, Raizen and Rossi (17, pp. 108-109) describe several ways to increase the utilization of academic program evaluations. One way is to write intelligible reports; reports should be written in a style that is easily understood and that is tailored to the needs of the recipients. The second suggestion is to accentuate the positive aspects; recommendations should concentrate on the positive program findings. Evaluators should not ignore negative results, but they should report adverse results in as positive a manner as possible. Also, evaluators should not report findings only through a written report; face-to-face communication is not only more personal, it insures that the results are received, and questions can be clarified and important points emphasized.

Any recipient of an academic program evaluation report should look for the following characteristics that are identified by Worthen (26, pp. 29-30). First, conceptual clarity; evaluators should exhibit a clear understanding of the particular form of evaluation they are proposing. The second characteristic is good characterization of the evaluation objective; no evaluation is complete without a thorough, detailed description of the program being evaluated. Worthen states that accuracy is greatly enhanced when evaluators accurately describe the program

under evaluation. The third characteristic is a recognition and representation of legitimate audiences who must be identified; the evaluation plan should include their objectives or evaluative questions to determine what data should be collected.

The fourth characteristic of good evaluation, says Worthen (26, pp. 31-33), is a sensitivity to political problems. When collecting sensitive data, permission must first be granted. Agreements should be reached early regarding permission to access data and data sources as well as establishing safeguards against misuse of the evaluation itself. The fifth characteristic is a specification of information needs and sources. A good evaluation plan needs a blueprint that tells precisely what information is needed to be collected in addition to the sources from which the information is to be obtained. The sixth characteristic is comprehensiveness-inclusiveness. A good evaluation includes all the main components, but it also includes provisions for remaining alert to unanticipated side-effects; no variables that could have an effect should be ignored. The seventh characteristic identified by Worthen is technical adequacy, which, of all the characteristics, is probably the most abused. The techniques to be considered include the instrument used, sampling method, and the correct choice and application of statistical techniques for data reduction. Without the knowledge

and control of these tools of the trade, evaluators have
little hope of producing evaluation information that meets
the scientific criteria of validity, reliability, and
objectivity.

Worthen (26, pp. 34-35) describes consideration of
costs as the eighth characteristic of a good evaluation.
Evaluators must be concerned with cost effectiveness in
order to discern between decision alternatives. The ninth
characteristic is explicit standards. The report should
include a statement of the criteria or standards that
were used to determine whether or not the program was
a success; the measurements and observations taken in
an evaluation cannot be translated into judgments of worth
without the application of standards or criteria. The
tenth characteristic of a good evaluation is judgments
and recommendations. According to Worthen, data alone
have little or no significance; standards must be applied
to the data to reach a judgment about whether the program
is effective or ineffective. Finally, Worthen states
that a good evaluation should have reports tailored to
audiences; the evaluator must write reports that are
applicable to each audience. Some evaluators find it
helpful to write both a technical and a non-technical
report.

Recent Research on Academic
Program Evaluation

The literature on recent academic program evaluation
may be categorized by reports of results of specific
evaluation studies and reports of specific methods of
academic evaluation. This section will discuss each
category separately.

Specific Academic Program Evaluations

An intensive survey of the relevant literature on
reports of specific academic program evaluations reveals
that few such evaluations are documented. The studies
that are reported, however, appear to be either internal
studies (by the institution of its own programs) or external
studies (by an agency or the state that has a degree of
power over the programs offered by the public institutions).

Internal program evaluations.--Koon (13) reports
the results of a 1979 undergraduate evaluation question-
naire that was administered to majors in fourteen social
science-related departments and programs at the University
of California at Berkeley. The recommendations for program
improvements indicate that, in the view of the students,
the programs need to offer more career-related information
to students, more low-enrollment courses for majors, and
more courses that stress the social implications of academic
knowledge.

Trotter and others (23) also report on a 1979 study, which is similar to the Berkeley study, at Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This internal formative evaluation was on graduate-level science education programs. The prepared questionnaire was distributed to program faculty, graduates of the doctoral and master's degree programs, and current students in the master's and doctoral science education programs. The goal of the review was to determine how well the science programs meet the needs of the students. The results of the review show a high degree of consensus between what the science programs are and should be.

An evaluation of the integrated science program at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, is reported on by Wortman and others (28). Overall, the science program was well evaluated, although the cited weaknesses of the program are inflexibility, lack of lab experience, and no independent projects.

In 1978, Hall and Hord (11) reported on the efforts of six college and universities to evaluate their teacher education programs. Of these six colleges and universities, Western Kentucky University made the most accurate identification of the problems of first-year teachers, and WKU also identified factors that are related to teacher retention after three years of experience. The teacher education faculty at Weber State College switched from a

traditional approach to an individualized performance-based program as a result of the evaluation. The review of their program enabled the faculty to examine and refine the effectiveness of their program. At the University of Oregon, the teacher education program conducted a study of its graduates with a resulting program modification that meets the needs of its students more comprehensively.

In 1979, Tennessee Technological University reported the results of its five-year longitudinal study of its teacher education graduates (3). Since this study identifies problems that concern both first-year teachers and teacher retention, some modifications were made in the teacher education program.

Drummond (9) reports on a follow-up study by the College of Education at the University of Maine at Orono of its graduates from 1975-1977. A survey was sent to graduates requesting information about the education program and how well it had prepared the graduates for teaching. Fifty-four per cent of the graduates stated that they were adequately or very adequately prepared for their profession. Furthermore, over 50 per cent reported that they would major in education again, given the opportunity. In ranking the education courses, the graduates gave student teaching the highest ranking, their major field of study the second highest, and the lowest ranking was given to courses on the foundations of

education. Nevertheless, 90 per cent of the respondents
believe that changes should be made in the education pro-
gram. Students expressed needs and desires for greater
field experience in the form of expanded student teaching,
improvement of methods courses, and curriculum revision.

External program evaluations.--By statute, the
Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) (6, p. 74)
does not have the authority to terminate programs, but
it can review academic programs and make recommendations
to the three governing boards for public institutions in
Tennessee. In 1974 and in 1977 the THEC took the initiative
to study low-producing programs at colleges and universities
in Tennessee. The review began with a graduation audit
of four-year institutions. Criteria were established
for low-producing programs that stated the degree level,
the age of the program (from four to six years), and the
average number of graduates as ten or less. In 1977, each
of the governing boards conducted independent evaluations
of programs that the THEC had labelled "low-producing."
These evaluations included additional criterion such as
faculty workloads, cost per credit hour, relationship
of the program to other programs, and number of declared
majors. As a result of the THEC studies, sixteen programs
were terminated by governing boards in 1974 and eleven

programs in 1977. During the intervening two years, eight
other programs were eliminated.

In 1975, the Louisiana Board of Regents (6, pp. 76-77)
instituted a comprehensive review of all doctoral programs
in the state. By statute, the Louisiana Board has the
authority to terminate programs. As a result of the study,
100 programs were reviewed and twenty programs were termi-
nated. This review process, which established a format
for evaluating doctoral programs, produced a policy state-
ment that reflects the commitment of the Louisiana Board
of Regents to doctoral programs. The Louisiana format
requires a thorough self-study by the institution that
is followed by a peer evaluation in the form of consultant
panels.

Since the inception of the Washington Council for
Postsecondary Education (6, p. 78), academic programs have
been the focus of its study. The first target of the
study was low-producing programs; at the end of 1973,
the council recommended that fifty of the 135 programs
studied should be terminated. The second thrust of the
program was the unnecessary duplication of graduate pro-
grams. Across the state, 225 master's and thirty-eight
doctoral programs were studied. First, the participants
of each program completed program questionnaires which
emphasized need, resource requirements, and institutional
mission. Second, an on-site evaluation was conducted

by the CPE staff. These evaluations resulted in recommendations to terminate thirty master's and four doctoral programs. Thirteen master's programs were consolidated with similar programs.

<div align="center">

Specific Methods of Academic
Evaluation

</div>

Michigan State University.--For several years, Michigan State University has used the Annual Evaluation and Report (AER) as a means of academic program evaluation. The AER system utilizes a department-wide approach that involves planning and budgetary considerations to attain its objectives (16, p. 23).

The AER cycle begins in September with a compilation of the faculty's professional achievements and estimates of budgeted funds. In February, deans send each department an AER packet of several computer-generated data schedules. Each department uses these AER forms and schedules to submit new plans and budget requests. The two areas that compose the AER materials are (a) evaluation and report and (b) planning and budgeting. The evaluation and report area contains computer-generated data schedules that provide comparable statistics for a specific department, its college, and for departments that have similar subject matter. This comparative evaluation report contains two-to-five year statistics for analysis purposes (16, pp. 23-24).

Each department utilizes these comparative statistics
to write a qualitative assessment of departmental perform-
ance that includes the three areas of instruction, research
and professional activities, and public service. Each
department's report is sent to the dean who also makes
a departmental assessment. Central administrators utilize
both the department's and the dean's reports in side-by-
side assessment in order to formulate an overall qualitative
performance evaluation (16, p. 24).

The second area of the AER addresses future depart-
mental plans and their budgetary implications. Goal
statements are formulated utilizing the university's mission
statements. These departmental plans are used as the basis
for formulating a budget that includes a rank ordering by
importance for each item (16, pp. 24-25).

The deans, who consolidate this material and make
recommendations, forward the material to the university's
office of institutional research (OIR). The OIR reviews
the material thoroughly before making its recommendations
in the form of a summary evaluation. The provost receives
the summary evaluations, discusses them with the deans,
and makes his recommendations; the OIR makes the final
budgetary recommendations (16, pp. 26-27).

The University of Michigan.--In the fall of 1975,
under the direction of the program evaluation committee

and the office of academic planning, the University of

Michigan began a systematic approach to academic program

evaluation with a program similar to Michigan State

University's. Although the goals of assessment for the

two universities are similar, the University of Michigan

also wanted to provide the means to assist both executive

and advisory groups in assessing potential program changes,

proposed new organizational arrangements, or the concomi-

tant staffing changes implied by either. To this end,

a three-phase planning and evaluation project was formulated

(16, p. 27).

The three phases consist of (a) developing program

objectives for each unit and college, (b) self-evaluation

by the unit or college in light of the objectives developed,

and (c) cooperative planning for the future between the

colleges and the office of academic affairs. Four specific

objectives were established as a procedure guide for the

project (16, p. 27).

The first project objective is to determine specific

internal evaluation needs for the college. These internal

evaluation needs include the incorporation of any external

requirements or limitations (such as accrediting agency

standards) with the objectives agreed to for the college

in phase one (16, p. 27). In order to achieve this objec-

tive, a questionnaire was distributed to each unit request-

ing detailed, written descriptions of that unit's principal

objectives and the major operational implications of each
over a five-year period. The seven major categories of
the questionnaire are (a) instructional objectives and
implications, (b) size, quality, and composition of student
enrollments by program, (c) cross-discipline instructional
cooperation and implications, (f) faculty quality and
affirmative action problems or implications, and (g) a
request to summarize the most important objectives con-
tained in the first six sections, the relative importance
of each, and the extent of agreement about the importance
within the department; staffing needs also should be
included in addition to an importance ranking of the
objectives should the budget be increased or decreased
by 10 per cent. All program participants are encouraged
to provide responses or comments which are attached along
with the unit head's and the dean's comments to the program
questionnaire reply (16, p. 28).

The dean, who synthesizes the questionnaire responses
into an all-college reply, forwards the report to the
vice-president for academic affairs who sends all deans'
reports to the program evaluation committee. The committee
reads the reports and writes two summaries. One summary
discusses the major objectives and measurable trends for
a particular college, and the second summary lists any
crucial questions left unanswered by the survey. Along
with any interested faculty, the deans of each college

review the summaries. Based on these conferences, the
summary reports are revised and submitted to the college
or school for approval (16, p. 28).

The second project objective is to conduct evaluations
of current operations and to devise a comprehensive plan
and schedule for the evaluation of each program over a
five-year planning period. Specific subjects evaluated
within this area include degree programs, the general
research or service activities of the department, and
the leadership of the department chair or program director.
The evaluation plan and schedule for each review subject
delineates the time at which such a review is to be con-
ducted, by what group, and the particular emphasis the
review will take. The plan further specifies the distribu-
tion list for each evaluation report and the amount of
funding support for each review. In accordance with the
evaluation plan and schedule, it is anticipated that each
academic program within each college will be evaluated
every five to seven years (16, p. 29).

The third project objective is to project the enroll-
ment and staffing requirements of the approved objectives
for each college. Staffing projections are made annually
that utilize statistical data on enrollment rates, staff
workload, and budgetary concerns; staffing changes are
made using this information (16, p. 29).

The fourth and final project objective of the University of Michigan program evaluation plan involves incorporating the college objectives, plans, and projections into a bilateral agreement between the colleges and the office of academic affairs. This document, which is called a memorandum of understanding, identifies (a) the results of the previous three objectives in a single document, and (b) the plans for their attainment over the next five yaers. Based on the results formulated in this document, resource allocations can be made in addition to program changes or terminations (16, p. 30).

The University of Houston.--The program evaluation procedures (16) developed at the University of Houston Central Campus are the result of a reaccreditation self-study initiated for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The self-study focuses on issues related to the institutional mission and potential conflicts between enrollment demands and funding capabilities. A self-study steering committee, which was composed of administrators, faculty, and students, undertook to evaluate each degree program of the institution, to culminate in the assignment of a quality goal for each program, which would be attained over a five-year period (16, p. 31).

Each college developed a mission statement complete with data packages that included pertinent information to

assist in the evaluations. The data packages contained information related to fourteen criterion developed by the steering committee to assist in evaluating the programs (16, p. 32).

Each dean was interviewed by the committee and, based on insights obtained from the interview, revisions were made in the evaluations. Summary statements of the evaluation studies provided a sense of the current and potential quality of each program, resources necessary, and congruence between the program and the mission statement of the institution as a whole. From these summaries, the programs were ranked according to importance, and these rankings were applied to a matrix design developed to mesh academic program quality with resource allocations. The results of this assessment were used by administrators to direct program change, continuance, or termination (16, pp. 32-38).

The University of Iowa.--The University of Iowa's procedures provide a good description of academic program evaluation because its program is integrated into long-range academic planning. The program which UI initiated in 1971 enables the university to systematically review all programs and levels as well as the university as a whole. In order to accomplish this, the review process is divided into three parts that include departmental

reviews, collegiate reviews, and the university review
(4, pp. 101-102).

The departmental review process at UI is a self-study
that focuses on goal statements, resource requirements, and
advice by the deans on stated needs. Within each department
to be reviewed, an ad hoc review committee is appointed to
interview students and faculty, enlist reactions from
external sources, and evaluate teaching, research, and
service functions. The review committee consists of faculty
members from other university disciplines in addition
to resource persons from outside the unviersity. The
review committee attempts (a) to ascertain the relationship
of the program or department to other college programs, (b)
to evaluate the contributions of faculty membres, (c) to
analyze program goals in relation to projected needs,
finances, and material support, and (c) to identify
strengths and weaknesses of the program (4, p. 102).

The compiled copies of the final review reports are
sent to the appropriate deans. The deans, in turn, submit
recommendations to the vice president of academic affairs.
The departmental review reports become a part of the overall
collegiate review process, and the collegiate reviews
are incorporated into a university review (4, p. 103).

Harvard University.--The heart of Harvard University's
review program is the Harvard Board of Overseers, which

consists of thirty alumni whose job it is to review and sanction the acts of the executive management of the university. The Overseers normally enlist the help of visiting committees that are composed of experts from outside Harvard who are asked to evaluate a particular department. Once their evaluation is complete, a report is submitted to the Board of Overseers, who, in turn, recommend any modifications to the president (4, pp. 112-113).

Harvard University's program evaluation procedures are steeped in tradition. In Barak's (4, p.113) opinion, their program evaluation procedures would be extremely difficult to duplicate.

Summary

This chapter presents research that is relevant to the study of academic program evaluation. The concept of evaluation is analyzed with emphasis on a definition of evaluation and types of evaluation. The most relevant approaches to program evaluation are presented from school and social action programs, government and industry, and higher education. Specific program evaluation procedures are presented for new as well as existing programs. The importance of evaluation is also considered which includes a description of the utilization of evaluation results in addition to the characteristics of good program

evaluation. The recent research on academic program evaluation is discussed as it pertains to reports of specific evaluations and reports of specific methods of academic program evaluation.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alkin, Marvin D., Richard Daillak, and Peter White, Using Evaluations: Does Evaluation Make a Difference? Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, 1979.

2. Anderson, Scarvia B., and Samuel Ball, The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1978.

3. Ayers, Jerry B., "Tennessee Technological University Teacher Evaluation Model, Year VI: Study of the Teacher Preparation Programs of Tennessee Technological University," ERIC document 1979 535, August, 1979.

4. Barak, Robert J., Program Review in Higher Education: Within and Without, Boulder, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1982.

5. Barak, Robert J., and Robert O. Berdahl, "State-Level Academic Program Review in Higher Education," Denver, Education Commission of the States, February, 1978.

6. Bogue, E. Grady, "State Agency Approaches to Academic Program Evaluation," New Directions for Institutional Research: Academic Program Evaluation, edited by Eugene C. Craven, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980, pp. 69-87.

7. Craven, Eugene, "Evaluating Program Performance," Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research, edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980, pp. 432-457.

8. Cronbach, Lee J., and others, Toward Reform of Program Evaluation, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

9. Drummond, Robert J., "1978 Follow-Up Study of University of Maine at Orono College of Education Graduates, 1975-1977," ERIC document 175 896, December, 1978.

10. Glenny, Lyman A., and others, Presidents Confront
       Reality, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1976.

11. Hall, Gene E., and Shirley M. Hord, "Teacher Education
       Program Evaluation and Follow-Up Studies: A
       Collection of Current Efforts," ERIC document
       176 98D, 1978.

12. Harcleroad, Fred F., "The Context of Academic Program
       Evaluation," New Directions for Institutional
       Research: Academic Program Evaluation, edited
       by Eugene C. Craven, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass,
       1980, pp. 1-20.

13. Koon, Jeff, "Social Science-Related Programs at
       Berkeley: An Academic Review Using Comparative
       Student Evaluations," ERIC document 180 903,
       November, 1979.

14. Lenning, Oscar T., "Assessing Student Program Needs,"
       Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of
       Planning and Institutional Research, edited by
       Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and Associates,
       San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980, pp. 263-288.

15. Millard, Richard M.,"Power of State Coordinating
       Agencies," Improving Academic Management: A
       Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research,
       edited by Paul Jedamus, Marvin W. Peterson, and
       Associates, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980,
       pp. 65-95.

16. Munitz, Barry A., and Douglas J. Wright, "Institutional
       Approaches to Academic Program Evaluation," New
       Directions for Institutional Research: Academic
       Program Evaluation, edited by Eugene C. Craven,
       San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980, pp. 21-42.

17. Raizen, Senta A., and Peter H. Rossi, editors, Program
       Evaluation in Education: When? How? To What
       Ends? Washington, National Academy Press, 1981.

18. Scriven, Michael, "Pros and Cons about Goal-Free
       Evaluation," Evaluation Comment, 3 (1972), 1-4.

19. Stake, Robert E., Evaluating Educational Programs,
       Paris, France, Organisation for Economic Co-
       Operation and Development, 1976.

20. Stake, Robert E., and Terry Denny, "Needed Concepts and Techniques for Utilizing More Fully the Potential of Evaluation," _Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means_, edited by Ralph Tyler, Chicago, National Society for the Study of Education, 1969, pp. 370-390.

21. Stufflebeam, Daniel L., "An Introduction to the PDK Book: Educational Evaluation and Decision-Making," _Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice_, edited by Elaine R. Worthen and James R. Sanders, Worthington, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973, pp. 128-150.

22. Suchman, Edward A., "Action for What? A Critique of Evaluative Research," _Evaluating Action Programs_, edited by Carol H. Weiss, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1972, pp. 52-84.

23. Trotter, Barbara, and others, "Internal Formative Evaluation of Graduate Level Science Education at Temple University," ERIC document 179 383, July, 1979.

24. Weiss, Carol H., "Evaluating Educational and Social Action Programs: A Treeful of Owls," _Evaluating Action Programs_, edited by Carol H. Weiss, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1972, pp. 3-27.

25. _____, _Evaluation Research_, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1972.

26. Worthen, Blaine R., "A Look at the Mosaic of Educational Evaluation and Accountability," Portland, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, August, 1974.

27. Worthen, Blaine R., and James R. Sanders, editors, _Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice_, Worthington, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973.

28. Wortman, Paul M., and others, "An Evaluation of the Integrated Science Program: Final Report," ERIC document 186 208, June, 1979.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR

COLLECTION OF DATA

The purpose of this study is to determine current
procedures, timelines, participants, and use of results
of academic program evaluation for both public and private
Texas senior colleges and universities. The procedures
used to obtain the data are (a) identification of the
contact person responsible for academic program evaluation
at each of the institutions from which permission to
collect data has been granted, (b) construction of the
survey instrument, (c) selection of a jury panel and
evaluation of the questionnaire, and (d) construction
and administration of the final instrument.

Identification of the Population

In order to identify the contact persons who are
responsible for academic program evaluation at Texas
senior colleges and universities, the following procedures
were used. A request was made to the Texas College and
University System Coordinating Board for a listing of
both public and private Texas senior colleges and univer-
sities. This list includes the name and address for
the president of each institution. A letter was mailed

to each of the seventy-four college and university presidents to explain the purpose of the research and request permission to collect data at their institution (Appendix A). A pre-addressed, stamped card was enclosed in each request for return whether or not permission was granted. If permission was granted, the name of the person responsible for academic program evaluation was requested, and the survey instrument was sent to the person indicated. For the majority of institutions, the vice-president for academic affairs was named, although some presidents named the assistant vice-presidents for academic affairs, directors of institutional studies, assistants to the president, deans of faculty, registrars, or provosts.

The mailout to the 74 college and university presidents produced 58 responses, of which 54 granted permission. Since a 73 per cent return rate was determined to be sufficient for a majority return, it was determined that there was no need for a second contact with the presidents. Therefore, the packet containing the survey instrument was sent to the 54 identified respondents.

The Survey Instrument

Prior to construction of the survey instrument, a comprehensive review of the relevant literature was conducted. The stated purpose of the research as specified by the research questions provided a guideline for the

specific questions to be included on the instrument. A study of the most current practices utilized in academic program evaluation served to provide the fixed alternative items from which the respondent would choose a response. For example, phases encompassed by planning, procedures, methods, evaluation, and publication of academic program evaluation are included within the fixed alternatives. After all the background material was compiled, a survey instrument was developed that contains 19 questions plus space for additional comments.

<div align="center">

Evaluation of the Survey
Instrument
</div>

Upon the advice of the advisory committee, a three-member jury panel was selected to evaluate the preliminary survey instrument. Of the three panel members selected, one is an expert in survey design and the remaining two are experts in academic program evaluation at the college and university level. Each panel member was mailed a letter that requested their assistance and explained the purpose of the research (Appendix B). A copy of the survey instrument was also enclosed. Upon receipt of the suggested changes by the jury panel, the necessary revisions were made in the instrument. The primary modification suggested by the judges concerned how the respondent was to answer each question. The judges suggested that each question contain directions for response. For example, check only

one, check all that apply, or mark greater to lesser importance on a scale of 1 to 5 specifically for each question on the instrument. No preliminary questions were deleted or modified.

Administration of the Revised
Survey Instrument

The final survey instrument (Appendix C) consists of 20 questions that were printed on 7-1/2 by 9 inch sheets of paper which were folded and stapled into a pamphlet format. A computer was used for the printing which was then professionally reproduced.

The survey instruments were mailed, along with letters of instruction (Appendix D) and pre-addressed, stamped return envelopes, to the 54 names supplied by the college presidents. Within the allotted two-week period, 40 of the 54 mailed instruments had been returned, and 7 more were received during the following week. Of the 47 returns, one questionnaire was not answered because the institution is not a four-year institution, which reduces the population to 73. The 46 usable responses equals a 62 per cent return rate, which exceeds the 60 per cent required return rate.

The responses from the population were coded on key-punch cards which were processed at a university computing center. The results of these computations are reported in Chapter IV.

Analysis of Data

The analysis of the data is organized around the six research questions, as stated in Chapter I, which were devised to investigate and report the status of program evaluation in Texas. Since percentage figures indicate frequency of use and degree of importance, all data are reported by frequency and percentages.

Research question one concerns the goals, objectives, and purposes of academic program evaluation at the responding institutions. Three questions on the survey instrument are concerned with obtaining this information which are reported by frequency and percentage. The two questions on goals and purposes of academic program evaluation are ranked by the respondents according to importance from 1 as most important through 5 as least important, and a mean is calculated for each response.

The frequency of occurrence of academic program evaluation is the concern of research question two for which one question on the survey instrument elicited this information. These data are reported by frequency and percentage.

The methods most frequently utilized in academic program evaluation is the information sought for research question three. Four questions on the survey instrument answer this question. These data are reported in terms of frequency and percentage.

Research question four deals with the participants in the academic program evaluation process. Six questions on the survey instrument are directed toward obtaining this information. Frequency and percentages are reported for these data.

The institutional characteristics that are related to systematic program evaluation is the concern of research question five. Three questions on the survey instrument are related to this information. Frequency and percentages are reported for these data.

Research question six concerns the means for utilization of academic program evaluation results. Two survey questions dealt with this topic. The first question asks rsepondents to rank in order of importance the ways in which results of academic program evaluations are utilized at their institutions. Means are calculated for each response, and ranked in order of importance. The second survey question that is related to research question six concerns the role of academic program evaluation in the future. For these responses, frequencies and percentages are shown.

Summary

This chapter presents the methods and procedures that are used for collection of data for this study. Directory information from the Texas College and University System

Coordinating Board is used to contact the seventy-four presidents of four-year public and private Texas colleges and universities. The information supplied by the presidents who consented to the study comprises the population of the study.

After extensive research, a survey instrument was designed that corresponds to the stated purposes of the research as interpreted by the research questions. A three-member jury panel evaluated the survey instrument and appropriate revisions were incorporated. The final survey was printed and mailed to the identified respondents; 46 usable returns were received, which is a 62 per cent return rate. The results of data analyses are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and analyze
the findings of this study. Data findings are arranged
in tabular form and discussed in the order of the research
questions that are presented in Chapter I.

The findings presented in this chapter are the result
of data collected from respondents in forty-six public
and private Texas senior colleges and universities. These
respondents were asked to check all the applicable responses
for each question on the questionnaire with the exception
of three questions that specifically refer to goals of
academic program evaluation, purposes of academic program
evaluation, and use of academic program evaluation results.
Excluding these three questions, all data are computed
in percentages. Since percentages provide the most direct
means for examining the status of academic program evalua-
tion at Texas senior colleges and universities, the data
are presented in a tabular form that shows the response,
the frequency of the response, and the percentage of the
total responses.

Responses are ranked according to importance for the three questions concerning goals of academic program evaluation, purposes of academic program evaluation, and utilization of results of academic program evaluation. For each of these questions the respondents were instructed to rank the response on a scale of 1 through 5, with 1 equaling most important and 5 equaling least important. The rankings are used to calculate a mean for each response, and each mean is ranked to indicate importance of the response.

Goals, Objectives and Purposes of Academic Program Evaluation

The data presented in Table I represent the reported views of the respondents regarding the goals of academic program evaluation at each of the 46 public and private senior colleges and universities in Texas. The goal to upgrade academic programs ranks first; 41 of the 46 respondents ranked this goal as most important for academic program evaluation.

The goal that ranks second is to maintain accreditation; 13 of the respondents ranked this goal as highly important. To determine personnel requirements ranks third; 25 respondents ranked this goal greater than or equal to 3 as an important goal of academic program evaluation.

TABLE I

RANKING OF GOALS FOR ACADEMIC
PROGRAM EVALUATION

| Goal | Responses | | | | | Rank |
| | Most Important | to | | Least Important | | |
	1	2	3	4	5	
To upgrade academic programs	41	3	2	.	.	1
To maintain accreditation	1	12	13	8	7	2
To determine personnel requirements	1	18	6	8	9	3
To determine cost effectiveness	.	7	9	17	10	4
To fulfill state requirements or approval	.	2	10	7	14	5

The fourth ranked goal of academic program evaluation is to determine cost effectiveness; 33 of the 46 respondents ranked this goal fourth in importance to academic program evaluation. The fifth ranked goal is to fulfill state requirements; 33 of the respondents ranked this goal as least important for academic program evaluation.

Ten of the responding institutions added an other response as a goal of academic program evaluation. These responses include increasing admissions standards, for improvement, to develop new programs, for long-range academic planning, to measure student academic outcomes-competencies, and planning for programs.

Table II presents the data regarding the standards that are used in academic program evaluation at the responding institutions. The respondents were asked to check all responses that apply.

TABLE II

STANDARDS UTILIZED IN ACADEMIC
PROGRAM EVALUATION

Standard Used	Frequency	Percentage
Accrediting agencies	45	98
Standards of discipline	35	76
Local standards	30	65
State guidelines	29	63
National or regional	28	62
Other	1	2

The data in Table II show that the institutions use multiple sets of standards in academic program evaluation. Standards for accrediting agency approval are used by 98 per cent of the institutions, and 76 per cent of the institutions also use the standards of the discipline that is being evaluated. Three standards that are used with approximately the same frequency are local standards (65%), state guidelines (63%), and national or regional standards (62%). Only one institution (2%) indicates that it employs additional standards other than those listed on the questionnaire; this other response is synodical criteria.

The raw data indicate that the largest number of
institutions employ multiple sets of standards. The
majority of the responding institutions utilize 4 or 5
standards when conducting academic program evaluation.

The data on the purposes of academic program evaluation
are presented in Table III. Respondents were asked to rank
these purposes according to importance.

TABLE III

PURPOSES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION

| Purpose | Responses | | | | | Rank |
| | Most Important | to | | Least Important | | |
	1	2	3	4	5	
Program change (or modification)	23	11	6	4	2	1
Course evaluation	10	10	12	7	3	2
Faculty evaluation	10	8	10	9	4	3
Program continuance-termination	5	12	6	10	7	4
Fund raising-public relations	1	.	2	2	5	5
Institute new program	2	1	6	7	17	6

The purpose of program change or modification is
ranked first by the responding institutions; 23 of the
respondents ranked this purpose as most important for
academic program evaluation. Course evaluation is ranked
second; 20 of the responding institutions ranked course

evaluation highly as a purpose of academic program evaluation.

Faculty evaluation is the purpose of academic program evaluation that is ranked third by the respondents; 28 of the respondents ranked faculty evaluation as greater than or equal to third rank as an important purpose of academic program evaluation at their institutions. Program continuance or termination is ranked fourth; 33 of the respondents regard program continuance or termination of lesser importance as a purpose of academic program evaluation at their institution.

The next-to-least important purpose of academic program evaluation ranked by the respondents is fund raising-public relations; this purpose is ranked fifth by 10 of the respondents. Instituting a new program is ranked sixth; 33 of the respondents ranked this purpose as the least important for academic program evaluation.

Two of the respondents indicated an other purpose of academic program evaluation. These purposes are instructional improvement and to satisfy an accrediting agency.

Frequency of Occurrence of Academic Program Evaluation

Table IV presents data concerning the frequency of occurrence of academic program evaluation at the responding institutions. Respondents were asked to mark all applicable responses.

TABLE IV

FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM
EVALUATION AT RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Frequency of Evaluations	Frequency	Percentage
Annually	25	54
During self-study	24	52
As part of an accrediting team visitation*	21	46
Other	9	20
Each semester	4	9

*See Ch. V, Implications.

Table IV data show that the majority of the respondents conduct academic program evaluation on a regular basis. The responses indicate that 54 per cent conduct academic program evaluation annually; 52 per cent and 46 per cent, respectively, conduct academic program evaluation during a self-study or as part of an accrediting team visitation. Conducting an evaluation each semester is indicated by only 9 per cent of the responses. Twenty-six institutions selected only one response; 8 institutions marked two frequencies; 11 marked three and two institutions made four selections.

The other responses (20%) indicated in Table IV are five different occurrences for the frequency of academic program evaluation. These frequencies are as needed, on an irregular basis, continuous, every five years, and when called for by the coordinating board.

Organization, Techniques, and Reporting of
Academic Program Evaluations

The data presented in Table V indicate the organiza-
tional format utilized in academic program evaluation by
the responding institutions. The respondents were asked
to check all applicable responses.

TABLE V

ORGANIZATIONAL FORMATS FOR ACADEMIC
PROGRAM EVALUATION

Organizational Method	Frequency	Percentage
Department-wide	28	61
Campus-wide	27	59
Division-wide	24	52
Discipline only	16	35
Other	1	2

The respondents use a variety of organizational for-
mats when conducting an academic program evaluation. The
organizational formats appear to have no relationship with
whether or not the institution is public or private.
Sixty-one per cent of the responses indicate the use of a
department-wide organizational format of academic program
evaluation (13 public and 15 private); 59 per cent also use
a campus-wide format (11 public and 16 private). A divi-
sion-wide format of academic program evaluation is used
by 52 per cent of the institutions (11 public and 13 pri-
vate), but a discipline-only organizational format is

utilized by only 35 per cent (9 public and 7 private). The one _other_ format used is accrediting agency requirements by a private school.

Table VI presents data regarding the techniques used in collecting information for academic program evaluation. The respondents were asked to check all responses that apply.

TABLE VI

TECHNIQUES USED IN COLLECTING INFORMATION
FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION

Technique	Frequency	Percentage
Formal reports	36	78
Questionnaire	35	76
Interviews	33	72
Informal reports	26	57
Other	3	7

A majority of the respondents employ a combination of techniques for collecting evaluation information. The most frequently used technique is formal reports (78%), but 76 per cent also use the questionnaire technique. Responses indicate that the interview technique is used by 72 per cent, and 57 per cent collect information for academic program evaluation through informal reports. Only 7 per cent use _other_ techniques that include data from institutional

research, committee-specified techniques, and accrediting agency techniques.

The data presented in Table VII represent the type of report prepared at the end of the evaluation process. Respondents were instructed to check all applicable responses.

TABLE VII

TYPES OF FINAL REPORTS PREPARED IN
ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION

Report Type	Frequency*	Percentage
Formal	37	80
Written	31	67
Informal	17	37
Verbal	13	28

*65 per cent of respondents (30) made multiple choices; 70 per cent (32) selected both formal and written and 17 per cent (8) checked all four types.

Texas senior colleges and universities appear to use a variety of techniques when preparing final academic program evaluation reports. Whether the institution is public or private, the majority of the institutions utilize either one or a combination of two of the reporting methods.

Upon completion of the evaluation process, the responses show that 80 per cent prepare a formal report; for 67 per cent, the final form of the report is written. Less frequently utilized (37%) is an informal final report. Only 28 per cent employ the verbal final report method.

The types of information employed in making judgments concerning academic program evaluations are presented in Table VIII. All responses that apply were checked by the respondents.

TABLE VIII

TYPES OF INFORMATION UTILIZED IN MAKING JUDGMENTS
CONCERNING ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION

Type of Information	Frequency	Percentage
Faculty opinions	44	96
Students' opinions	43	94
Enrollment data	39	85
Financial data	35	76
Accrediting reports	35	76
Information from business or industry	26	57
Outside consultants judgments	22	48
Alumni opinion	19	41
Denominational criteria	9	20
Students grades	9	20
Other	2	4

The respondents utilize a variety of sources in making judgments concerning academic program evaluations. The largest number, 96 per cent, employ faculty opinions in academic program evaluations. The next most frequent source (94%) is students' opinions, and 85 per cent use enrollment data. Financial data and accreditation reports

are utilized equally as sources by 76 per cent of the respondents, and 57 per cent also use information from business and industry in evaluation reports. Responses indicate that other sources are outside consultants (48%), alumni opinion (41%), denominational criteria (20%), and student grades (20%). Only 4 per cent also use other sources that include state board exams, employment statistics, and accreditation agency information.

Participants in the Academic
Program Evaluation Process

The data presented in Table IX reflect identification of the person or persons whose job description identifies responsibility for academic program evaluation. The respondents were asked to check all applicable responses.

TABLE IX

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION
AS INDICATED BY JOB DESCRIPTION

Responsible Person	Frequency	Percentage
A vice president	29	63
A dean	29	63
A department chairperson	18	39
A director of institutional research	4	9
A committee chairperson	2	4
Other	2	4

A majority of the respondents indicate that an administrator is responsible for academic program evaluations, and this responsibility is included in job descriptions. A vice-president (63%) and a dean (63%) are also identified as responsible for academic program evaluation. The department chairperson's job description provided for academic program evaluation responsibility in 39 per cent of the responses, but only 9 per cent identified the director of institutional research and 4 per cent a committee chairperson. The 4 per cent that chose an other individual identified a program head and the chairman of the commission for college planning.

The data that identify the position of the person who is responsible for initiating academic program evaluation are shown in Table X. All applicable responses were indicated by the responding institutional representatives.

TABLE X

TITLES OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR
INITIATING ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION

Title	Frequency	Percentage
A vice president	29	63
A dean	25	54
A department chairperson	12	26
Other	4	9
A director of institutional research	3	7
A committee chairperson	3	7

According to the responses, the initiation of academic program evaluation tends to center around an administrator. A majority of the responses identified a vice president (63%) and a dean (54%) as the persons responsible for initiation. Only 26 per cent indicated that a department chairperson initiates academic program evaluation. Seven per cent each identified a director of institutional research or a committee chairperson as the initiator of academic program evaluation. Other initiators (9%) include a program head, a president, the faculty, and the accrediting agency.

Participants in the academic program evaluation process is the subject of the data in Table XI. The respondents were asked to check all applicable responses.

TABLE XI

PARTICIPANTS IN THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM
EVALUATION PROCESS

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Administrators	44	96
Faculty	43	94
Students	36	78
Outside consultants	20	44
Alumni	15	33
Institutional research office	14	30
Government agencies	5	11
Other	3	7

Many groups were indicated by the responses as participants in the academic program evaluation process. According to the raw data, the majority of the responding institutions includes from 3 to 5 groups as participants in the evaluation procedure. The groups that the responses identified as providing the most information for the evaluation process are administrators (98%), faculty (94%), and students (78%). Also utilized are outside consultants (44%), alumni (33%), and institutional research personnel (30%). Only 11 per cent make use of government agencies. Other responses (7%) list the teacher education center, the board of trustees, and the accrediting agency.

Respondents were also asked to identify the administrators who are involved in academic program evaluation. A condensed list includes the president, vice president, dean, department or division chairperson, and members of the board of trustees. Additional participants mentioned are the director of research, the academic affairs council, the business manager, the registrar, and the admissions director.

The data concerning the identification of the person who makes final judgment in the academic program evaluation process is shown in Table XII. Respondents were instructed to check only one response.

TABLE XII

IDENTIFICATION OF PERSON WHO MAKES FINAL
JUDGMENT IN THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM
EVALUATION PROCESS

Person	Frequency	Percentage
The president	28	60.8
A vice president	9	19.6
A dean	5	10.9
No response	4	8.7
Total	46	100.0

A clear majority, 61 per cent, responded that the
president of the institution is the person who makes final
judgments concerning the evaluation process; the institu-
tions that comprise this majority are 68 per cent of the
private institutions and 61 per cent of the public institu-
tions. Of the 9 institutions (20%) that identify a vice
president as the final judge, 2 are public institutions.
The 5 (11%) institutions that identify a dean and the 4
(9%) institutions that did not respond to this question are
private institutions.

The subject of the data in Table XIII is the identifi-
cation of the groups or persons to whom the final program
evaluation report is made. Respondents were instructed
to check all responses that apply.

TABLE XIII

RECIPIENTS OF THE FINAL ACADEMIC PROGRAM
EVALUAION REPORT.

Recipient	Frequency	Percentage
Administration officials	42	91
Faculty	25	54
Accrediting agency	24	52
Department chairperson	23	50
Board of trustees	20	44
Coordinating board	10	22
Students	4	9
Funding agency	2	4
Denomination-private authority	1	2

Administrative officials are most frequently presented with the final academic program evaluation report according to 91 per cent of the responses. The next largest groups identified as report recipients are faculty (54%), department chairpersons (50%), and members of the board of trustees (44%). Only 22 per cent presented a final report to a coordinating board. The least cited recipient groups are students (9%), funding agencies (4%), and denomination-private authority (2%).

A study of the raw data indicates that the majority of the respondents make a final academic program evaluation report to four groups. The most frequent recipients of

the report are administrative officials, faculty, an
accrediting agency, and department chairpersons.

Table XIV data are related to the individuals or
groups who have access to the final academic program evalu-
ation report. The respondents were asked to check all
responses that apply.

TABLE XIV

GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ACCESS TO
THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Individuals or Groups	Frequency	Percentage
Administration officials	44	96
Faculty	42	91
Department chairperson	40	87
Board of trustees	36	78
Accrediting agency	34	74
Students	17	37
Coordinating board	15	33
Funding agency	10	22
Denomination-private authority	7	15
Other	4	9

The data in Table XIV indicate clearly that academic
program evaluation reports are accessible to many different
groups. Administrative officials (96%) and faculty (91%)
are the largest groups to have access to the final academic
program evaluation report. Following are department

chairpersons (87%), members of the board of trustees (78%), accrediting agencies (74%), students (37%), the coordinating board (33%), funding agencies (22%), and denomination-private authorities (15%). Other responses (9%) identify a dean, the academic affairs council, and the development office as having access to the final academic program evaluation report.

Selected Institutional Characteristics
Related to Academic Program
Evaluation

Table XV data present the annual student enrollment of the institutions that responded to this study. Respondents were asked to check only one response.

TABLE XV

STUDENT ENROLLMENT AT THE
RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Enrollment	Frequency	Percentage
Up to 5,000	33	71.7
5,001 to 10,000	3	6.5
10,000 to 15,000	2	4.4
15,000+	8	17.4
Total	46	100.0

Of the responding institutions, 33 (72%) enroll up to 5,000 students annually, and 8 (17%) institutions enroll more than 15,000 students annually. Three (7%) institutions

enroll between 5,000 to 10,000 students, and only two
(4%) institutions enroll between 10,000 to 15,000 students
on a yearly basis.

Table XVI data show the classifications of the
respondent institutions by control. The majority of the
respondent institutions to this study are privately con-
trolled (61%); 54 per cent are church affiliated colleges
or universities, and only 7 per cent are non-church
affiliated institutions. Public institutions compose 39
per cent of the respondent institutions.

TABLE XVI

CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENT
INSTITUTIONS BY CONTROL

Control	Frequency	Percentage
Public	18	39.1
Private (non-church affiliated)	3	6.5
Private (church affiliated)	25	54.4
Total	46	100.0

Table XVII data show the academic organization of the
responding institutions. Exactly 50 per cent of the
responding institutions are organized into schools and
colleges. Forty-eight per cent of the institutions are

TABLE XVII

ORGANIZATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF
RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS

Organization	Frequency	Percentage
Single college (no depart- ments)	1	2.2
Departments	22	47.8
Schools and colleges	23	50.0
Total	46	100.0

organized by academic department, and only one institution

(2%) is a single college that has no departmental divisions.

Utilization of Academic Program
Evaluation Results

Respondents were asked to rank the ways in which

academic program evaluation results are utilized. Table

XVIII presents these data.

The evaluation utilization program change or modifica-

tion is ranked first by the responding institutions; 23

institutions ranked this use of academic program evaluation

results as most important. Course evaluation is ranked

second; 17 of the responding institutions ranked course

evaluation as a highly important means of utilizing the

results of academic program evaluations.

TABLE XVIII

UTILIZATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM
EVALUATION RESULTS

Utilization	Responses					Rank
	Most Important		to		Least Important	
	1	2	3	4	5	
Program change	23	9	11	2	.	1
Course evaluation	9	8	9	11	4	2
Program continuance	4	15	6	10	5	3
Faculty evaluation	7	8	6	10	8	4
Institute new programs	4	2	8	5	19	5
Fund raising	.	1	2	3	3	6

Program continuance or termination is ranked third; 25 of the institutions regard this utilization of academic program evaluation results as important. Faculty evaluation ranks fourth; 31 of the institutions regard faculty evaluation as a less important usage of academic program evaluation results.

The next-to-least important utilization of academic program evaluation results is to institute new programs; this utilization is ranked fifth by 38 of the respondents. Fund raising is ranked sixth; this utilization of academic program evaluation results is seen as least important by 9 of the respondents. Other utilizations of academic program evaluation results are for program credibility and integrity and accrediting agency utilization.

Table XIX presents data that pertain to the future role of academic program evaluation. The respondents were asked to make a future projection regarding whether or not academic program evaluation will be of greater or lesser importance to higher education.

TABLE XIX

RESPONSES REGARDING THE FUTURE ROLE
OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION

Future Role	Frequency	Percentage
Increasing importance	41	89
Decreasing importance	5	11
Total	46	100

The majority of the respondents (89%) predict that academic program evaluation will be of greater importance to higher education in the future. Only 11 per cent predict that program evaluation will be less important to higher education in the future.

Summary of Data Findings

Based on the collected data, following is a summary of the major findings of this study.

1. The most important goal of academic program evaluation is to upgrade academic programs.

2. The standards most frequently used to conduct academic program evaluation are accrediting agency standards.

3. The major purpose of academic program evaluation is for program change or modification.

4. The majority of the responding institutions indicates that they conduct academic program evaluation annually.

5. The respondent institutions most frequently utilize a department-wide academic evaluation method that culminates in the dissemination of information by a formal report.

6. Faculty opinion is the most utilized source of information for making judgments that concern academic program evaluations.

7. Most often, it is a vice president or a dean who is responsible for academic program evaluation.

8. A vice president is the one who most frequently initiates academic program evaluation.

9. Administrators are the most likely participants in the academic program evaluation process.

10. The president of the institution most often makes the final judgments concerning academic program evaluation processes.

11. Administrators are the most frequent recipients of academic program evaluation reports.

12. Once the process is complete, administrative officials are the most likely group to have access to the final evaluation reports.

13. The majority of the responding institutions enroll less than 5,000 students annually, are private church-related institutions, and are organized into schools or colleges.

14. The most important utilization of academic program evaluation results by the responding institutions is for program change or modification.

15. The respondents predict that the process of academic program evaluation will become increasingly important to higher education in the future.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

Summary

The problem with which this study is concerned is to
determine the status of academic program evaluation in
Texas senior colleges and universities. A survey instru-
ment, which was designed around six research questions,
was evaluated by a panel of three experts. A copy of the
survey was mailed to the presidents of all the public and
private senior colleges and universities in Texas; each
institution president who granted permission to collect
data designated the recipient of the survey instrument.

All data from the returned survey instruments were
computed in frequencies and percentages. Since the purpose
of this study is to determine current procedures, timelines,
participants, and use of academic program evaluation results,
it was determined that frequencies and percentages would
provide the best means to achieve this purpose. In response
to three of the survey questions, the recipients ranked
their responses according to importance.

Summary of Findings

Based on the data from this study, a summary of the findings follows. The findings are grouped as they pertain to research questions.

Research Question One

The following findings reflect the responses of the recipients about the goals, objectives, and purposes of academic program evaluation at their institutions.

1. The responding institutions ranked the goals of academic program evaluation in terms of importance. The most important goal of academic program evaluation is to upgrade academic programs. In descending order of importance, the goals are to maintain accreditation, to determine personnel requirements, to determine cost effectiveness, and to fulfill state requirements or approval.

2. Ninety-eight per cent of the respondent institutions use accrediting agency standards in academic program evaluation, and 76 per cent also use the standards of the discipline being evaluated. In addition, local standards are used in academic program evaluation by 65 per cent of the responding institutions, 63 per cent use state guidelines, and 61 per cent use national-regional guidelines.

3. Program change or modification is the most important purpose of academic program evaluation according to

the responding institutions. Other purposes in order of importance are course evaluation, faculty evaluation, program continuance or termination, fund raising, and instituting new programs.

Research Question Two

Reflecting the frequency with which academic program evaluation occurs at each institution, 54 per cent of the institutions indicated that they conduct academic program evaluation annually. Furthermore, conducting academic program evaluation as part of a self-study is done by 52 per cent of the institutions, and 46 per cent conduct academic program evaluation as part of an accrediting team visitation.

Research Question Three

The following findings reflect the organizational formats utilized in academic program evaluation by the responding institutions.

1. The majority (61%) of the respondent institutions use a department-wide format for academic program evaluation. Also employed are the campus-wide (50%) and the division-wide (52%) organizational formats.

2. Techniques used for data collection in academic program evaluations are the formal report (78%), the questionnaire (76%), the interview (72%), and informal reporting (57%).

3. At the conclusion of the evaluation process, 80 per cent of the respondents prepare a formal report, and 67 per cent prepare a written report.

4. In making judgments that concern academic program evaluations, 96 per cent of the respondents utilize faculty opinions, and 94 per cent also employ students' opinions. Also utilized are enrollment data (85%), financial data and accreditation reports (76%), and information from business and industry (57%).

Research Question Four

The findings in this section indicate the individuals or groups who are involved in the academic program evaluation process.

1. Either a vice president (63%) or a dean (63%) is responsible for academic program evaluation at the majority of the respondent institutions.

2. Academic program evaluation is initiated by either a vice-president (63%) or a dean (54%) according to the respondent institutions.

3. The three groups that provide the majority of the information in the evaluation process are administrators (98%), faculty (94%), and students (78%).

4. Sixty-one per cent of the respondents identified the president of the institution as the individual who makes the final judgments concerning the evaluation process.

5. The four groups that usually receive the final program evaluation reports are administrative officials (91%), faculty (54%), an accrediting agency (52%), and department chairperson (50%).

6. Access to an academic program evaluation report is given to administrative officials (96%), faculty (91%), department chairpersons (87%), members of the board of trustees (78%), and an accrediting agency (74%).

Research Question Five

This section profiles the institutional characteristics of the institutions that responded to this study.

1. Although 72 per cent of the institutions enroll less than 5,000 students annually, 18 per cent enroll over 15,000 students. Seven per cent have enrollments between 5,000 to 10,000 students, and only 4 per cent enroll between 10,000 to 15,000 students. (See Appendix E for list of schools contacted and list of schools responding.)

2. Thirty-nine per cent of the respondent institutions are public institutions and 61 per cent are private; 54 per cent of the private institutions are church-affiliated.

3. Fifty per cent of the respondent institutions are organized into schools or colleges. Departmental organization is used in 48 per cent of the institutions. Only one institution (2%) is a single college.

Research Question Six

The utilization of the academic program evaluation results is reflected in the following findings.

1. Program change or modification is the most important utilization of academic program evaluation results at the respondent institutions. In declining order, other implementations of academic program evaluation results include course evaluation, program continuance, faculty evaluation, instituting new programs, and fund raising.

2. Academic program evaluation will play an increasingly important role in higher education, according to the predictions of the respondents.

Implications and Discussion
of the Findings

Based on the findings of this study, the goals, objectives, and purposes of academic program evaluation appear to be closely associated in Texas senior colleges and universities. The respondents indicated that the most important goal of academic program evaluation is to upgrade academic programs. Accrediting agency standards, which, if met, are assumed by the institutions to automatically upgrade the quality of academic programs, are, therefore, frequently utilized to accomplish this goal. In order to achieve the goal of upgrading academic programs, the institutions identified the most important purpose of academic program evaluation as program change or modification. In other words, the

quality of the academic program is of highest importance,
and the institutions are willing to be flexible enough to
alter or modify an academic program if such is needed to
upgrade or enrich the program. No obvious reference was
made to the use of program evaluation for reductions in
offerings or programs.

The findings indicate that academic program evaluation
is not conducted only to please the accrediting agency.
Table IV in Chapter IV indicates that not all institutions
in the state are conducting program evaluations as part
of the accrediting process. These data must be viewed with
great care, however, because almost all the institutions
are accredited and are expected to utilize program evalua-
tion as a part of the accrediting process. Serious doubt
must be raised about the number of responses indicating
annual program evaluation. Typically, Texas institutions
are not known for having systematic annual program evalua-
tion.

In order to maintain a high level of academic programs,
most institutions responded that they evaluate academic pro-
grams annually. Although annually could imply that each
academic program within an institution is evaluated
annually, a more likely implication or interpretation is
that programs are evaluated on a rotating basis (probably
on a three-to-five year interim) or when a special need
arises such as a notable increase or decrease in enrollment.

It is also implied that as a result of annual academic program evaluation, academic programs are changed or modified to improve their quality.

The respondent Texas institutions most often use the department-wide organizational format for academic program evaluation. Since disciplines of similar or related subject matter can be evaluated most effectively on a comparative basis, the results of concomitant academic evaluations can be used to improve the overall effectiveness of a college or school.

Since the evaluation of a department will normally involve the evaluation of two or more academic programs (e.g., an undergraduate program, a master's program, a doctoral program), there is an implied evaluation of areas outside the target program or department (major-minor integration and support courses). A timely example of such program integration is the decision to allow computer science to be elected in selected programs as an option for the foreign language requirement. The ripple effect of such a decision among departments is obvious.

The most frequently used technique for collecting academic program evaluation information is by a formal report, and the word *formal* implies that the report will be a written one. This procedure culminates in the preparation of a comprehensive formal written report at the end of the evaluation process. Such a formal written report is

important because the document can serve as a guideline throughout the period to the next evaluation for upgrading the program. It also means that improvements or modifications can be evaluated more effectively by comparison with previous years' evaluation reports.

According to the findings, the opinion of faculty and students is the most frequently utilized type of information in formulating evaluation judgments. This is an important finding since, together, faculty (as administrators of the program) and students (as recipients of the program) may be able to delineate any discrepancies that may occur within the academic department. An implication of the importance of faculty and student opinion on program evaluation is the fact that the interests of each can create new programs and diminish others. Computer technology, again, is a good exmple of how interest and student demand (because of career opportunities) can create academic programs. Another example is the energy crisis that spawned many academic programs; in this instance, the federal government sponsored many types of research programs that are conducted by faculty members.

Academic program evaluation is most effective when a variety of participants provide information for the evaluation process. According to the findings, a vice president or a dean is the individual most frequently responsible for academic program evaluation. This responsibility,

specifically for the vice president, includes initiating the evaluation process. Administrators and faculty are those who most often provide information in the evaluation procedure.

Once the evaluation information is assembled, the president of the institution is the individual who makes final judgments and formulates them into a final report for designated administrators and faculty. The major impact may be highly centralized. Obviously, however, there must be this ultimate authority whose viewpoint is broad and institutional. The importance of report accessibility lies in the fact that administrators are responsible for initiating changes in the academic program, and faculty are responsible for incorporating the changes. The implication is that faculty members will be more receptive to program changes if they understand the rationale behind the changes.

Both the review of the literature and the responses to this study indicate that evaluation reports are closely held. One hesitates to assume that this is so because most evaluations are fault-finding; neither, however, can it be assumed that most evaluations are likely to be laudatory. When any evaluative report is made, there is always the possibility that wide dissemination can enhance the probability that one or more findings will be taken out of context and misunderstood. There is also the

possibility that such reports have a limited audience regardless of the findings because need-to-know is restricted by intent.

According to the responses, systematic program evaluation occurs most frequently among private church-related institutions that enroll fewer than 5,000 students annually; the vocal lay advisors who support such colleges could prompt more frequent changes and evaluations (exclusion of certain texts, for example, because of material that is viewed as offensive). Whereas program evaluation is more often associated with public institutions because they must fulfill state guidelines, it is noteworthy, nevertheless, that the findings of this study indicate that academic program evaluation appears to occur as frequently in private as in public institutions.

According to the findings of this study, program change or modification is the most important utilization of the results of academic program evaluation. This finding is important in relation to the finding that program change or modification is also the purpose of academic program evaluation. This congruence implies that a reason or problem (positive or negative) may have been identified which motivates the evaluation of a program. Whatever the impetus, institutions appear to utilize the results of academic program evaluation to accomplish the stated purpose.

Academic program evaluation will probably continue for many years in institutions of higher education in Texas; the respondents predict that academic program evaluation will play an increasingly important role in higher education. Based on this finding, it may be assumed that institutions will work to improve the process of academic program evaluation.

Conclusions

Based on data collected and the findings of this study, the following conclusions about academic program evaluation at Texas senior colleges and universities seem to be warranted.

1. Higher education institutions in Texas are very concerned with the quality of their academic programs.

2. According to the respondents, academic programs appear to be evaluated frequently in a stated effort to enhance program quality.

3. Final academic program evaluation reports appear to be available for institutional use but not for public distribution.

4. Institutional size or type does not appear to be a factor in whether or not academic program evaluations are conducted.

5. The results of academic program evaluations are apparently used to secure changes and modifications, thereby improving the quality of academic programs.

6. Since few actual academic program evaluation reports are published, the value of such evaluations is dependent upon intent, accurate data collection, and the forcefulness behind the instigation of such evaluations.

7. As technology and research increase the specialty areas within each discipline, the role of academic program evaluation in higher education will become increasingly important.

Recommendations for Future Study

Based on this study of academic program evaluation at Texas senior colleges and universities, the following future studies are recommended.

1. It is recommended that a study be conducted to determine the specific methods utilized at institutions to determine the effectiveness of these methods.

2. Based on the finding that academic program evaluation will play a greater part in the future of higher education, studies should be conducted to determine who provides the most important information into the evaluation process.

3. A more concerted effort needs to be made to collect and document the successes and failures of academic program evaluations.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Dallas Baptist College
7007 West Kiest
Dallas, Texas 75211
January 3, 1982

President F. Henderson McDowell
East Texas State University
East Texas Station
Commerce, Texas 75248

Dear President McDowell:

I am currently working on my dissertation for my Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration at North Texas State University. Your assistance would greatly facilitate this undertaking by granting permission to collect data at your institution.

The problem of this study is to determine the status of academic program evaluation in Texas senior colleges and universities. In this analysis I am only concerned with evaluation procedures of courses for which academic credit is given. The purpose of this study is to determine current procedures, timelines, participants, and use of results in academic program evaluation for both public and private Texas senior colleges and universities. The data collected for this study will be used solely for my dissertation and each institution participating will remain anonymous. No institution will be reported by name.

With your approval will you please send me the name of the person to whom the questionnaire should be directed? A postcard is enclosed for your convenience. Also, in order for you to understand the data that will be requested, a sample questionnaire is enclosed. Your assistance and cooperation in expediting this request is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jo Loyd Skidmore
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department

Enclosures (2)

APPENDIX B

Dallas Baptist College
7007 West Kiest
Dallas, Texas 75211
September 21, 1981

Dr. Earl McCallon
Department of Higher Education
North Texas State University
N.T. Station
Denton, Texas 76203

Dear Dr. McCallon:

I am currently working on my dissertation for my Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration at North Texas State University. Your assistance would greatly facilitate this undertaking by acting as an evaluator of my survey instrument.

The problem of this study is to determine the status of academic program evaluation in Texas senior colleges and universities. In this analysis I am only concerned with evaluation procedures of courses for which academic credit is given. The purpose of this study is to determine current procedures, timelines, participants, and use of results in academic program evaluation for both public and private Texas senior colleges and universities. In order to accomplish the above purpose, the following research questions are presented:

1. What are the goals, objectives, and purposes for conducting academic program evaluation?

2. How frequently does academic program evaluation occur?

3. What methods of academic program evaluation are most often utilized by the institutions?

4. Who participates in the evaluation process?

5. What are the institutional characteristics most related to systematic program evaluation?

6. How are the results of academic program evaluation utilized?

Dr. Earl McCallon
September 21, 1981
Page Two

Enclosed in this letter you will find a copy of the questionnaire. Please analyze the questionnaire and indicate any appropriate changes out in the margin or on a separate sheet. Additional questions may be written in the appropriate section. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by October 5.

Thank you for your cooperation. Your years of experience in higher education as well as your insightful intuition will provide invaluable assistance in the completion of this project.

Sincerely,

JoLynn Loyd-Skidmore
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

Academic Program Evaluation Questionnaire

1. How many students does your institution enroll annually?

　　_____　　　　　1-5,000

　　_____　　　5,001-10,000

　　_____　　10,001-15,000

　　_____　　15,000+

2. What type of academic institution is your school?

　　_____　public

　　_____　private (non-church affiliated)

　　_____　private (church affiliated)

3. Which of the following describes the academic organization of your institution?

　　_____　single college (no departments)

　　_____　departments

　　_____　schools/colleges

4. Which of the following best describes the goal of academic program evaluation at your institution? Mark five of the following in order of importance. Place a 1 by the most important item and continue through 5 as the least important.

　　_____　to upgrade academic programs

　　_____　to determine personnel requirements

　　_____　to maintain accreditation

　　_____　to fulfill state requirements or approval

　　_____　to determine cost effectiveness

　　_____　other (please specify) _____

5. Check all of the standards that are used in academic program evaluation on your campus.

　　_____　national or regional

　　_____　accrediting agencies

　　_____　state guidelines

_____ standards of the discipline

_____ local standards

_____ other (please specify) _____

6. What are the specific purposes of academic program evaluation at your institution? Mark five of the following in order of importance. Place a 1 by the most important item and continue through 5 as the least important.

_____ faculty evaluation

_____ course evaluation

_____ program continuance/termination

_____ fund raising/public relations

_____ institute new program

_____ other (please specify) _____

7. How often does academic program evaluation occur at your institution?

_____ annually

_____ each semester

_____ during self-study

_____ as part of an accrediting team visitation

_____ other (please specify)

8. What method of academic program evaluation is used on your campus? Check all that apply.

_____ campus wide

_____ division wide (or school/college)

_____ department wide

_____ discipline only

_____ other (please specify) _____

9. On your campus, whose job description contains responsibility for academic program evaluation?

_____ a vice president

_____ a dean

_____ a department chairperson

_____ a director of institutional research

_____ a committee chairperson

_____ other (please specify) _____

10. Who is responsible for initiating academic program evaluation at your institution?

_____ a vice president

_____ a dean

_____ a department chairperson

_____ a director of institutional research

_____ a committee chairperson

_____ other (please identify) _____

11. Who provides input in the academic program evaluation process? Check all that apply.

_____ administrators (please list)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ faculty

_____ students

_____ institutional research office

_____ alumni

_____ government agencies

_____ outside consultants

_____ other (please identify)

12. Who makes final judgments concerning the academic program evaluation process? Check only one.

_____ the president

_____ a vice president

_____ a dean

_____ a department chairperson

_____ a director of institutional research

_____ a committee chairperson

13. What technique is used in collecting information for the evaluation? Check all that apply.

_____ questionnaire

_____ interviewing

_____ formal reports

_____ informal reports

_____ other (please specify) _____

14. What type of report is prepared at the end of the evaluation process? Check all that apply.

_____ formal

_____ informal

_____ written

_____ verbal

15. To whom is the final academic program evaluation report made? Check all that apply.

_____ board of trustees

_____ accrediting agency

_____ coordinating board

_____ funding agency

_____ faculty

_____ students

_____ denomination/private authority

_____ administration officials

_____ department chairperson

16. Once the final report is made, which of the following then has access to the report? Check all that apply.

_____ board of trustees

_____ accrediting agency

_____ coordinating board

_____ funding agency

_____ faculty

_____ students

_____ denomination/private authority

_____ administration officials

_____ department chairperson

_____ other (please identify) _____

17. What type of information is utilized in making judgments concerning academic program evaluation? Check all that apply.

_____ faculty opinions

_____ student opinions

_____ denominational criteria

_____ outside consultants judgments

_____ students grades

_____ enrollment data

_____ financial data

_____ accrediting reports

_____ alumni opinion

_____ information form business/industry

_____ other (please specify) _____

18. Which of the following describes how the results of academic program evaluation are utilized on your campus? Mark five of the following in order of importance. Place a 1 by the most important item and continue through 5 as the least important.

_____ faculty evaluation

_____ course evaluation

_____ program change (modification)

_____ program continuance/termination

_____ fund raising/public relations

_____ institute new programs

_____ other (please specify)

19. Projecting into the future, what role do you believe academic program evaluation will play in higher education?

_____ increasing importance

_____ decreasing importance

_____ no importance

_____ other (please specify) _____

20. Any additional comments:

APPENDIX D

Dallas Baptist College
6007 West Kiest
Dallas, Texas 75211
January 26, 1982

Dean D. L. Chappell
CR 417
The University of Texas of
  the Permian Basin
Odessa, Texas 79762

Dear Dean Chappell:

The president of your institution has granted permission
for me to collect dissertation data at your institution.
In doing so, your president recommended the questionnaire
be directed to you for completion.

The problem of this study is to determine the status of
academic program evaluation in Texas senior colleges and
universities. In this analysis I am only concerned with
evaluation procedures of courses for which academic credit
is given. The purpose of this study is to determine
current procedures, timelines, participants, and use of
results in academic program evaluation for both public
and private Texas senior colleges and universities. The
data collected for this study will be used solely for my
dissertation and each institution participating will remain
anonymous. No institution will be reported by name.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it
by February 5. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is
enclosed for your convenience. Your cooperation is greatly
appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jo Loyd Skidmore
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department

Enclosure

APPENDIX E

Population of the Study
(* indicates respondents)

Public Schools:

   *East Texas State University
    East Texas State University Center at Texarkana
   *Lamar University
    Lamar University at Orange
    Lamar University at Port Arthur
   *Midwestern State University
   *North Texas State University
    Pan American University
   *Pan American University at Brownsville
    Stephen F. Austin State University
   *Texas A & M University at Galveston
    Prairie View A & M University
    Tarleton State University
   *Texas A & M University
    Texas Southern University
   *Angelo State University
   *Sam Houston State University
    Southwest Texas State University
    Sul Ross State University
   *Texas Tech University
    Texas Woman's University
   *The University of Texas at Arlington
   *The University of Texas at Austin
   *The University of Texas at Dallas
   *The University of Texas at El Paso
   *The University of Texas of the Permian Basin
    The University of Texas at San Antonio
    The University of Texas at Tyler
   *University of Houston Central Campus
    University of Houston at Downtown College
    University of Houston at Clear Lake City
   *University of Houston Center at Victoria
    Corpus Christi State University
   *Laredo State University
    Texas A & I University
    West Texas State University

Private Schools:

   *Abilene Christian University
   *Abilene Christian University at Dallas

*American Technological University
*Austin College
 Baylor University
*Bishop College
*Concordia Lutheran College
*Dallas Baptist College
*East Texas Baptist College
 Gulf-Coast Bible College
 Hardin-Simmons University
*Houston Baptist University
*Howard Payne University
*Huston-Tillotson College
*Incarnate Word College
*Jarvis Christian College
*LeTourneau College
 Lubbock Christian College
*McMurray College
*Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio
*Paul Quinn College
*Saint Edward's University
 Saint Mary's University
*South Texas College of Law
 Southern Methodist University
*Southwestern Adventist College
*Southwestern University
*Texas Christian University
 Texas College
*Texas Lutheran College
*Texas Wesleyan College
*Trinity University
 University of Dallas
*University of Mary Hardin-Baylor
*University of Saint Thomas
 Wayland Baptist College
*Wiley college
 William Marsh Rice University

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Alkin, Marvin D., Richard Daillak, and Peter White, _Using Evaluations: Does Evaluation Make a Difference?_ Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, 1979.

Anderson, Scarvia B., and Samuel Ball, _The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Craven, Eugene C., editor, _New Directions for Institutional Research: Academic Program Evaluation_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Cronbach, Lee J., and others, _Toward Reform of Program Evaluation_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Doyle, K. O., Jr., _Student Evaluation of Instruction_, Lexington, Lexington Books, 1975.

Eurich, Alvin C., editor, _Compus 1980_, New York, Delacorte Press, 1968.

Glenny, Lyman A., and others, _Presidents Confront Reality_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Jedamus, Paul and Marvin W. Peterson and Associates, editors, _Improving Academic Management: A Handbook of Planning and Institutional Research_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Levine, Arthur, _When Dreams and Heroes Died_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Mayhew, Lewis B., _Legacy of the Seventies_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Raizen, Senta A., and Peter H. Rossi, editors, _Program Evaluation in Education: When? How? To What Ends?_ Washington, National Academy Press, 1981.

Stadtman, Verne A., _Academic Adaptations_, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Stake, Robert E., _Evaluating Educational Programs_, Paris, France, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1976.

Tyler, Ralph, editor, _Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means_, Chicago, National Society for the Study of Education, 1969.

Weiss, Carol H., editor, _Evaluating Action Programs_, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

_____, _Evaluation Research_, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Worthen, Blaine R., and James R. Sanders, editors, _Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice_, Worthington, Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973.

Articles

Aleamoni, L. M., and R. E. Spencer, "The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire: A Description of its Development and a Report of Some of its Results," _Educational and Psychological Measurement_, 33 (1973), 669-684.

Scriven, Michael, "Pros and Cons about Goal-Free Evaluation," _Evaluation Comment_, 3 (1972), 1-4.

Stumpf, Stephen A., "Assessing Academic Program and Department Effectiveness Using Student Evaluation Data," _Research in Higher Education_, 11, No. 4 (1979), 353-363.

Reports

Ayers, Jerry B., "Tennessee Technological University Teacher Evaluation Model, Year VI: Study of the Teacher Preparation Programs of Tennessee Technological University," ERIC document 1979 535, August, 1979.

Barak, Robert J., _Program Review in Higher Education: Within and Without_, Boulder, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1982.

Barak, Robert J., and Robert O. Berdahl, "State-Level Academic Program Review in Higher Education," Denver, Education Commission of the States, February, 1978.

Drummond, Robert J., "1978 Follow-Up Study of University of Maine at Orono College of Education Graduates, 1975-1977," ERIC document 175 896, December, 1978.

Hall, Gene E., and Shirely M. Hord, "Teacher Education Program Evaluation and Follow-up Studies: A Collection of Current Efforts," ERIC document 176 98D, 1978.

Koon, Jeff, "Social Science-Related Programs at Berkeley: An Academic Review Using Comparative Student Evaluations," ERIC document 180 903, November, 1979.

Schwab, D. P., "Manual for the Course Evaluation Instrument," University of Wisconsin-Madison, Graduate School of Business and Industrial Relations, 1976.

Trotter, Barbara, and others, "Internal Formative Evaluation of Graduate Level Science Education at Temple University," ERIC document 179 383, July, 1979.

Worthen, Blaine R., "A Look at the Mosaic of Educational Evaluation and Accountability," Portland, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, August, 1974.

Wortman, Paul M., and others, "An Evaluation of the Integrated Science Program: Final Report," ERIC document 186 208, June, 1979.

Unpublished Materials

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, "Policy Guidelines for Statewide Academic Program Review," unpublished document, 1980.

Freedman, Richard D., Stephen A. Stumpf, and Kenneth M. Krieger, "Business Students Perceptions of Subject Matter, Their Learning, Evaluation of Courses, and School Comparisons," unpublished paper, the 38th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco, August, 1978.