Barriers to Program Evaluation: UCLA Outreach Program Staff Perspectives

Sandy Taut & Marvin C. Alkin

Occasional Report #10

Outreach Evaluation

OCCASIONAL REPORT SERIES

Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
UCLA

Barriers to Program Evaluation:
UCLA Outreach Program Staff Perspectives

Sandy Taut & Marvin C. Alkin

OCCASIONAL REPORT #10

May, 2002

Outreach Evaluation Project
Marvin C. Alkin, Project Director

Graduate School of Education and Information Studies

UCLA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Purpose of the Study

This study investigated the nature of barriers to program evaluation, as perceived by UCLA Outreach program staff. The study served a dual purpose: (1) expanding existing research on factors explaining barriers to evaluation; (2) enhancing communication between evaluation team and program staff about concerns and hopes regarding the ongoing evaluation efforts and deriving ideas for improvements.

Study Procedures

The study consisted of three parts. First of all, we were interested in staff attitudes toward evaluation. Secondly, we asked the participants in general terms to share what they thought to be barriers to evaluation. The third part of the study was based on the existing literature on explanatory factors for barriers to evaluation. The principal investigator conducted sixteen semi-structured, confidential, 45-minute interviews (see interview protocol in Appendix A). The sample of interviewees included program staff from different hierarchical levels (see pp. 5-7).

Findings

- The respondents' own attitudes toward evaluation were generally much more positive than what they believed others to feel about evaluation (see pp. 7-10).

- When asked to explain barriers to evaluation without any further prompts, participants seem to believe that human factors were most important, mentioning them twice as often as evaluation factors. Context factors were considered least often.

  This supports prior research done in other settings. Furthermore, it is striking that program staff tend to focus on the actions (or inactions) of the evaluator as the barrier, while evaluators often see program staff as the source of resistance to evaluation (see pp. 10-11).

- There was a great deal of overlap in the themes extracted from the first (attitudes) and the second (unprompted barriers) part of the interview (see Table 8, p. 19). Attitudes toward evaluation seem to be closely tied to barriers.

  Likewise, there was a lot of overlap between the unprompted and the prompted barriers discussions (see Table 9, p. 21). Prompting the factors caused the category frequencies to be more equally distributed so that the human factor was not the predominant factor in this last interview part.

- In summary, this study reinforces our understanding that participation and communication during the evaluation process are crucial, as is a carefully planned, methodologically sound evaluation, done by socially skilled, trustworthy evaluators. See discussion section for more detailed interpretations of the study's findings (pp. 15-24).

- We also provide an added perspective on understanding barriers to evaluation by an examination of evaluation when seen as an innovation introduced into a system. See discussion section for further details (pp. 24-25).

Recommendations

Finally, we derived recommendations for both the evaluation team and program staff. Advice for evaluators underlines their multiple roles, for example, as teacher, communicator, program expert, and credible source. Advice for the program side reiterates the necessity to make evaluation more of a priority by dedicating resources (staff time and training) for its support (see pp. 26-27).

Introduction

In the last two years, the UCLA Outreach program evaluation team has undertaken numerous program evaluation studies. These evaluation studies were concerned with EAOP[1] as well as SUP[2] activities. At least for the past academic year, at Outreach evaluation team meetings, the evaluation team members have consistently reported barriers they were facing while trying to implement evaluation studies. The productivity of the evaluation team was limited to some extent by the obstacles that had to be overcome in order to move ahead with certain evaluation studies. The present study investigates barriers to program evaluation in the context of the UCLA Outreach program.

More specifically, barriers to evaluation are problems faced by evaluators when trying to implement an evaluation. Barriers can exist from the inception to the completion stage of an evaluation. Synomymous with "barriers", one could talk about "resistance", "obstacles", or "hindrances". In evaluation research, barriers to program evaluation have traditionally been discussed in the context of factors influencing evaluation utilization. In this line of thought, barriers are seen to inhibit the conduct of evaluation and, thus, their proper utilization. The UCLA Outreach evaluation team is strongly committed to evaluation utilization: both evaluation process and evaluation results should maximally benefit the primary intended users of the evaluation by meeting their particular information and decision-making needs.

In accordance with these introductory statements, the current study served a dual purpose: (1) It intended to confirm or build on existing research on barriers to program evaluation. One goal was to test the appropriateness of factors previously found to explain barriers, as seen from a staff perspective. (2) It provided the opportunity for Outreach program staff to share their concerns and hopes regarding the ongoing evaluation efforts. The evaluation team intended to raise awareness of the issue of barriers to evaluation and learn about staff perceptions of obstacles and ideas about how to better address them in the future. As prominent evaluation researchers put it: "The route to transformation lies in acknowledging contradictions and

[1] Early Academic Outreach Program
[2] School-University Partnership

differences and working through them…" (Preskill & Torres, 1999, p. 28); "By providing a vehicle for discovering and expressing [staff] concerns, it is possible to surface major issues that may later affect evaluation use." (Patton, 1997, p. 36).

The study consisted of three parts. *First*, we were interested in staff's perceptions of the attitudes of others toward evaluation, as well as their personal attitudes. *Second*, the participants of the study were asked in general terms to share what they thought to be barriers to evaluation. The *third* part of the study was based on the existing literature about explanatory factors for barriers to evaluation. The factors we investigated were taken from Alkin et al. (1985). In empirical studies, Alkin and his colleagues identified factors that influence evaluation utilization. They categorized these factors into three major areas: human, evaluation, and context factors. In the absence of much specific research on barriers *per se*, it was helpful to consider the utilization literature since utilization is the flipside of barriers.

The "human" (or "personal") factor describes both evaluator and user characteristics – that is, for example, user knowledge about and attitudes toward evaluation and perceptions about the credibility of the evaluator. Under this broad human factor area, we were particularly interested in examining psychological mechanisms as explanations for how such personal barriers to evaluation develop. Psychological mechanisms identified in prior research by the principal investigator include prior learning experiences, fear of loss of control / power, and prediction of (positive or negative) evaluation findings and effects (Taut, 2001).

Although initial attitudes toward evaluation are included within the human factor, they are of such great importance that we conducted a separate inquiry directed at this issue. Evaluation literature has explained the difficulty to conduct useful evaluations with negative attitudes toward evaluation. Alkin and his colleagues (1979, p. 238) note that users' expectations for the evaluation and feelings based upon experiences with previous evaluations, conversations with others, and various professional readings combine to establish a user frame of reference for the specific evaluation. Patton (1997, p. 26), a utilization-focused evaluation theorist, writes: "Research on 'readiness for evaluation' … has found that valuing evaluation is a necessary condition for evaluation use."

The second of the three factors, the “evaluation” factor, concerns the way the evaluation itself is conducted, for example procedural issues, instruments, and the quality of information it provides. Potentially, a poorly conducted evaluation can create its own barriers.

Finally, the third factor refers to the “context” in which the evaluated program exists. Here, the question is how contextual variables, including the broad political and organizational background as well as specific program features and administrative structures, influence the barriers evaluation has to face.

During the course of the study it became apparent that barriers to evaluation are often entangled with barriers to program implementation. Therefore it is not surprising that a few participants talked more about obstacles they were facing in their daily Outreach work than about barriers specific to evaluation. Although we could not use these statements as data in the current study, we were interested to hear about programmatic struggles because it helps us better understand and stay in touch with the realities of UCLA Outreach staff and the unique and complex context in which they operate their program(s).

Study Procedures

Because we were interested in personal insights that reach well beyond placing checkmarks on a questionnaire (or even writing a few lines), and we were also trying to foster communication with UCLA Outreach staff, we decided on face-to-face interviews as the data collection method. The principal investigator conducted sixteen semi-structured, confidential, 45-minute interviews. The interview protocol for university and school-based staff can be found in Appendix A. The sample of interviewees included SUP and EAOP staff from different hierarchical levels of the program, ranging from staff in leadership positions to site coordinators. An original list of interviewees was slightly altered and expanded as the study proceeded. In the end, the principal investigator succeeded in completing all the intended interviews.

Technically speaking, the study included both inductive and deductive inquiry. On the one hand, it tested deductive hypotheses, aimed at confirming prior exploratory findings. On the other hand, it included an inductive approach to find rival explanations and unanticipated factors. The interviews were semi-structured which enabled the interviewer to be adaptive to each individual, at the expense of fully comparable results.

Fifteen out of sixteen interviews[3] were tape-recorded and transcribed by the principal investigator. The interviewees received the interview transcriptions of their individual interviews for validation. From the sixteen transcriptions that were sent out approximately half of the interviewees replied to the request. When respondents asked for changes or additions, they were very minor. Data analysis remained entirely anonymous; all identifying information was removed from the data. The analysis consisted of a cycle of categorizations, interpretations, and revisions of the category systems. The data tables can be found in Appendix B1 to B7. All interviewee statements were categorized under their corresponding categories and subcategories. Sometimes one statement fit under two different (sub)categories and was therefore doublecoded. To determine the prevalence of emerging themes we counted the frequencies with which they occurred. We report these (sub)category frenquencies in the tables to be found in the following "findings" section.

However, we need to point out that the number of statements under one category depends on the scope of the category. A very broadly defined category (e.g. "evaluator competence") has the potential to encompass many statements, while a very specific category (e.g. "expectation of positive results") can, by definition, only contain few. In general, when designing a category system, the data analyst should keep in mind the following guidelines (Miles & Huberman, 1994):

- Categories of the same "order" should have approximately the same level of abstraction (see example above).
- The data should be described completely by the category systems; no relevant statements should be left uncoded. "Other" categories should be avoided or kept at a minimum.

---

[3] Because of repeated scheduling difficulties, one interview had to be done over the phone. The interviewer took notes and sent the interview summary to the participant for validation.

- Categories need to be clearly defined (or labeled) so that other people arrive at the same categorizations. This includes minimal overlap between the categories within one category system.

We did our best to adhere to these guidelines. To check for potential bias in our data analysis due to the prior involvement of the authors with the topic of the study, we employed two strategies: (1) the principal investigator suggested category systems and categorizations which were critiqued and modified by the second author; (2) the first part of the raw data (attitude and unprompted barrier statements) was given to an evaluation colleague unfamiliar with the study. We asked him to derive main themes he found to emerge from the data. We then compared his results with our own analyses and found them to correspond.[4]

Findings

Part I: Attitudes Toward Evaluation

After an introduction, the interviews started with the following request: “First, please tell me what you observed to be general attitudes of people toward evaluation.” We categorized the responses as describing positive, negative, or indifferent attitudes (N=16; see Table 1 below). Participants varied in the way they answered the question. Some differentiated between school staff and university or Outreach staff attitudes toward evaluation, or they referred to the group they personally identified with (“we”), or they gave specific examples from Outreach program and/or school settings. Again others spoke more generally about attitudes, only implicitely revealing which population they were talking about. Following the discussion of general attitudes, participants were asked: “How about your own attitudes toward evaluation?” Again, we categorized responses into “positive”, “negative”, and “indifferent”.

As the second part of Table 1 shows, we also coded all respondents’ illustrative statements in relation to the three groups of factors introduced later on in the interview. For both general and personal attitudes, most of the statements relate to the human factor, the evaluation factor is mentioned about half as often, and the smallest number concern the context factor.

The interviewer also probed about what experiences helped shape the personal attitudes. The attitude portion of the interview was further categorized using the following main themes that emerged from the data:

a) Where do these attitudes come from (attitude development)?
b) How could these attitudes be changed (attitude change)?

Table 2 shows the subthemes discovered under “attitude development” and “attitude change”. Attitude development is most frequently associated with prior experiences with evaluation. Positive attitudes seem to often stem from the conviction that there is merit to doing evaluation. Ten statements concerned evaluation approach, design, methods and so on. Participants most frequently believed that a change of attitudes could result from a transparent purpose of the evaluation and clarity about the use of the evaluation results. Participants also mentioned building trust and participation, aspects mentioned in the literature (Alkin et al., 1979), to influence potential change in attitudes.

Further, the interviewer asked most of the participants (N=14) to talk about the stereotypes people have about evaluation. From these statements (having positive, negative, or neutral connotations), we extracted key words that we summarized under the common themes “general”, “methods”, and “utilization” (see Table 3 below).

---

[4] The authors’ categories were more detailed, i.e. closer to the data, than the themes derived by the evaluation colleague, but all of the latter’s themes could easily be recoded into categories of the authors.

TABLE 1: Attitudes Toward Evaluation

Tone of statements	**General Attitudes**[5]	**Personal Attitudes**[6]
Positive	7	10
Negative	7	1
Indifferent	6	3
Statements related to factors	**General Attitudes**	**Personal Attitudes**
Human Factor (H)	24	15
Evaluation Factor (E)	11	9
Context Factor (C)	8	2
TOTAL (H+E+C)	43	26

TABLE 2: Attitude Development & Attitude Change

Attitude Development		**Attitude Change**	
Subcategories	Frequency	Subcategories	Frequency
1. Prior experiences (general statements)	14		
2. Merits of doing evaluation	12		
3. Evaluation approach, design, methods, and validity of results	10	Evaluation methods and validity of results	3
4. Fear of negative results	9		
5. (General) knowledge about evaluation	6		
6. Cost-benefit imbalance (low utility)	4		
7. Evaluation detached from program	4	Building trust Participation in process	2 2
8. Accountability requirements	4	Accountability requirements	1
9. Prioritizing of limited resources for evaluation (esp. time)	3		
10. Awareness of purpose of evaluation	3	Transparent purpose of evaluation, including clear use of results	4
11. Characteristics of evaluator	2	Propriety of evaluator	1
12. Expectation of positive results	2		

5 Because some interviewees differentiated between different populations, the numbers add up to more than the number of participants.
6 Not all interviewees shared personal attitudes, even when asked to do so.

TABLE 3: Stereotypes

Stereotypes: Themes	Positive	Negative	Neutral
General	- Professional - Effective	- Punitive - Out to get me - Threatening - Fear that negative results come back to haunt you - Suspicion	- Being judged personally[7] - Graded - Mysterious - Used to it
Methods	- Valid information - Finding out whether or not something functions	- Unfair & unfounded - Not representative - Incorrect data - Incorrect information - No validity	- Quantitative - Long process - Personnel evaluation - Evaluation = research
Utilization	- Useful feedback - Helpful	- Removed - Disconnected - Low utility - Just another paper - Not useful for us - Unclear purpose	- Better left to experts - Professor will publish it

Part II: Barriers to Evaluation

"What do you think are the barriers to evaluation getting implemented?" was the question posed in the second part of the interview. The interviewer did not provide any further probes because this part of the interview focused on the (explanations to) barriers that participants would mention spontaneously. This approach allowed us to assess the salience of certain barriers from multiple staff perspectives. We first extracted themes from the data and then categorized these themes under our three factors (human, evaluation, context).

Table 4 shows the category system and the response frequencies for this part of the interview. Most often, themes related to the human factor category (32 statements), followed at some distance by the evaluation and context factors (17 and 12 statements respectively). We differentiated the human factor themes into two subcategories: evaluator competence and program staff issues. Regarding the evaluator, participants talked most often about his or her social competence, particularly relationship building skills (8 statements). Complementing this view from a program staff perspective, barriers related most often to lack of trust (seven statements). Gaining access to (correct) data is the predominant evaluation factor subcategory.

[7] This was the only exact statement that occurred more than once: three times.

As for the context, participants mainly made lack of resources of stakeholders (esp. time) responsible for creating barriers to evaluation.

TABLE 4: Barriers to Evaluation

Categories	Frequencies
HUMAN FACTOR	
1. Evaluator competence	
a) Social competence (relationship building)	8
b) Context & program knowledge	4
c) Technical competence	1
2. Program staff	
a) Lack of trust	7
b) Lack of knowledge about evaluation	4
c) Threat of negative results	4
d) Lack of appreciation of evaluation	3
e) Prior negative experiences	1
TOTAL	**32**
EVALUATION FACTOR	
7. Gaining access to (correct) data	6
8. Inappropriate methods, instruments etc.	4
9. Lack of cooperation / detachment of evaluation	4
10. Lack of utility of evaluation	3
TOTAL	**17**
CONTEXT FACTOR	
11. Lack of resources of stakeholders (esp. time)	6
12. Staff turnover (schools)	3
13. Program setting (schools)	3
14. Other program characteristics	2
TOTAL	**14**

Part III: Prompting Factors Found by Prior Research

The third part of the interview dealt with the three main factors found in evaluation research to influence barriers to evaluation (see introduction section for further explanations). The interviewer introduced the three main factors (evaluation, human, and context) one at a time. For each factor, the interviewer gave a short, very general definition and then asked the participants to share their thoughts on the topic. At this point, the interviewer generally had not shared any particular examples for the factors yet. These were only used later as additional prompts, if necessary.

Human factor

From the interviewees' statements following the general introduction of the human factor, we extracted seven subcategories (see Table 5) [8].

TABLE 5: Analysis of Human Factor

Subcategories	Frequency
1. Trust/fear issues	9
2. Relationship building & interpersonal skills of evaluators	7
3. Communication about the evaluation	5
4. Lack of staff resources	5
5. Stakeholder knowledge about evaluation	3
6. Personality of stakeholders	3
7. Bad experiences with evaluation	2

The following are examples of statements categorized under the most frequent theme, labeled "trust/fear issues":

> Interviewee 2: "There is the issue of fear, what are you trying to find out about me, and how is this going to impact me and be used against me…."
>
> Interviewee 15: "First of all, the 'I don't know you and I don't trust you' factor…"

After this initial discussion of the human factor, the interviewer generally asked more specific questions about potential variables under this broad heading. The specific probes employed varied slightly across the sample of participants because the interviewer considered the extent to which the probe area had been covered in prior statements of the participants. First, the interviewer asked about stakeholder perceptions in general. Ten respondents commented on the role of prior experiences in explaining barriers to evaluation, an area that had already been discussed by many in response to prior questions. Twelve participants discussed power and control issues of stakeholders. Further, the interviewees were probed on whether stakeholders might predict potential findings and weigh the cost and benefit of the evaluation for them personally. Twelve participants shared their thoughts, three of which just reinforced what they had said earlier about the topic. Finally, complementing the focus on stakeholders, the interviewer asked all but one of the respondents to talk about evaluator characteristics. After general responses the interviewer prompted the topics of “credibility” and “knowledge in the field”. Please see Appendix B4 for a complete list of the participants’ statements.

Context factor

Secondly, we examined the context factor, i.e. we asked participants how organizational and program features could explain the barriers to the conduct of evaluation. Where appropriate due to the sparcity of the response, the interviewer prompted participants to talk more about certain aspects of the context factor. General comments (excluding findings using more specific probes) resulted in the following nine themes (see Table 6).

TABLE 6: Analysis of Context Factor

Subcategories	Frequency
1. Influences of program context and setting	4
2. Political structures, decisions, mandates	2
3. Accountability requirements	2
4. Organizational hierarchical structures	2
5. Purpose and use of the evaluation	2
6. Organizational culture	1
7. Staff turnover	1
8. Level of implementation of the program	1
9. Evaluator context knowledge	1

Please note that some of these subcategories, namely number five and number nine, overlap with subcategories of the human factor and the evaluation factor. In practice, differentiation of the three factors was not always as clear as might be theoretically indicated. The following quotation illustrates the most frequently mentioned context variable with regard to barriers to evaluation, “influences of program context and setting”:

> Interviewee 7: “Outreach is this big, vast component. Every school is different. … The school environment really has a big impact and that makes the evaluation difficult.

In addition, three interviewees commented on “organizational structures”, and seven shared their views on how “specific program characteristics” might explain barriers to evaluation. Please see Appendix B5 for a complete list of context factor statements.

[8] Due to the flow of the interview two of the sixteen interviewees received a more specific prompt, asking them about program staff perceptions in particular.

Evaluation factor

Lastly, the interview dealt with the way the evaluation is conducted and how this could create barriers to evaluation. Participants first shared their views concerning the evaluation factor in general, without prompts. Seven subcategories summarize these statements (see Table 7).

TABLE 7: Analysis of Evaluation Factor

Subcategories	Frequency
1. Good methods & meaningful data	7
2. Participation & information of staff	6
3. Context sensitivity of evaluation design	4
4. Justifiable & context-specific criteria/conclusions	4
5. Reporting issues	3
6. Issues with time	3
7. Competence of the evaluator	3

The following two statements exemplify the most frequent evaluation factor subcategory "good methods & meaningful data":

> Interviewee 9: "The kinds of programs we are involved in are so complex. If the participants don't feel that the evaluation is getting at all the issues in a meaningful way, then they will see the evaluation as not helpful and meaningful."
>
> Interviewee 11: "Whenever you do an evaluation, the data is a major barrier."

As in the discussion of the prior factor, there is overlap of some of these subcategories (particularly 2, 6, 7) with context and human factor subcategories. A number of participants also commented on various more specific prompts related to the evaluation factor. The interviewer asked ten respondents whether it was important for barriers who was the client and sponsor of the evaluation, and five participants commented on whether who received the results had significance. Three participants talked about the amount of funding available for the evaluation. Eight interviewees debated the relevance of the use of qualitative vs. quantitative methods for barriers to evaluation. Finally, participation and communication with stakeholders during the evaluation process were topics with thirteen and six participants respectively. Please see Appendix B6 for the complete list of statements relating to the evaluation factor.

Advice

At the end of the interview, the interviewer encouraged the participants (N = 15) to share advice that they might have for the evaluation team. This request was made despite the fact that some interviewees had already shared advice at some point or another during the interview. The main themes of this last part of the interview clearly emerged: seven participants mentioned "more communication" (information, conversation) between evaluation and program people, three interviewees went one step further and called for "involvement" of stakeholders in the evaluation process. Three times our participants requested more "relationship building" initiative by the evaluators, twice the interviewees recommended better "program knowledge" by the evaluators (see Appendix B7 for the complete list of statements). For example, two interviewees summed up their advice in the following way:

Interviewee 4: "The program staff should know the evaluators, the goals of the evaluation, what and when they will collect data etc. Communicating with each other is the key, I think.

Interviewee 10: Get to know the staff, occasionally attend the staff meetings. If the staff are aware of what you are doing and see you as part of the Outreach effort, they will be more supportive of your work."

In the recommendations section of this report (see pp. 26-27) we elaborate on the advice shared by the participants.

Discussion

Attitudes Toward Evaluation

We first discuss the findings related to attitudes toward evaluation. We would like to stress that our entire discussion is context-specific. We only talked to program staff of one specific program, the UCLA Outreach program, and cannot claim to present generalizable findings. Table 1 shows that for our group of participants, their own personal attitudes are much more favorable than what they perceived to be general attitudes. Personal attitudes are predominantly positive while general attitudes are believed to be equally positive, negative, or indifferent, depending on whom we talked to. Some respondents differentiated groups (e.g. school staff and university staff) regarding their attitudes toward evaluation. We are aware that talking to an evaluation team member did not make it easy for participants to admit to their own negative attitudes toward evaluation. The interviewer had the impression that participants who were involved in actual program implementation were more disillusioned (or maybe just more straightforward) about what evaluation can do for them. Staff in higher positions were more vocal about the merits of doing evaluation.

Another interesting finding is that – contrary to what the psychological literature would predict – participants used human factor explanations for attitudes equally often when talking about general attitudes as when talking about their own attitudes. Proportionally, they did not use external (evaluation and context) factors more frequently when referring to their own attitudes as compared to when referring to other people's attitudes.[9] For both general and personal attitudes, human factor statements were most prevalent; the evaluation factor was mentioned only about half as often. Participants talked about the context factor least frequently. Table 1 (see row labeled "total") also shows that people talk much more about others than about themselves when asked to comment on attitudes.

There was considerable overlap between attitude development and attitude change categories, as shown in Table 2. Albeit from different angles, these two main categories naturally contain overlapping subcategories, because reasons for attitude development can simultaneously serve as starting points for changing attitudes. There are no surprises here, except maybe the weight attached to the evaluation approach, design, and methods in determining attitudes toward evaluation. Combined with the general statements about prior experiences with evaluation shaping attitudes, we as evaluators are led to conclude that a lot of the barriers we encounter are self-induced (if not by us then by our colleagues) – at least in the eyes of our clients. It is also no surprise to us that transparency regarding purpose and uses of the evaluation are believed to have the most impact on changing existing attitudes, along with high-quality (valid) evaluation methods and results.

[9] Psychological research found a so-called "fundamental attribution error": People tend to attribute internal (in our case "human") causes to someone else's behavior while attributing external (in our case "evaluation" or "context") causes to their own behavior (Fischer & Wiswede, 1997).

The stereotypes categorized in Table 3 speak for themselves. As the word “stereotype” suggests, participants mentioned many more negative or neutral stereotypes than positive ones. Besides general statements, the stereotypes were related to methods and utilization, two main dimensions in the categorizing of evaluation theories (see Alkin & House, 1992, who differentiate evaluation theories based on their predominance of “values”, “methods”, or “uses”).

Barriers to Evaluation

Without any prompts, the participants talked most about human factors as explanations for barriers to evaluation. Like the accounts related to attitudes, participants mentioned evaluation factors about half as often as human factors, and considered context factors least often. We are guided to believe that human factors are most important with regard to barriers to evaluation, specifically in the program context in which we collected the data. However, this conclusion is also supported by prior research done in other settings (see Patton, Grimes, et al., 1977; Alkin, Daillak & White, 1979; Alkin, 1985).

Based on the categorization of this second part of the interview, we can share several interesting observations:

1. Program staff discuss most frequently the competence of the evaluator(s). Social competence, along with context/program knowledge, is considered much more important than technical competence. We are aware of some respondents’ prior negative experiences in this regard.
2. Participants regard lack of trust the next most prevalent reason for barriers to evaluation. Therefore trust building has to be a major objective at the onset of an evaluation.
3. Gaining access to (correct) data was most often mentioned as an evaluation factor hindering the evaluation process. This seems to be an especially program-specific problem due to the context of dealing with school districts having inadequate data systems.
4. Program staff most often consider lack of resources, especially lack of time, as a context factor hindering the conduct of evaluations.

It strikes us that program staff tend to see the evaluator as the culprit, while evaluators often accuse program staff as being the source of resistance to evaluation. Similar to the attitude portion of the interview, in this part there were some differences between higher-level and lower-level staff. The latter tended to focus on "bad evaluation" and "bad evaluators" to explain barriers, whereas the former often considered a broader range of factors.

Relationship of Barriers and Attitudes

Reviewing the data for the first two parts of the interview – attitudes and unprompted explanations for barriers – we suspected the following: There seemed to be substantial overlap of statements between the two parts. Participants talked about barriers when asked about attitudes and vice versa. Although it is theoretically clear that attitudes are only one construct potentially explaining barriers to evaluation, there was much less actual differentiation of the two topics for some interviewees. Therefore, we designed a data analysis table showing the correspondence of themes (subcategories) derived for the first and the second part of the interview (see Table 8).

Table 8 shows how much the themes extracted from the first and the second part of the interview overlap. The overlap (eleven of a total of sixteen subcategories) is spread across all three main factors. Subcategories were considered to correspond if they were either labeled using exactly the same or just slightly different words, or if they had exactly inversed meaning (positive instead of negative). This finding means that, de facto, it is difficult to differentiate attitudes toward evaluation from barriers to evaluation; participants talked about similar issues in both instances, albeit with different frequencies. One possible interpretation is that the same interviewees talked repeatedly about "their" issues throughout the interview. On the other hand, some respondents might have raised certain points in the first part of the interview, and might not have repeated them later, even though they would have "belonged" there (from our theoretical point of view). It is important to note that in the first two parts of the interview, participants did not know about human, evaluation, or context factors in explanations for barriers to evaluation. All their responses were only later categorized using these main categories. Taking into account overlapping subcategories for attitudes and barriers, and adding the numbers for unique categories, the total frequencies for the three main categories are as follows: human factor = 80; evaluation factor = 48; context factor = 22.

TABLE 8: Overlap Between Inductive Barriers and Attitudes Toward Evaluation Subcategories

Main Categories	**Barriers Subcategories**	**Barriers Part # of Respondents**	**Attitudes[10] Subcategories (if different from Barriers Subcategories)**	**Attitudes Part # of Respondents**	**TOTAL**
Human Factor	1. Evaluator competence:	13		3	**16**
	a) Social competence	8		-	**8**
	b) Program knowledge	4		-	**4**
	c) Technical competence	1		-	**1**
			General evaluator competence	3	**3**
	2. Program staff:	19		45	**64**
	a) Lack of trust	7	Building trust	2	**9**
	b) Lack of knowledge	4		6	**10**
	c) Threat of negative results	4		9	**15**
			Expectation of positive results	2	
	d) Lack of appreciation	3	Merits of doing evaluation	12	**15**
	e) Prior experiences	1		14	**15**
TOTAL		**32**		**48**	**80**
Evaluation Factor	7. Gaining access to (correct) data	6		-	**6**
	8. Inappropriate methods, etc.	4		14	**18**
	9. Lack of cooperation / detachment	4		4	**17**
			Awareness of purpose	7	
			Participation in process	2	
	10. Lack of utility of evaluation	3	Cost-benefit imbalance (low utility)	4	**7**
TOTAL		**17**		**31**	**48**
Context Factor	11. Lack of resources of stakeholders	6	Prioritizing of limited resources	3	**9**
	12. Staff turnover	3		-	**3**
	13. Program Setting	3		-	**3**
	14. Other program characteristics	2	Accountability requirements	5	**7**
TOTAL		**14**		**8**	**22**

[10] Both “Attitude development” and “Attitude change” categories were included.

Relationship of Unprompted and Prompted Discussion of Barriers

We thought it would also be helpful to show the overlap between categories extracted from the unprompted and from the prompted discussion of barriers to evaluation. Table 9 shows that there is again a lot of overlap between the two sets of categories. Compared to the unprompted discussion, participants mentioned all but four subcategories again in the later interview section that was guided by briefly introducing the three types of factors (human, evaluation, context). A few new themes emerged, e.g. "reporting" and "criteria of judgment" under the evaluation factor heading. The overall frequencies of the statements relating to the main categories (human factors, evaluation factors, context factors) converged in the prompted discussion compared to the unprompted discussion: 1) human factors (28 statements), 2) evaluation factors (32 statements), 3) context factor (21 statements). The overall rank order of the main categories stayed the same; the majority of statements elaborated on human factors (60 statements), followed by the evaluation factor (48 statements) and the context factor (35 statements).

This analysis of the overlap between unprompted and prompted discussion clarifies that, even without any guidance, the participants identified the same explanations for barriers to evaluation that were found in prior research. The predominance of human factor themes also corresponds to prior research findings.

TABLE 9: Overlap Between Unprompted And Prompted Discussion of Barriers to Evaluation

Main Categories	Unprompted Barriers Discussion Subcategories	Number of Respondents	Prompted Barriers Discussion Subcategories	Number of Respondents	TOTAL
Human Factor	1. Evaluator competence:	13		11	**24**
	a) Social competence	8	Interpersonal skills of evaluator	7	**15**
	b) Program knowledge	4	Evaluator context knowledge	1	**5**
	c) Technical competence	1	-	-	**1**
			General competence of the evaluator	3	**3**
	2. Program staff:	19		17	**36**
	a) Lack of trust	7	Trust/Fear issues	9	**16**
	b) Lack of knowledge	4	Staff knowledge about evaluation	3	**7**
	c) Threat of negative results	4	-	-	**4**
	d) Lack of appreciation	3	-	-	**3**
	e) Prior experiences	1	Bad experiences with evaluation	2	**3**
			Personalities of staff	3	**3**
TOTAL		**32**		**28**	**60**
Evaluation Factor	3. Gaining access to (correct) data	6	-	-	**6**
	4. Inappropriate methods, design etc.	4	Good methods & meaningful data	7	**15**
			Context-sensitive evaluation design	4	
	5. Lack of cooperation / detachment	4	Communication about evaluation	5	**15**
			Participation & information of staff	6	
	6. Lack of utility of evaluation	3	Purpose and use of the evaluation	2	**5**
			Reporting issues	3	**3**
			Justifiable & context-sensitive criteria and conclusions	4	**4**
TOTAL		**17**		**31**	**48**
Context Factor	7. Lack of resources of stakeholders	6	Lack of staff resources	5	**14**
			Issues with time	3	
	8. Staff turnover	3	Staff turnover	1	**4**
	9. Program Setting	3	Program context and setting	4	**7**
	10. Other program characteristics	2	Political structures, decisions, mandates	2	**10**
			Accountability requirements	2	
			Organizational hierarchical structures	2	
			Organizational culture	1	
			Level of implementation of program	1	
TOTAL		**14**		**21**	**35**

Explanatory Factors Found in Prior Research

In the third part of the interview, participants commented on the three explanatory factors we introduced to them.

Human Factor

The explanation of the human factor most frequently evoked discussions of trust and fear issues, as well as relationship building and interpersonal skills of the evaluator. This finding is similar to the one relating to barriers in part two of the interview. As Alkin noted, “evaluators must be skilled in personal dynamics; they must be able to recognize that the kinds of interrelationships they develop will influence the way in which they are able to collect data and the respect and accord that are ultimately provided to their evaluation” (1991, p. 108).

Due to the small number of responses regarding the psychological explanatory factors for barriers that we specifically prompted, we can only draw limited conclusions:

1. “Prior experiences” are seen as relevant by almost all of the respondents in determining barriers to evaluation.
2. With “power and control issues”, the picture is more mixed. While most interviewees do agree that especially the fear to loose control or power can create barriers to evaluation, some point to personal experiences that do not support this claim.
3. Almost all interviewees agreed that “predictions of potential benefits versus costs” of the evaluation are important. The emphasis was on the negative effects it has if stakeholders do not expect to benefit from the evaluation.
4. Respondents were unanimous in their affirmations that “evaluator characteristics” play a crucial role in determining the fate of an evaluation. Credibility and knowledge in the field are sometimes seen as linked, and the latter was often interpreted in the sense of context sensitivity and empathy.

Although all of these human factor topics were generally considered important, program staff tended to put the least weight on power and control issues. There are different interpretations for this finding. They relate to the program context (university setting), the consequences believed to follow from the evaluation, and perhaps the general reluctance of people to be conscious of and admit to control and power struggles.

Context Factor

Interviewees did not share many statements about the context factor. Judged by the requests for clarification that the participants posed to the interviewer, this seemed to be the factor most difficult to understand. Please remember it was also mentioned least often in the unprompted part of the interview, suggesting that program staff tend to be less aware of this factor than the other two factors (especially compared to the human factor). Not surprisingly, program context and setting, specifically the notion of accountability in education, were mentioned most frequently as constituting potential contextual barriers to evaluation. In our context of a university outreach program it is interesting to take into account Patton's (1997, p. 29) observation that "ironically, mandated evaluations can actually undercut utility by making the reason for the evaluation compliance with a funding requirement rather than genuine interest in being more effective."

Evaluation Factor

Within this category, participants commented most often on good methods and meaningful data, as well as on participation and information during the evaluation process. The interviewees regarded participation and communication as important aspects of the evaluation. The comments about who was the client or sponsor of the evaluation and who received the results hint that these aspects were not as central to staff for explaining barriers. The eight interviewees who talked about qualitative versus quantitative methods were predominantly convinced of the merits of both, depending on the situation in which they are applied.

In summary, this study reinforces our understandings that participation and communication during the evaluation process are crucial, as is a carefully planned, methodologically sound evaluation, done by socially skilled, trustworthy evaluators. Patton (1997, p. 34) summarizes his experiences as follows: "Many of the problems encountered by evaluators, much of the resistance to evaluation, and many failures of use occur because of misunderstandings and communication problems." Patton's list of "threats to utility" (1997, p. 263) includes most of the points we found in our study as barriers to good evaluation: failure to focus the evaluation on intended use by intended users, inadequate involvement of primary users in methods decisions, poor stakeholder understanding of evaluation generally and the findings specifically, low user belief and trust in the evaluation process and findings, low evaluator credibility, and failure to keep stakeholders adequately informed and involved along the way.

Potential Insights from the "Innovation" Literature

Before we derive some recommendations for both evaluation and program staff we will include a short discussion of the linkage between evaluation and innovation. If one considers evaluation as itself an innovation, or as an attempt to bring about innovation and change in organizations, one can turn to innovation research for ideas on how to explain and overcome barriers to evaluation. For example, innovation research asks how the properties of an innovation affect its rate of adoption. Five attributes, conceptually distinct but empirically interrelated, are described in the literature: (1) relative advantage, (2) compatibility, (3) complexity, (4) trialability, (5) observability (see Rogers, 1983). Relative advantage is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea it supersedes. Compatibility is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the existing values, past experiences, and needs of potential adopters. Complexity is the degree to which an innovation is perceived as relatively difficult to understand and to use. Trialability is the degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis. Observability is the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others. We here speculate on how these attributes can be transferred to the field of evaluation in general and to our current study on barriers to evaluation in specific. We will focus on the first three attributes because they are best supported by empirical research (Rogers, 1983, p. 238).

With regard to evaluation, relative advantage may be thought of as relating to "prediction of evaluation findings" or "cost-benefit considerations". If program staff expect to benefit from the evaluation relative to its costs (not just in the monetary sense), they will be more likely to support the evaluation. Regarding compatibility, if the evaluation is consistent with existing values, for example, if the organization has already created a climate of continuous learning, staff will be less likely to resist the evaluation. Hence, their attitudes toward evaluation will likely be positive. In addition, compatibility can apply to staff-evaluator relationships. If they have similar values and experiences, they will be more likely to cooperate well. Complexity, the third attribute, is another important factor with regard to evaluation. Staff often regard evaluation as difficult to understand and use. They feel it is something left to experts and therefore they see no role in it for themselves. This affects their likelihood to support the evaluation.

Innovation research also investigated the diffusion effect of an innovation, meaning the amount of pressure exerted on an individual within a social network to adopt the innovation – in our case, to embrace the evaluation. The diffusion effect is greater in a social system with a higher degree of interconnectedness (interpersonal networks) (Rogers, 1983, p. 240). In our study we found that program staff considered personal relationship building with the evaluation team a major factor in enhancing their collaboration in evaluation efforts.

There are also interesting findings concerning the change agent, in our case the evaluator. Rogers (1983, p. 343) discusses two major problems faced by the change agents: (1) their social marginality, (2) information overload on the part of the clients. A change agent's relative success depends on a number of factors, all of which also apply to evaluators: (a) extent of contacting clients (communication), (b) general client-orientation and empathy with clients' needs,
(c) credibility in the clients' eyes (both competence and trustworthiness affect credibility),
(d) working through opinion leaders and internal aides.

Findings from this study, as well as, the above thoughts on innovation research findings inform the following section on recommendations.

Recommendations

Recommendations for the Evaluation Team

- Evaluators as teachers: What is evaluation; how is it different from research? Why should we do evaluation – how can it help us learn and improve? We have to do more to "develop a shared definition of evaluation and mutual understanding about what the process will involve" (Patton, 1997, p. 23).
- Evaluators as communicators: Evaluation reports could be placed on the Internet (for example, on the EAOP website), including a place for remarks and feedback (like a "guest book"). We agree with Patton (1997, p. 34): "The burden of clear communication rests on the evaluator. It is the evaluator who must find ways of bridging the communications gap."
- Evaluators as reporters: There should be more conversations between evaluators and program staff concerning the evaluation findings; it is not sufficient to have printed reports only.
- Utilization-focused evaluators: Evaluators should include program staff in the development of new evaluation questions and keep them informed during the evaluation process. The evaluation team has already developed an "Evaluation Information Form" that will be used to inform about every new study (please see Appendix C).
- Evaluators as credible source: Evaluators should build relationships with program staff, thereby enhancing mutual trust and understanding.
- Evaluators as program experts: Evaluators should gain even better program and contextual knowledge. They should expand activities like visiting staff meetings.
- One of our own realizations is that it might have been informative to do a so-called evaluability assessment (Wholey, 1979) before the evaluation process began to better understand the dynamics related to evaluation and the feasibility of conducting a particular evaluation.

Recommendations for Program Staff

- Be receptive and take the time to learn more about evaluation in general, and about the specific evaluation studies that are going on. Evaluation training could be offered from time to time to staff at all levels so they can better understand the value and usefulness of evaluation and its basic concepts.
- Take the time so that communication between evaluators and program staff can improve and relationships (and trust) can be built.
- Recognize that stakeholder participation in the evaluation process is essential in order to complete meaningful evaluations.
- However, pleading that people take the time to support evaluation is not enough. More resources (on an individual program staff level) should be explicitly allocated to evaluation. For example, every staff member could have one (or half an) hour of evaluation-related activities per week written into their contracts.

Bibliography

Alkin, Marvin C. (1985). A Guide for Evaluation Decision Makers. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Alkin, Marvin C. (1991). Evaluation Theory Development II. In Milbrey W. McLaughlin & D.C. Phillips (Eds.), Evaluation And Education at Quarter Century. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Alkin, Marvin C., Daillak, Richard & White, Peter (1979). Using Evaluations: Does Evaluation Make a Difference? Beverly Hills: Sage.

Alkin, Marvin C. & House, Ernest (1992). Evaluation of Programs. In Marvin C. Alkin (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Macmillan.

Fischer, Lorenz & Wiswede, Günther (1997). Grundlagen der Sozialpsychologie [Foundations of Social Psychology]. München: Oldenbourg.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Patton, Michael Q., Grimes, Patricia S., Guthrie, Kathryn M., Brennan, Nancy J., French, Barbara D. & Blyth, Dale A. (1977). In Search of Impact: An Analysis of the Utilization of Federal Health Evaluation Research. In Carol H. Weiss (Ed.), Using Social Research in Public Policy Making. Lexington: D.C. Heath.

Patton, Michael Q. (1997). Utilization-Focused Evaluation (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Preskill, Hallie & Torres, Rosalie T. (1999). Evaluative Inquiry for Learning in Organizations. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Rogers, Everett M. (1983). Diffusion of Innovations (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Taut, Sandy (2001). Psychologische Erklärungsansätze für Widerstand gegen Programmevaluation [Psychological Explanations for Resistance to Program Evaluation]. Diplomarbeit [Masters Thesis], Psychologisches Institut, Universität zu Köln, Germany.

Wholey, Joseph S. (1979). Evaluation: Promise And Performance. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute.

APPENDIX A

Interview Protocol UCLA Outreach Staff

(45 minutes)

Introduction

Sometimes it is difficult to implement a program evaluation. We call these "barriers" to evaluation. As we are working on the Outreach evaluation, we would like to know more about where these barriers come from. Thank you again for your willingness to help us. Your cooperation is very important in our striving to make evaluation work and be useful.

There are a few issues I would like to address before we start.

- In the interview, I will ask you to share your thoughts with me. As with most interviews, there is no right or wrong in answering my questions or commenting on the issues we will talk about. Please note that your statements will only be useful to us if you say what you really think.
- I would like to make use of the tape recorder to enable me to capture our exact and entire conversation and to avoid disrupting the conduct of the interview by taking notes. I assure you that the contents of the interview will be kept confidential. You will be given the possibility of reviewing the summarized transcript of the interview. You will be asked to add or make changes as you see appropriate. Your name or any other identifying information about you will not be linked to any of your statements and will not be given to third parties.

1. Attitudes

A. First, please tell me what you observed to be the general attitudes of people towards evaluation.

PROBES:

- What observations do you base your judgment on?
- Can you give examples?
- Do you think these attitudes are difficult to change?
- What stereotypes do people have about evaluation?

B. How about your own attitudes towards evaluation?

PROBES:

- What experiences helped shape your attitudes?

2. Inductive Explanations for Barriers

Could I now ask you to share with me your thoughts on the following question: What do you think are the barriers to evaluation getting implemented? [Be careful not to suggest a particular factor by the way the question is phrased.] Think about your experiences with evaluation and try to provide some examples.

NO PROBES

3. Deductive Explanations for Barriers

Now I would like to ask you to comment on some of the factors that evaluation researchers have used in the past to explain barriers faced by evaluation. [You already mentioned a few/many in your earlier comments.] Please feel free to dispute the relevance of the factors based on your experiences. Again, please try to provide examples to illustrate your views.

The first factor I would like to explore with you is called "**human factor**". This factor describes characteristics of people involved in an evaluation. What characteristics of people or psychological mechanisms could lead to potential barriers to evaluation?

PROBES:
A. Let's first focus on program staff characteristics.
- Do you think that particular *program staff perceptions* are relevant for explaining barriers to evaluation?
    - Could you provide some examples to illustrate your statements?
    - What role do staff's *previous experiences* with evaluation play in explaining barriers? [Program staff's prior experiences with evaluation might influence the way they react toward following evaluations.]
    - Do you think that some program staff fear *losing control or power* due to an evaluation? [Some people might feel that due to the evaluation they lose control over the way their program is viewed by others and how they themselves are viewed by others. They might also feel that they will have less impact on changes in program implementation or the general fate of the program if an evaluation is done.]
    - Do you think that program staff predict the evaluation's *potential positive and negative effects* on them?

B. We have been talking about program staff. Let's shift focus to the evaluator now.
- Do you think that *characteristics of the evaluator* are relevant for explaining barriers to evaluation?
    - Could you provide some examples to illustrate your statements?
    - How about the evaluator's knowledge in the field?
    - How about the evaluator's credibility?

The second factor used in evaluation research to explain barriers relates to the organizational setting of the program that is being evaluated, called the "**context factor**". How could organizational or program features explain the barriers evaluation has to face?

PROBES:
- How relevant is *the way an organization works* in explaining why evaluation runs into problems sometimes? [For example, the evaluation might threaten the existing status quo of administrative structures.]
    - Could you provide some examples to illustrate your statements?
- Do you think *specific program characteristics* could explain barriers to evaluation in some cases? [For example, program staff might reject an evaluation because the program's goals are so ambitious that it would be unlikely to reach positive evaluation results.]

- Could you provide some examples to illustrate your statements?

The third and last factor used in evaluation research to explain barriers concerns the way the evaluation was conducted; it is called the "**evaluation factor**". How could this factor explain the barriers evaluation has to face?

PROBES:

- Do you think barriers depend on *who commissioned* the evaluation?
- Do you think barriers depend on *who is known to receive the evaluation findings*?
- Do you think the *amount of money* allocated to the evaluation is important in terms of barriers to evaluation?
- Do you think barriers to evaluation depend on whether *stakeholders participated* in the evaluation process?
- Do you think the amount of *communication with stakeholders* while conducting the evaluation is important in terms of barriers?
- What *other features* of the evaluation are relevant for explaining barriers to evaluation? [qualitative or quantitative methods, criteria of judgment, relevant and specific information provided, etc.]

We have reached the end of the interview. Do you have any questions or comments?
I would like to thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B1

Attitudes

Question: "First, please tell me what you observed to be the general attitudes of people towards evaluation."
Probes: "Can you give examples?"; "Do you think these attitudes are difficult to change?"
Question: "How about your own attitudes towards evaluation?"
Probes: "What experiences helped shape your attitudes?"

Subjects	**General attitudes**	**Own attitudes**
1	Most people recognize the value and importance of evaluation. Sometimes the notion of evaluation is viewed as threatening. There may be high stakes involved, their job security, judgments made about their competence. So there is sometimes a degree of anxiety that the evaluation produces. The more people understand the purpose of the evaluation, the more they feel that the evaluation data are being collected in a fair and impartial manner, and the more they feel they are having some input in the design of the evaluation and have the opportunity to discuss the results, the more comfortable they will be with the evaluation. *Examples?* Right now, the higher the stakes, the higher the anxiety. In high schools with the SAT results, teachers see their competence being evaluated on the basis of a single test, this produces high degrees of anxiety and people engage in behavior that is not really appropriate for getting a fair and accurate evaluation going. Teachers feel that students are being tested on material that they have not been taught, so they respond negatively. Some of my experiences with school districts, when teachers are being observed, they will deny what the so-called objective observers have noted in their classroom visits. So there is a certain amount of denial, especially if people are not happy with the results that are shared with them. *Hard to change?* There are overarching attitudes that people may have carried over a life time of experiences that are hard to change, but some attitudes are very specific to the particular evaluation that is going on. So if the appropriate steps are taken, if you are open about the purposes of the evaluation, if people understand what is being done, if they think the data is valid and reliable, on this more specific basis the attitudes are really easy to change.	If evaluation is done well, I think it is very useful and very informative. Unfortunately, I have seen many poorly done evaluations. But I think my general attitudes toward evaluation is positive but there are specific instances where I feel something was done improperly and not thoughtful enough. *What shaped your attitudes?* I had one negative personal experience when I was evaluated unfairly by a high school teacher who said that the next person talking in class would fail, it was a irrational judgment. Programmatically, my general feeling is that the art of evaluation is still rather crude. We have not invested enough in education to create more sophisticated instruments in evaluation. As a consequence, we have a lot of educators including me who have dismissed evaluations because they did not accurately reflect what was going on. On the other hand, I participated in quality evaluations and for these I have a great deal of respect.

2	Generally, the people I deal with are supportive of the idea of evaluation because it is seen as something that has the potential to improve things or to reveal possible weaknesses. I am thinking about people in the university. But people in K-12 tend to see evaluation as a potential threat because it might reveal something negative that they will be held accountable for, there are implications down the line of negative findings. So the attitudes are different depending on which of the two populations we talk about. *Hard to change?* The negative ones definitely. The word evaluation gets used in ways that makes people fearful in K-12. To them, it is about taking a program away. It is about taking resources away. It is difficult because the word gets used by so many different people for so many different things that it would be hard to change those perceptions. *Examples?* In my work with school districts, when we talked about evaluating our projects, I have seen it conjure up a lot of different things for them; it depends on how we frame it going in sometimes. If we frame it in a non-threatening way, in a way that makes clear that all we want to know is whether we are on the right track with the program. I have not seen that same negative reaction at the university level. I have seen the same sense of passive detachment – that evaluation is something that has nothing to do with the actual work I am doing.	I am really interested in it. I tried to stay connected to the evaluation of the whole outreach efforts. I do still feel it is removed and part of it comes from my stereotype of evaluation and part of it is my experience with it and the difficulty in connecting with the evaluation team and finding out what is going on and having our voice from the field be represented in the way the evaluation is done.
3	It is different with different people. With one group, it is more work for them and they see little utility that comes back. They are expected to make a contribution without any feedback that is helpful to them. In another group, they see themselves as having been evaluated to death without anything that they see that comes out of it as productive or constructive. These are not just true for Outreach but for evaluation in general. One question that is important in Outreach is the question of privacy versus the ability to truly track the information for each individual continuously over time. In education, everything needs to be looked at longitudinally. The other problem is attrition. Sometimes you loose people because you are doing poorly, but that is not the case in Outreach. In Outreach, there are a lot of reasons why. And attrition can also be a positive outcome. For example, [gives example of how attrition can have both neg. and pos. causes]. If people do not have the feeling that you, the evaluators, are aiming at the right variables, then the likelihood that they will cooperate is small.	My own attitudes are very good. In school I learned about the importance of evaluation. I experienced formative evaluation as very helpful. I can show program staff how to use the data to improve their work on the student-centered side. If they do not know how to use the data, then it will end up on the shelves.

	Hard to change? Yes and no. There are some positive things that can help overcome those barriers. One is the notion of accountability. More and more people, whether they like it or not, are being held more accountable, so they need the evaluation data to respond to those demands.	
4		I think evaluation is perfectly fine and it should be done. Evaluation helps you learn. Sometimes you think you are doing the right thing but you are not doing the right thing. Through evaluation, through the eyes of someone else, you get to see a different perspective. It could be a valid perspective. A lot of times it is not a valid perspective because if the evaluator shows up at a bad day, when normally you have good days, then that evaluation would not be a good evaluation. It would have to go on for a longer period of time instead of just two days. From my perspective, we are fine with the evaluation of EAOP. We are looking forward to seeing what you are gathering. I don't think we have anything against the evaluation except for sometimes people just showing up and interviewing without telling us. A couple of times that happened. You want to know if someone will be interviewed. *Examples?* I work at XXX High School where the evaluation team collected data. My interaction with them has been fine but I can't speak on someone else's behalf. *Hard to change?* I do not think so. It does not matter what attitudes there are, it is done anyway. I think people know it is not them who are being evaluated, it is the program. The people are "out of the loop".
5	In general, evaluation is important. If you provide services it is important to know if your services are having an effect, that you make a difference; an opportunity for me to know if our services are having an impact on students, on schools. In terms of our partners, they also want to know. It helps them get a better feel for the effectiveness of the program. *So generally positive attitudes?* From my perspective, they are generally positive for the most part. We also have to be very careful and critical as to how we read evaluations because there is only so much they can measure, especially in the line of work that we do. There is a lot of it that cannot be measured.	I am appreciative but I am also critical and analytical. It developed from my studies, learning the value, the importance of it, as a student and later as a professional.

6	The general attitudes are very positive. When we started Outreach, the first evaluation was done on the student-centered side. All the way along, we knew that there was going to be accountability to the Office of the President. We knew that data was going to be important in order to share our findings, our success with others. Evaluators have a different eye, they see things differently. *[talks about the history of evaluation in Outreach]* All in all, the reactions to evaluation have been very positive, with one exception. We had some problems with one evaluator, Marv's predecessor. We have had monumental problems in terms of her personal interactions. But with Marv's team, things have been fine. We have tried to be as helpful as we can, I know the data collection has been frustrating, that is a byproduct of a number of other things.	
7	A long process. What effect will it have, i.e. we are doing an evaluation, but is anything going to change? *Examples?* In our program, two or three evaluations have been done. They were read, looked at, maybe opened some eyes of some superiors but other than that, it did not do much. I read them; in some parts I agreed, in other parts I thought "Ok, a different view" but I did not see anything got done with them. They were not used to change things.	I think the last two evaluations I read did not help much. They just talked about the negative parts of the program. I never get the reports myself. If people really had taken the time to review them, there could have been things changed since they came out, but there hasn't. To me, evaluations are done, but not used. I just hate when that is going on. We hear of another evaluation being done, and we ask "Why so many evaluations?" They give us all this information but either nothing changes, or we are asked to change at a certain moment in time so drastically and rapidly because we saw the need for change but we did not take the time to plan the change correctly.
8	On the school side, they get nervous when you ask them questions about programs. Maybe they think you are coming in trying to collect data for your own purposes and not for the school's purpose. You are using them as guinea pigs. I know this was a problem in one school district. But it has changed now. We built a good relationship with them. On the UCLA side, they are pressed for time. The evaluations are not high on their priority list. That way you don't get the kind of cooperation you would like to get. It is like pulling teeth. *Hard to change?* No, I don't think so. It just takes time, you have to build credibility, be there for a long period of time, gaining their confidence.	I think it has its place. It is needed if you come up with good data. Evaluators and evaluations are important for showing us which areas need improvement and which are already good. *What shaped your attitudes?* When I am evaluated on my job.

APPENDIX B1 cont'd

9	People seem to be in two schools about evaluation. One is that they truly support it and see it as a tool for learning, the other school are people who see it more as a threat, as criticism, rather than seeing it as support so that we can learn and grow. Those who see it as a tool definitely are people I want to work with because then you are learning together and that makes a difference. With the other people, it is hard to get information and that is what we are facing in some schools. They see evaluation as "judgment". *Hard to change?* Yes, it will take time because it is about relationships and building trust for people to have positive experiences with evaluation. Too often, schools, teachers, administrators feel that evaluations are used against them, that it is not about the good things that are going on but about the bad things – and there are consequences for that. *Examples?* In one school district, the people did give us the data we needed because they were afraid they were failing some requirements. They did not trust us and they were worried what people would think about them.	One of the most important processes in our work, in terms of understanding what we are doing and how we can improve on it. Evaluation is a tool. Without evaluating we do not learn, we do not grow or improve.
10	The regular evaluation that OP requires is pretty routine for us. The comprehensive evaluation is new. There were some unanswered questions about the protocol. There is a little mystery there. It is not necessarily negative, just a lot of unknown. There is not a clear picture of their role for the Outreach efforts. *What observations do you base these thought on?* On emails, on the unclear protocol, people asking questions regarding data. There is lack of information.	When we collect the data it helps us meet the requirements of OP. We are looking at eligibility, and now competitive eligibility. Now we are collecting data on the activities that our students are participating in and the hours of contact.
12	I do not know how representative my sample is but most people I know feel positively about program evaluation. They feel like they can get useful information. Most people assume that the evaluation will show that their programs are doing well and doing good. They are looking forward to getting evidence of that. They can use these evaluation findings with funders or other important constituencies.	I feel good about it. I took courses in it. I think it is important to do it. It is hard to get baseline data, you often think of it later. I am not an evaluator first, I am not thinking about it early enough sometimes.

13	Sometimes the evaluators come in and they have a preconceived notion of what it is that they need and that we must have the answer. But we do not know about all the aspects of the program. The barrier might be in getting this information. *Hard to change these attitudes?* No, I think they are easy to change. The evaluators have to be clear as to what they are looking for and understand what they are looking for. And you have to ask the questions at all levels of the program because you will probably get many different answers to the same question. *Experiences? Observations?* Yes, one evaluator seemed to just want their data to look good. They were not really interested in what I had to say.	
14	Honestly, people do not think much about evaluation. It is a little different with our program because it has been evaluated for a long time. But people are indifferent to evaluation, I think. It is not part of their lives. We do not evaluate ourselves so we do not know much about the process of evaluation. That is the case for me, at least.	Maybe it is lack of exposure. I see the need, the necessity to evaluate, to check if things are doing what they are supposed to be doing. I also see the need for research as well. Sometimes it takes an outsider who comes in with a clean slate to tell you based on observations what should be done differently. When you are engaged in work, you often don't see that, you are only focused on what you are doing. I am more action-oriented; therefore, evaluation has never been a major interest. I think evaluation is good and necessary but I do not see myself do it.
15	Hesitance. Uncomfortable feelings. Threatening personal safety. For example, with a tape-recorded interview, I do not really know where that goes. You assure confidentiality but I have to believe you, I have to trust you. So evaluation in general is not highly favored.	It is not a priority for me because there are so many other things I need to do. Evaluation is number eleven on a list from one to ten. I am so busy trying to get all the other things done I need to do that I have to take work home with me. I think written surveys might be seen more favorably than interviews. You can do it whenever you want to, have a break when you want to etc. *What shaped your attitudes?* According to my experience, evaluation is a lengthy process. During interviews, for example, sometimes you are asked the same questions over and over again. I asked myself: Have I not just told you that? What more can I say? On the positive side, I do think that the person interviewing me is really looking for true answers, in order to help the program. But I have not seen any products, any results of the evaluations, even though they were promised to me at the time of the interview.

16	Depending on what you are evaluating, evaluation is either embraced or shunned. With quantitative data, there can be more misinterpretations and lack of understanding, whereas qualitative data, e.g. stories, generally have much more meaning to people. *Examples?* Quantitative school data should be readily available, but not much attention is paid to data in the district. Therefore, the data is not of high quality. The data is not valued enough, and there are no evaluation conversations. Qualitative data, e.g. observational data in classrooms, seems to have more impact on changes when it is reported back to the schools.	Data is to inform the work we do. I have a strong belief in reflecting on data during the evaluation process. I want to take the data to the staff and ask what it tells us about our practices. We need to explore the work we do based on data we collect. For example, why do 35 % of the teachers leave the district each year? What do they need to stay?

APPENDIX B2

Stereotypes

Question: “What stereotypes do people have about evaluation?”

Subject	Stereotypes	Keywords
1	The whole notion of being judged, judgmental, that the evaluation is used to “get me”, that it is not going to be used to assist me but is perceived to be negative and punitive in its nature. This goes back to experiences with teacher evaluations for grades when people felt they were treated unfairly. Or personnel evaluation and their job depends on it, if people felt their supervisor made unjust and unfounded accusations based upon the evaluation. People mix personnel with program evaluation.	Judged, punitive, out to get me, unfair, unfounded
2	A disconnect between what something is trying to accomplish and how it will be measured. Also, quantitative research gets associated with evaluation and then there is the notion that it is removed and that it has nothing to do with what people are experiencing.	Quantitative, removed, disconnected
3	The first two points I mentioned. And I think it is changing, especially with the student-centered side of the program. A lot of it is because Marv has taken over the evaluation. It is beginning to feed back data that we can use to strengthen our work. That is the key to evaluation to me. If the feedback is in a form that we can use, then we can improve. Our needs are being met much better than before now.	Low utility, useful feedback
5	One is that it only captures one moment in time. Therefore, it is not representative. That is one criticism. Another criticism is how the information is obtained. Depending on who gives the information, who is interviewed, there is always the question of are they really telling me the reality, what is really going on, the validity of your information.	Not representative, incorrect data
6	The terms that come to mind: helpful, professional, effective.	Helpful, professional, effective
7	Just “long interviews”, “long process”. Sometimes “information”. If it is wrong or right can be seen differently by different people. If the evaluation shows something that was not even the purpose of the program, then this evaluation is incorrect. But if the evaluation shows what the people in the program also see happening, then maybe change comes about. Oftentimes, evaluation reports are just “another paper” that you have to read but then you set it aside in a binder.	Long process, (valid or invalid) information, just another paper
8	Being graded. Judging them on their work.	Graded, judged
9	For these people, evaluation is someone saying what they are doing right or wrong. So it is threatening because people think “I am doing something wrong” or “I am not good at what I am doing”.	Judged, threatening
10	Not on the program side, but the schools might be leery about evaluation because of the nature of the schools, the low performance of their students. They might be protective of the data they share and fear it might come back to haunt them rather than to help them. I do not think I or the program staff have stereotypes.	Fear that negative results come back to haunt you
11	There is an inherent human suspicion. However, people go through evaluations on a regular basis now. It is getting better because people are more used to it now. We are only a few years away from a radical change in that regard. There is also suspicion about how the evaluation results will be used.	Suspicion, used to it

APPENDIX B2 cont'd

12	Not really. Sometimes people have the most rudimentary understanding of it. They think of it as a simple pre-post design. When I deal with the school districts, they don't have impressions. They expect us to know about evaluation. I guess that is a stereotype: it is something mysterious and better left to experts.	Mysterious, better left to experts
13	A professor who will publish it and nothing else really being done with it. It will not be used for our purposes of monitoring our progress. Sometimes it seems the evaluation does not know what it is asking. That makes it hard to help the evaluators find the information they are looking for.	Professor will publish it, not useful for us, unclear purpose
14	I think of evaluation as a process where people are interested in observing something to determine whether or not it functions. I think of evaluation as I think of research, people finding out about what they intend to do.	Evaluation = research, finding out whether something functions
16	Teachers think of teacher evaluation. They think it has no validity.	Personnel evaluation, no validity

APPENDIX B3

Barriers to Evaluation (no prompts)

Question: “What do you think are the barriers to evaluation getting implemented?”

Subject	Barriers to evaluation
1	Lack of knowledge and understanding of the evaluation, especially its purposes. People are not sure or distrust the reasons for the evaluation. A second barrier might be the instrument or the method of evaluation is not appropriate. A third barrier might be that people feel the results of the evaluation reflect poorly on them, or on their work, or in some way have a negative or adverse result for them personally, and their personal interest. If people feel they have been mislead and they see the data being used in ways that they did not understand it was going to be used, that will create negative attitudes toward future evaluations. If people do not trust the competence of the people doing the evaluation, for example if they think the evaluators do not understand their work enough to make the judgments.
2	Lack of understanding of the purpose or the importance of it. And how integral it is to the whole project, that it is not something detached from the actual outreach work. In particular with people who are asked to fill out surveys. To get them to respond and to respond thoughtfully and honestly is really critical. Time is also a barrier, there is not enough time to plan the project and plan changes and one of the first things that get pushed to the side is the evaluation. That is also a question of priority, that it is seen as a low priority, not only for the people in K-12 but also for those of us at the university.
3	One of the obvious barriers – and this is not true for Outreach – is the resources to do good evaluation. It is often a last minute thing: Oh let us just do a survey. Then it is poorly thought-out evaluation. I have seen that happen. So it is the resources and the design and the thoughtfulness. I do not suggest that all evaluations have to be terribly expensive. Another piece is the understanding by the evaluators of what they are evaluating, the dynamics thereof. This could be reflected in the design. Both real and perceived understanding; perceived means, if the people who are being evaluated do not see the evaluators as knowing what they are doing. They do not see the evaluator as an expert, even though he might be one. *Examples?* Earlier, we engaged someone to do the evaluation. This person came in and in essence said, I will use the quasi-experimental design. I told her, I am not the expert but I do not think this will work because you will not get enough subjects in each group to do a statistical analysis. And she found out that is was indeed a problem, and the results were favorable, but not statistically significant. The effect on our staff who had to go out of their way to help her do the study and then get such feedback was negative, negative, negative. So going back to the barriers, you reinforce precisely those attitudes that you are trying to overcome. So we had a real experience! Then, when we started to work with Marv’s team, it was good that his team went out of their way to create the kind of working relationship with the staff that was necessary to get the evaluation going. That helped a great deal.
4	We are concentrating the evaluation efforts on activities that are going on in the schools with a small population. But the schools themselves have not been evaluated. That is what I would like to see happening. If you go to a site and there are five people at an event, you are trying to figure out why they are not showing up. There are reasons for them not showing up. There were surveys with students finding out why they do not show up, for example the parents do not allow their kids to stay after school. All this should be taken into account in the evaluation. In the schools, if they do not know you, they will question why you are here. The relationships I have with the schools, with the principals, are not the same everywhere. Some welcome us and others do not. The whole staff is like their principals at the schools. That affects evaluation. It happened that a survey was sent out to the counselors, but not all were filled out. It would probably be a good idea to have lunch or dinner with them and tell them what you will be doing, what you are looking for.

APPENDIX B3 cont'd

5	To getting information for an evaluation? I mentioned earlier, making sure that you are getting correct responses, that you are getting realistic answers, that there is honesty. That is the bottom line. Another barrier is getting access to the program people, having them make time for you, gaining access to the right people. Also in terms of the evaluation tools, making sure you are using the right tools.
6	One of the barriers is access to data from schools. There is a technical problem: Infrastructure, time, resources. Then there is also a reluctance to share data because they know their performance is not satisfactory. Another problem is that all three districts have gone through significant changes of key administrators, e.g., new superintendents. There is also a trust issue. We need to ask, what can we do with the data that is of benefit to you… The evaluators and the program people really have to work together. I don't know if that is a barrier because we have done a pretty good job with it. Evaluators need to know what we are trying to do, what we are trying to accomplish in different places by doing different things, they need to have some backgrounds. At the same time, program people need to be aware of what evaluators are about and to be able to facilitate their work. It is really a team effort. Another issue is time. Do the program people have time, do the evaluators have time. The personalities of the evaluators could be a barrier, but not with the current evaluation team.
7	Gathering correct data. Having the people dedicate their time to it, e.g., to get interviewed. Having people feel comfortable and saying what they really think, and hopefully it will not have negative effects. The perception of evaluation goes back to "again another evaluation", and nothing is being done with it.
8	Winning the stakeholders' confidence. You have to convince them that you are there to help and not to judge them or grade them. You have to get their trust – that is a barrier, by just being there and sometimes by becoming their friend. You have to be at their level, not above them. You also have to persist, be like a pest so they do what you want them to do.
9	One are the misunderstandings people have about evaluation. To overcome those you have to build trust. Evaluation is also often seen as something separate from the work that is going on, that can be problematic. They often do not see themselves as included in conversations about it, or they don't know how to frame it, what questions to ask – when the program people don't see themselves as part of the evaluation. Time is also a barrier.
10	Collecting data. Not all schools work the same way and can give you the data that we need in a timely manner. It has not happened a lot, but some schools have been reluctant to share data. When you have developed relationships in the schools and then a new administration comes on board, that creates barriers, too. If you got a system working and then the key person leaves, you have to start all over again. Then, often the data is not complete. So the biggest barrier is collecting the data. Inputting the data into a system is not a barrier, but it is time-consuming. From your perspective, a barrier is to get program people to make time for interviews. And getting in contact and getting to know the people who can help you. If you are encountering barriers, then those are probably the barriers we are encountering, too.

APPENDIX B3 cont’d

11	There is a pattern. If the people are really into the [program] activity, if they are really immersed in it, then it is hard to have them sit down long enough to say what they think they are doing, what they think the results are. That is an inherent barrier – they say they have no time. I see a lot of that. The schools we are dealing with are some of the most impacted high schools of the state. We are trying to correct that. We get so immersed in that, we don’t even want to stop to talk about what we are doing. There is such commitment for the job that it can be a barrier to evaluation. That is as shortsighted as it can get but it happens. From the UCLA side, we still have not clearly defined what our purpose is. I think everyone is committed to our overall mission of increasing the number of underrepresented students at UCLA. The problem is the HOW. When the questions come from an evaluator, it is difficult to help the evaluation move along because you never feel secure about what it is you are trying to do. Unless, programmatically, what we are trying to do is clearly understood by everyone, the evaluation becomes a problem. That is what bothers me the most. Another thing that affects the evaluation is the changes in personnel, especially on the school side. Every school I am working with has changed principals in the last year, for good reason. Then you come with the evaluation. Well, we are still trying to explain what the program is about – as much as we have figured it out ourselves. The schools do not want to look bad, they want to make sure their best foot is forward in an evaluation. That is natural. Because they are not sure about the programs themselves, there is a certain hesitancy on their part with regard to the evaluation. You can tell them you are not using their names etc., but they think “Yeah right”. There is a trust problem. That applies to any of us. They see evaluation as a process that might verify that not much has happened in the school.
12	One is the “thinking early” I just talked about. It all comes back down to good data and how to get good data. How do you measure what is meaningful and not what is easy to collect? What are meaningful change indicators?
13	Evaluators should not just rely on what staff have to say about what is going on in the schools. It is important that they go out to the schools, get a feel for the schools, and interview some people there. That would be a way to overcome barriers to evaluation.
14	Fear by the people being evaluated is a major one. When someone that you do not have a working relationship with calls you and tells you they want to interview you or observe your work, it feels almost like being graded. Even though you know it is a good thing and people are not out to criticize you, with your experiences in school, it does feel like you are being graded for a good job or a bad job. I remember the first time I was called by someone who wanted to observe my work, I was nervous because I did not know the person. People are not comfortable having someone checking them out while they are working.
15	Evaluation as a low priority is a barrier. The job itself that you are doing could be the barrier, the prioritizing of the job over the evaluation requests. The fact that you do not know the evaluator, the person you will be talking to in an interview, could be a barrier, whether that person really cares about what I have to say – or am I just a checkmark on a list?
16	The evaluator and the program people must have conversations about the purpose, the process and the outcomes of the evaluation. A trusting relationship must be built. That is everything in schools. Also, the evaluation should be meaningful and useful to the organization. The more information the evaluator gives up front, the more cooperation she will encounter.

APPENDIX B4

Human Factor

Subject	Human factor (general)
1	Distrust. Bad experiences with evaluation in the past. Threats with regard to how the evaluation will be used.
2	There is the issue of fear, what are you trying to find out about me, and how is this going to impact me and used against me, so there is self-protection and privacy issues for a lot of people. That applies to the K-12 people as well as the faculty. With the faculty or the UCLA outreach people, there may be a sort of defensiveness, this is our project and we are doing fine and we do not need to be evaluated – this sense of ownership on both levels and the self-protection mechanisms.
3	If you are being evaluated, one could feel very defensive. So how can you make people less defensive if that is not what evaluation is all about, that they are really on the same team instead of "us against them". I have seen both. I have also seen evaluators come down and say "My job is to EVALUATE you. And I will tell you where you are right and wrong."
4	The schools have a lot of programs in their schools. Everyone is hesitant to accept new programs because they might end up doing work for one year and then the program leaves. As an evaluator you are coming in as just another person. When I talk to principals, even to good principals, they see it as a wave. You are here now but you will be gone. The consistency is missing. *Program Staff Perceptions?* [talking about difficulties in programming] They need to really care about the students. They need to work evenings, Saturdays, but you are working for the parents, for the kids, for the school. *How could evaluators show they care?* A lot of the data does not get recorded I think. But you should ask the college counselors at the schools how they feel about the program; they are the staff that know the most about whether the program makes a difference. A lot of times you might not see a big change reflected in the evaluation. But if you see the whole school, you would see a bigger change. The counselors know the trends. It is very hard to measure accurately what the program achieves if you concentrate on program activities and UC admission. My main concern is that students go to a four-year college.
5	It has to do with your interpersonal skills. If you are trying to get information from someone, you have to make that person feel comfortable. The comfort has to be established before trying to get any information. It can be established by giving them information on what you are trying to get from them, making sure they are well informed. Also, how you approach them.
6	Both evaluators and program staff need to have an ability to effectively communicate. Part of it is social, part of it is to conceptually understand and to make sure that each side is not just throwing out jargon. The personality issue is another thing. Evaluators and program people also have to be able to read situations, they have to understand the context in which the schools and the program is operating. An example is when a previous evaluator needed some data, coinciding with the time when some schools were closed because Asbestos had been found. Sometimes it is impossible to make available some data. Now they have the longitudinal database, so it is better now. You need to be able to predict and we need to be able to live in their time frame. The program people have information that is critical for evaluators to have and if we have conversations about those things beforehand, then the program people know what information they are supposed to be keeping and the evaluators will know when they need access and how to set up the mechanisms. The procedures need to become part of a relationship.
7	*Program Staff* Staff might be so overwhelmed, so busy, that they see evaluation as secondary to their doing their job, service to students. Time is a barrier. And then, not disillusionment – but frustration sometimes. We are being told we are not doing a good job or we know we are doing our best but yet the evaluation shows quite the opposite. We might have seen improvements in our schools but the evaluation generalizes and shows the opposite overall. And you think "But I have improved this part." When our superiors read it, it brings us down, back to zero. And we say "This is not true".

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

8	I think race is important, of the program people and the evaluator. If the evaluator is Caucasian and the data comes from a minority, they may not trust you. Also, economic status. If you are coming from UCLA to a really poor neighborhood, that might be a problem. *Program Staff?* The program staff might not know what the goals of the evaluation are. They might not be informed. They might not know enough to support it.
9	Fear, people are afraid of participating. And the other part is lack of trust in the people doing the evaluation, which relates to fear, in terms of "What are they going to do with the information when they get it." And then lack of understanding, but I don't want to sound condescending.
10	If staff see the evaluation as additional work they might not be very receptive to it. It is important that they know in advance and can work around it.
11	A lot of the Outreach staff are younger, with obvious ambitions. It relates to wanting to look good. It is obvious we are doing some good things and the evaluation should show that. The younger people have a natural concern regarding their future. And they have not always had an evaluation, except an informal one. As an evaluator, I would wonder if I am getting a straightforward answer. They have to get used to that now. Nobody is putting out money anymore unless there is some proof of impact. That is very necessary in my view.
12	Evaluation might not be a priority. People are more compelled by either what they are held accountable for, or what they consider to be important. People might be intimidated by it. They might see it as something they cannot do or they feel like they might not get the positive outcomes they would like to see.
13	People (I mean people who are in charge of the evaluation) who look stern und unapproachable, but maybe are not. People who are arrogant. Others might be very friendly but they do not know what they are doing. *Program Staff?* Someone who cannot commit to a date and time to participate in the evaluation. For example, I cannot do everything, I cannot please everyone. There is a time issue. Also, I am asking myself what the interview will be like, what the interviewer will be like. I did not know you before.
14	We fear the unknown. It is unsettling when someone you do not know does something to you that you don't know very well, and when that person does not know the work that you are doing. Maybe they do not know anything about the work you are doing but they know about evaluation – and they are critiquing your work.
15	First of all, the "I don't know you and I don't trust you" factor we talked about earlier. Secondly, insecurity of the people being evaluated, not enough self-confidence about what they have to say and how they should say it.
16	*Program Staff?* Teachers: they need to understand why the evaluation is done. Another problem is the timing in which the evaluation is done: when is it appropriate to be interviewed? A teacher's day is filled. Another question is: How will the evaluation inform their work?

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

Subject	**Prior experiences**
2	If someone had a negative experience with evaluation I would expect that they shy away from it. In the schools that we work in, not only did evaluation have negative results but they were used in negative ways, in destructive ways. So I think that definitely, previous experiences would be important.
3	Very relevant, yes, as mentioned before.
5	Yes, absolutely. If you said something in an evaluation that came back to haunt you... I think people get nervous when you ask questions. *Examples?* I have had positive experiences. I have been interviewed a lot of times. I have had positive experiences because I am honest. As I said earlier, we have to be careful how we assess our work because we make differences every day, could be in a phone call or a meeting, differences in the lives of students and families.
6	With our arena, no prior experience has been particularly problematic.
7	Yes, because prior evaluations were very demanding. For one evaluation, we had to leave a certain number of students alone while working with the other half. And that was difficult for staff, to not be able to help those students, too, even if they asked. After that, it was "Oh my God, another evaluation".
9	Right.
10	This comprehensive evaluation is new to us. The other evaluation requirements are built into their tasks, so that is nothing new. The demands for interviews and having to escort your staff, that is new to us, at least for continuing staff. They see the evaluation as additional work.
12	Sure, if people have had positive or negative experiences, it is almost certain to affect their willingness to engage in evaluation.
13	Yes, definitely. Two years ago, we were told that we were being evaluated on one thing, but it turned out to be something completely different. Then we do the human thing, we shut down. We became suspicious.
14	Possibly. It could also just be fear of the unknown, as I said earlier. In my case, the first time I was evaluated, I did not know the person who would evaluate nor the purpose of the evaluation. I had no prior experience, but I did not know what to expect.

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

Subject	Power / control
1	If the program staff feel that the results of the evaluation will negatively impact their work or their position (that is a form of power), or if the evaluation threatens the amount of time that they have, the way they are doing things, the power they hold to make decisions because of the evaluation results.
2	*Control?* It is possible. The evaluation might measure something other than what the program is trying to accomplish. There might be a fear that the evaluation reveals something negative that will be used in a way that might take away control from the program people when it is not really warranted. *Power?* Yes, indirectly, because who is in power will determine what will be evaluated and how this information will be used. But on a person to person level I have not really sensed that. That may be because I am in a buffer position when I do not feel coerced by the evaluator nor by the school. If an evaluator went directly to the schools, then that might be an issue.
3	*Control?* I don't know if they see it as loosing control as much as being exposed. *Power?* Indirectly, if you are being exposed in a negative way then who ever you are working with may have less respect for you and question you etc.
4	*Control?* No, I don't think so. Personally and for the other staff, I do not see that. You are evaluating the process, not the people. The process was set up before the person was here.
5	*Control?* UCLA people no. Externally, it goes back to the issue what is the data being used for, does it go to the legislature, does it point out this high school to the legislature. We are talking about schools that have been identified as low-performing. I don't know whether "lose control" is the right phrase. That it would come back to sting them, that is definitely a fear. That is a political concern.
7	*Power issues?* No. If the evaluation shows somebody is doing a better job than somebody else, we already know who is doing a better job than others. It will not catch us off guard. We know who should be recognized and we will be ok with it. Only if the evaluation does not identify the correct people, we will wonder what is going on. *Losing control?* No. They don't have time to worry about that. And this program is not about having control, it is about getting the job done.
9	*Control?* Yes, that is part of the feeling of not being part of the evaluation, definitely this could be an issue of control. If they are not part of the design, if they do not see it as integrated in what they are doing, then it is about somebody else doing it to them, and then they are not in control. *Power?* Yes, in the sense that their roles would change due to the evaluation.
10	I don't think that is a factor. We have not seen a lot of reports of the evaluation. We have seen the CBOP reports. Someone took these results personal. The contents of the reports generally corresponded with the perceptions and conclusions of the staff. So it was no big surprise for us. Maybe in the future there will be surprising findings that might change these attitudes of staff.

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

11	I don't think program staff believe that the evaluation is an objective assessment that is not going anywhere. They ask what you will be using the evaluation for. They are not too sure what the agenda is. There is a lot of mistrust out there, especially because of "accountability", "cutting your head off if you are not performing". It is scary for a lot of people.
12	That is certainly an issue for people who feel they do not have any control in the first place. That issue will get heightened depending on how autonomous or beleaguered they might feel. So if they feel like all that ever happens with the data that get collected is that they get beat up, then they will be reluctant to share the data or to support the evaluation. If people have more autonomy and control in their lives, then this is less of an issue to them. Or they might even feel this is positive because they can show what a good job they are doing and attempt to get more approval or credit in the institution.
13	They might. But what they are often lacking is an opportunity to share with the evaluator what it really is that they are doing. That is why visits are so important so that the evaluator sees what is actually happening.
14	I do not mind to be told what to do if I feel the person who is telling me how to do my job knows my job. But I do not take it kindly if that is not the case. I accept feedback from my boss, who has done my work and has done it well. I am more receptive if I know the person criticizing is not just out to criticize but to point out a better way of doing things based on their experience.
16	Depends on purpose of evaluation and how the results will be used. Who has control over the information? If the people don't understand where it will lead, there will be barriers.

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

Subject	Prediction of findings / cost-benefit analysis
1	Yes, that is relevant. As mentioned before.
2	Yes, as mentioned before.
3	Yes, as mentioned before.
4	You could predict it for each school because you know how much support you get from the school. I see it through my eyes, you come in with different eyes though. *Threat?* No, I do not think we are impacted by the evaluation results.
5	I do not think evaluation is taken that seriously. If the results are really bad, it gets people's attention. But for the most part, we are so involved in our work and trying to make a difference --- a lot of it goes unmeasured. There are so many things that make a difference but not all of it is documented. For every issue that the evaluation captures, there are ten other things that go unnoticed. And some of these issues are really meaningful. There is a lot that we do that makes a difference, changing culture, for example. We educate a family that does not know anything about college. We conduct a parent night, and then you take the time to meet with the parents again, you increase their college awareness. That is meaningful change. That is an example of something that might not be captured. You cannot measure that.
7	*Predicting outcomes?* Yes. But I think if you ask them questions and want their opinion, they will be straightforward, whether it comes out positive or negative. They really want people to know what is going on in the high schools or the different components of the program. That is what I like about the staff – they are very honest. People don't dictate what will happen in the evaluation. People were interviewed but their statements never showed up in the evaluation.
10	I am not sure they look at the benefit end of it because that may be so far away to them. I think they see the importance of it but they don't see any immediate benefits of the evaluation.
11	I think so. A barrier would be if they did not see anything coming back to them. In some cases, people might actually want evaluators to come in and see what they have achieved; they think they have done something good and believe the evaluation can show it. But working in schools and with people, it is rare that you get clear-cut results like that. The changes are incremental. And our environment, the legislature, for example, is very immediate. People are aware of this need to show results NOW. When you come in to evaluate, they know they cannot show that all of a sudden, there is a 400 % increase. That burden of trying to change something that has been going on for a long, long time is scary for a lot of people. When you come in as an evaluator and you talk about the data and the results, the people know you are not seeing the kind of results they would like to see. That has to do with the multiple factors that they do not control but they are evaluated as if they did have control.
12	I think so. I think people do that positively and negatively. We will look good in this and therefore we should collect it, or I don't know if we will be able to show what we are changing, I don't know if we will look good.
13	*Prediction of potential outcomes?* Yes, they think that everything will be negative, based on prior experiences. *Cost-benefit analysis?* Yes. We and the program are being evaluated, and we have no control over it. I cannot tell a professor what they should be doing or not.

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

14	*Prediction of potential outcomes?* I don't know about people in general, but I like to be told whether I am doing a good job. There is the potential for a lot of positive reinforcement that is sometimes necessary to continue the kind of work that we do. I also like to know if there are better ways how I can do my work. That is probably true for most people. I would hope that if you asked a group of people whether they would prefer to do their work every day without ever being critiqued, they would say no. Once people have overcome the shyness and fear, then they will take on a more positive attitude and accept the evaluation. *Cost-benefit analysis?* It has not crossed my mind but for some people it might. If they got more of a stake in what is being evaluated, it would be good. If I am being evaluated, I would like to have some benefit from it, to learn how I could do things better, for example. Everyone wants to improve.
16	*Cost-benefit analysis?* This seems to be an important piece for school people. How will I learn about the results, how will they be used, who will have access? *Prediction of negative outcomes?* Yes, prior information and preconceptions can color the commitment to what we have to do. What is expected? Will it be difficult or useless?

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

Subject	Evaluator characteristics
1	If it is evident that the evaluator may have some biases, or hidden agendas, or if he is not competent enough, or if he does not understand the program being evaluated well enough to make judgments about it. Sometimes there is arrogance on the part of the evaluator.
2	I do. I think members of the evaluation team need to have a sensitivity to the environment that they are going into, the people and the program they are evaluating. They need to be aware that there is potential for them to evoke those feelings that we talked about, to create a situation where there is fear or worry about how the results will be used. There is also the chance to create an atmosphere where this does not exist. The way the evaluator approaches the evaluation is critical. *Credibility or knowledge in the field?* In my experiences with educational evaluations, those can be two separate things. The credibility is not necessarily connected to the experience someone has an evaluator. K-12 people could probably care less about the amount of experience someone has as an evaluator, as long as that person has experience in K-12 schools and being one of them. They will be much more comfortable when they believe they are in the hands of someone who understands their context, not so much the evaluation methods.
3	Very much so. Probably more so. If they come across as "us against them" as opposed to "I am here to help you by giving you critical feedback" I think it makes a major difference. *Knowledge in the field?* Very much so. I mentioned that earlier. If you don't understand what you are evaluating and the dynamics, you will miss part of it and you will not get the respect and your findings will not be as credible.
4	There are things that I could say to my supervisor that need improvement but it is a different story if the evaluator says what needs improvement. We could be saying the same thing, but it is a different point of view when it comes from the evaluator who is an outsider. That is why I like to see that perspective. I do not worry about the credibility of the evaluator. I trust you – if you have been selected to do the job. I only worry that your view might be too limited on what you are evaluating.
5	They have to come across as someone that is credible, who knows what they are doing. *Knowledge in the field?* That is very important, that lends to credibility. That person is an expert and knows what they are talking about.
6	*Knowledge in the field?* Absolutely. I would go beyond that and say that in your work with school people, you need to know what goes on in schools, in classrooms, with counseling. The evaluators have to have the technical expertise but they also need to know about the context of the school. For example, there are times when schools come to a halt because they are doing standardized testing. They need to know about "norming day", for example. There is some homework that evaluators need to do. Some questions should not be asked, they should be found out a different way. They should also know the contact persons in each school who are changing. You have to know the people to talk to and the people to stay away from.
7	Yes, if the evaluator is a type that is very easy-going and with whom you feel comfortable, and who is flexible, then it is easier for people to dedicate their time. But if the personalities just clash, and if the evaluator is too demanding, the staff will not be as cooperative and give their time. The evaluators need to show some patience and show some understanding; people notice when they are sincere about that. *Knowledge in the field?* That would be good. Sometimes evaluators asked questions that they should have already known. That can be bad, certainly if you are dealing with people in the field, e.g., principals, counselors, etc. Knowledge about the program would be helpful, about the school, the environment there, who the main contacts are – that would make a big difference. What CBOP and EAOP look like in each school differs.

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

8	If you are a student evaluator versus a professional evaluator, program staff will look at you in a different way. The credibility is affected. Also the age is important. If you are a young woman going somewhere to evaluate something, and the program person is 60 years old, they might be reluctant. They may not trust you. *Knowledge in the field?* That plays a big role.
9	Absolutely. They can do the most to ease some of the fears. They can provide a sense of security for the people by including people in the process. The evaluators can make a difference. *Knowledge in the field?* I think it is critical because it has to do with credibility. As a program person, I want to feel like I am talking to someone who knows about my work and the things I do because that also validates what I do. If the evaluator is totally disconnected, then the questions she asks and the probes etc. will not be as good.
10	Yes. I have had experiences with the evaluator prior to your evaluation team. The mindset, the terminology used to describe has a lot to do with the receptivity to the evaluation. So the evaluator sets the tone whether staff will be cooperative. *Credibility?* If it is known that evaluation reports were issued that did not reflect the information shared, the credibility of that evaluator is on the line, and it jeopardizes future collaboration.
11	The work I would do as an evaluator would be based on what the purpose of the program is that I am evaluating, what resources did you bring in, how did you carry out what you set out to achieve, and what have been the results. And you might talk about impediments, too. But the evaluation work depends on what the evaluator perceives to be the purpose of the program; and that depends on how it is stated to them. If it is not clear in the minds of the program people, then I am not sure how clear it can be in the minds of the evaluators. *Credibility?* Yes, although there is now enough there in terms of qualified evaluators. The qualification side is not an issue, neither in the schools, nor at UCLA. I think there is respect for the evaluation, especially coming out of UCLA.
12	It could. If people feel like evaluators are different from themselves and would not understand or not be sympathetic to what they are trying to do, then they are less inclined to feel positively about the evaluation. The more familiar they have become with the evaluation in the past, the more they have a frame to put evaluation in. The fear and intimidation factor gets lessened. Particularly if the evaluation seems mysterious and done by some other kind of human being, then the more it raises issues of experts as outsiders, experts as distant from the work that the program people are engaging in, the more it would have a tendency to make people nervous. *Knowledge in the field?* I would imagine this to be a big positive factor. I know people who are social workers who feel a lot better if they are being evaluated by someone who has been a social worker, if the evaluator has engaged in the daily routines and knows the details. The same is true in education. It is like a union card – if you can show it, you are likely to be given some credibility on credit.
14	*Knowledge in the field?* Depending on the purpose of the evaluation it might not always be necessary to know the program or the tasks that well, i.e. if you are looking at broader issues, like UCLA's role in Outreach, for example. *Other characteristics?* The evaluator should not be aggressive in approaching the program people. They should try to put people at ease. Instead of being a passive observer, they might want to be a little more participatory and hands-on. There are probably different characteristics for everybody. There might be people that are not comfortable at all about having someone in the room observing them

APPENDIX B4 cont'd

15	To me a passion is more important than a degree. If you really want to know, you will dig until you have found the answer you were looking for as opposed to just accepting what you were told at first.
16	One important aspect is the agenda that the evaluator brings to the table. They have their own values and beliefs. It is also important how questions are asked, what the body language is, in short, what conditions the evaluator creates. The evaluator should be dressed appropriately based on who is going to be interviewed (children vs. superintendent) *Evaluator's knowledge in the field:* Certainly, n good understanding of the organization, based on either written or verbal information beforehand, will give the evaluation more depth and more valid outcomes.

APPENDIX B5

Context Factor

Subject	Context factor (general)
1	There is a relationship between the purpose of the evaluation and the conflicts. If the people in a program being evaluated feel threatened by the evaluation, if the program is evaluated in such a context, then there is a defectiveness. If evaluation checks on compliance or competence of the program people or questions the work of the program – this is all part of the context and determines how people perceive the evaluation. On the other hand, if the evaluation asks how can we do this better, we need a more objective set of eyes looking at our work and giving us feedback, then the evaluation happens in a more receptive context. So I don't look at context independent of the other issue, I see them as interrelated.
2	This factor explains barriers to a large extent because if an organization is structured in a way that has not historically revealed the way that things work or the connections between programs or any of the inner workings of the organization, then the evaluation could be seen as a greater threat to the individual well-being. The culture of the organization as a learning organization and also just whether different departments know what they each are doing or if the don't. If there is a department within an organization that is run autonomously and nobody has ever questioned what they do and how they do it, and then there is an effort to evaluate that department, I would expect that there would be resistance. That has to do with structural issues – that this department has been separate from everyone else and has never been questioned before.
3	The context of accountability will cause people to assist with having good evaluations. The opposite could also happen. It is very political, it lends itself to political influence. Whether it is good or bad, if the name of the game changes constantly or the measures that are used then why bother. It becomes very discouraging. In Outreach, the money was given to us with the mandate to create long-term changes. Half the money was for that and half for more immediate outcomes. Institutional and organizational changes take 10 years. If we work with the students, we see changes in one to four years. So you set the standards according to the mandate. All of a sudden two years later, they say, on the partnership side, we do not see any impact so the money is gone. Why bother evaluate?
5	We operate at so many different levels, we are counselors, we are teachers, we are mentors, we are administrators. We wear many different hats. That is what people may feel; they ask: What are you trying to measure, what hat do you want me to wear when you ask me questions? We do so many things. Unless the evaluation identifies all those things and measures their impacts, it is simplistic.
6	For example, the changes in leadership in the schools has been phenomenal. Of fourteen superintendents, thirteen started in July. Of seventeen partnership high school, nine have gotten new principals this year. Which means you start all over again building contacts, and with the politics. Another are board elections, e.g., you change from a predominantly African American board to a Latino board. So the context really plays a significant role [for programming issues]. The same with changes in our staff. Some senior site coordinators have made themselves critical, for example. They developed trust relationships at the schools.
7	It might. Outreach is this big, vast component. Every school is so different. One school could be this amazing school where everything works great, at another school it is even a struggle to communicate with the principal. It is so difficult to analyze. The school environment really has a big impact and that makes the evaluation difficult. How can you compare schools if their environments are so different?
8	No, I don't think the setting has much relevance, e.g., for the evaluator to get data.
9	If we look at the K-12 system, teachers feel that evaluative information is used against them. There is this whole issue of accountability, and teachers see it as evaluation. If people are watching them, it could have consequences in terms of their pay, in terms of their reputation, so I think that right now in the K-12 system, people are very suspicious of anything resembling evaluation because something might change to the worse for them. [Gives examples of teachers afraid of knowledge assessment] They see evaluation as a threat because of the structures they are working in. They are confusing personnel and program evaluation. For too long, even if a program was evaluated, it ended up being about the teacher.

APPENDIX B5 cont'd

10	Not sure. I remember one time when an evaluator was observing a session and that made the participants very apprehensive and inhibited them from interacting in the usual way. That was not a good observation.
11	The program staff already have an uneasy feeling. They are very committed, every one of them. When they go out into the schools, they see what teachers these kids have. One of them tells me, 40% of the teachers at one school are not even credentialed. And there are even more who are teaching out of their specialty. This is very common. Yet, UCLA is holding them to increasing the number of students competitively eligible to UCLA. They are looking at barriers themselves. They say: "We don't control that. Why are we being evaluated for that?" That is your contextual barrier. And that is why they are scared of the evaluation. And I don't blame them.
12	Very relevant. If the context is one where people are given latitude to try things and if it works it works, and if it is a mistake that is fine and they move on, then people will be more open to evaluation. If the context is one where people are punished or otherwise held accountable in seemingly capricious or harsh ways, then people will not want to be evaluated, they will not want to give any more power over themselves to other people. So I imagine the context to be a big factor.
13	I am not sure because oftentimes the evaluators do not really know what the context of our program is like. They should not come in with preconceived notions, they should come in and observe what is going on.
14	For Outreach in general, from a programmatic standpoint, there probably would not be many barriers. You would probably get a high level of cooperation from people. At the schools it might be different. Schools are sensitive about who they let on their campuses to do what kind of work. They are not trusting of stranger, they have been burnt many times. They often do not appreciate university people telling them what to do.
15	I believe this could play a role. If you are in a program that is understaffed versus a program that is well-staffed, well-funded, and running like a well-oiled machine, the time people will have to support the evaluation will be very different. In Outreach, we are somewhere in between those two extremes.

APPENDIX B5 cont'd

Subject	**Organizational / administrative structures**
1	This is important for explaining conflicts as well. If people think the evaluation is something being done to them rather than with them, if they see it as top-down, imposed, they might be more suspicious.
11	At the university side, everything is grant-driven, driven by resources that come in. And the money comes in pieces. The money from the legislature comes from pressure on the legislators. If there is pressure from the community college side, here comes money for a community college program. And this relates to the structure of Outreach. It also comes in pieces. And someone who is running one of the components, sees their part and does not always see the overall picture. The university recognizes that and is trying to correct it by having us all come together and understand one another's roles. The barrier there is that the people do not see the total picture of what we are trying to do and worry about the evaluation of their part. There are so many different types of aid to students. All the different projects and acronyms. When I first came in I did not understand what they were all doing. When you evaluate, the program staff tend to think only about what they are responsible for, not how everything is connected. They miss the big picture, we miss the big picture.
16	At the schools, especially at the secondary level: it is crucial to make the appropriate time for the evaluation, to be able to understand what is important in that school, to have conversations with the staff, and to understand the barriers that exist. The evaluator should ask questions upon entry. They should understand that there are people who are positive and some that are negative. There is power of the position and there is personal power, i.e. there are people who have informal power and those who have formal power. Both determine whether the evaluation will succeed. Another point is what kind of leader is in the organization. Preferably, the leader understands the value of assessing one's work. There should be communication systems in place within the organization that help staff understand the purpose and utility of the evaluation. If there is a focus on a specific population, the leader has to communicate that this is important to the organization as a whole. A leader who passes the ball (the evaluation) to someone else, for example the assistant principal, is not as good.

APPENDIX B5 cont'd

Subject	Program characteristics
1	Right, that is true. If the people feel there is a lack of alignment between the evaluation and the program goals, another disjuncture between the two.
2	Certain types of program might be more vulnerable than others. If the goals of a program are more open to question than another, for example, not many people will question the value of a program to improve literacy rates but if the goals are not as common or as well understood as literacy, then there might be some worry about how it will be evaluated and how the evaluation results will be understood.
4	It depends on the schools. If you have six or 49 participants means different things in different schools. The evaluators should know that.
9	All of the schools we are working with are very low performing. Students are not learning a lot and are not succeeding. The teachers think that people feel they are not doing their job. They feel like we are trying to get them. So when we meet with them, they start by blaming everything on the students.
10	In order for the evaluation to take place, the evaluator has to go out in the field. There is no possibility of changing the setting. ***Earlier you mentioned staff turnover?*** New administration or staff turnover also affects the evaluation because the evaluators have to be reintroduced and to prove themselves credible again.
12	If a program is radical or in some sensitive area, for example, drug abuse, that would serve to heighten evaluation worries. Certainly, context issues of seeming program success or weakness; so as the program people have some sense of whether they are doing well or poorly, that is a context that would operate to make people more or less open to evaluation.
16	When gathering student information, privacy became an issue. Technical issues might be barriers to gathering information for evaluation. In addition, sometimes it is a barrier who is the director of a program if he or she refuses to allow access to data.

APPENDIX B6

Evaluation Factor

Subject	Evaluation factor (general)
1	Anything that comes as a surprise is bad news. Anything that people feel is imposed on them. I believe strongly that before evaluation takes place there should be conversations between the evaluation team and the program team being evaluated. It is even better if the program people can give input in the design of the evaluation or review the instruments or anything, so they can feel they have some control over what is going on. They should feel there is an understanding of the program that makes it likely that the evaluation will produce fair as well as valid and reliable results. I think evaluators could often have done a better job if they had conversations with the program people first. In other words, oftentimes I do not feel they understand the program enough to do it. I really think that by getting to know the program better and by letting the program people know what the evaluator has in mind and getting input from them before the final design is being developed, I think the quality of the evaluation could improve as well as the trust between the evaluator and the program people.
2	The quality of the evaluation ties closely to the quality of the evaluator. The evaluator can create the barriers. The questions that are asked, the quality of the instruments, for example a survey that does not immediately make sense to the person filling it out, I would expect that would really hurt the response rate. It is also important how much time it takes the person and that the person knows what to do with it once they are finished etc. So from a practical standpoint, if it is not well thought out and if it is not in tune with the organizational culture of the program it might create a barrier.
3	Competence and knowledge of the evaluation team. They have to come across, and they must understand the context. The way feedback is given is also important, it has to have utility. Not just giving statistical tables – the manner in which the feedback is given is very important.
4	You cannot evaluate one school the same way as another school. That is what makes a good evaluation – it adapts to the specific context. If you had one person visit all our schools, they could see the differences. The same challenge has to be met by the program also. [Example of how program adapts to specific school context] The criteria of success are different for each school as well. For one school, 15 students might be a good result, for another it might be 45 student. There are certain things you need to know about how to interact with staff. If you want something for a certain date, you need to ask two weeks ahead. At another school, you can get it the same day.
5	It should be clearly written, that uses language that the lay person can understand, and if graphs or statistics are used, making sure that they are at a level where everyone can understand them. That is important. And having good methods in the evaluation. And having good documentation so that if someone wants to verify something you claimed, that you can point to the sources, to your documentation. That speaks to the credibility of the evaluation. *What else would an evaluator have to do to not run into barriers?* For those of us who are being interviewed, it is important to know the purpose. You have to make sure that the person is well informed, what you are measuring, when and how it will be written up. All this information will make the participants feel more comfortable with the evaluation.
6	I don't think we have entered into a conversation about how the evaluation helps our partners. They do not have an interest in providing the data. If you don't have data, then your evaluation design is problematic. The districts have not been able to take advantage of the evaluation.
7	If you need all the information and data at the last minute, there is a barrier. We will get something to you but it might not be exactly what you had wanted, especially if it is data from the schools.
8	They could not judge the quality of the evaluation until after the evaluation is completed. That is very important, if the report is well-written, easy to understand, and how it is reported. That affects how well they will cooperate in the future. If evaluations come out of UCLA, they got to be good reports. That has a huge impact on what kind of cooperation you will get in the future. It has to be a good evaluation.

APPENDIX B6 cont'd

9	The kinds of programs we are involved in are so complex. If the participants don't feel that the evaluation is getting at all the issues in a meaningful way, then they will see the evaluation as not helpful and meaningful. It is very important that people see the evaluation as well done.
10	If the information is not shared up front and the program is not aware of what type of evaluation is going on, it could create barrier. Knowing what is going on, and perhaps having some input, would make both our jobs easier. At this point, there is a mystery how the evaluation is operating and what our involvement is. Initially, we shared questions with the evaluation team. We have seen the Occasional Reports but we have not really gone over them or developed new evaluation questions. I am not sure what the evaluation questions are that you are working on right now. I am not sure where we are now.
11	Number one: collection of data is a problem. [Gives examples of data collection problems] Whenever you do an evaluation, the data is a major barrier. They are embarrassed, they need someone to help them with it, it is not readily available. Number two: time is a huge barrier. When we talk to school people about what we want to do in terms of our program, we just add to their list of things to do. [Gives examples] The other barriers we have mentioned already: fear of being evaluated, fear how the results will be used, are they going to be published, are guarantees of anonymity trustworthy – there is a saying: "Once bitten, twice shy." Some people have been disappointed. Again, the credibility of UCLA is high, they will tend to believe you. But it is still a fear factor. There is a minor one: sometimes there is a personality issue. There is a personality clash. But that can happen with anything, it is not a major barrier. But you have to be cognizant of that. But the time issue covers a lot: How much do I have to do? What does it mean for my staff?
12	The first thing I thought about when I heard you say "evaluation factor" is that nobody likes to be evaluated. It is a risk situation, the risk is that you won't fare well. If you are risk-aversive, then you are not going to like evaluation. If you have to take exams as a student, or if you go through a review process as a faculty. Everybody is nervous about evaluation to one degree or another. By definition, evaluation is tricky business. Then there is also the issue that you don't know how good the evaluator is who is passing judgment, whether or not the right data or circumstances exist to prove that you are doing well, whether or not you would agree with what other people use the yardstick by which to measure you.
14	I can think of some suggestions that might help at the planning stage of an evaluation to prevent barriers. If you are going out to the schools to evaluate, it would be good to bring the schools in to participate in the evaluation planning, getting the principals involved, so they develop some ownership in the evaluation. They can be your biggest proponents at the school. They can put you in contact with everyone you need. Last year, all of the planning was done in advance and we were just told that we needed to work things out with the school. The schools are not receptive to being told what will happen, they like to have some say.
15	Oftentimes, the people being evaluated know only what the subject matter is of the interview or the evaluation. You do not really know what the questions will be, or what will be expected of you. You want to do right by the evaluator and right by the program. You want to be honest, but you do not want to rock the boat too much. I hope by the time I leave, I have helped the program and the evaluation team for the greater good. I don't know what will happen to the answers I have given you, so that is a barrier to evaluation.
16	For gathering data, it is important how much time is dedicated to the interview, for example. If surveys are passed out, there are different problems to be taken into account, for example, how accurate the information collected will be. There is also an interpretation issue. Not all data allows all sorts of conclusions.

APPENDIX B6 cont'd

Subject	Who is the client of the evaluation / who pays for it
1	Obviously. Who gives the money often gives the people some clue what the motives might be to do an evaluation.
2	Sure, if that entity was identified, if it is not a known entity or a trusted entity. If there was some history with that person or group as being judgmental or difficult in previous evaluations, if the evaluation was used in ways that were not viable to the program people.
3	I am not sure if that makes a difference. *Who receives the results?* No, not very relevant.
6	That is not the same. If the people who commissioned it, have not actively supported the involvement of our school partners, then it is problematic. And that is true in our case. We have pushed to include partners, and we have not been successful.
7	*Who receives the results?* I am being evaluated but I never get a copy of the reports. One copy for the whole staff is not going to do it. Maybe each team should get one. Or find out who is interested in reading the evaluation.
9	Yes, it would make a difference. A group of teachers undertaking a textbook evaluation is different from a school board evaluating a program by counting the number of students failing. *Who receives the results?* Yes. If the evaluation just goes to the school board, then teachers will be hesitant to participate and you will not get to the real issues because they don't believe it will be anonymous. Everyone has to see himself or herself as a stakeholder in the process.
10	(laughs) That could play a very big role.
14	*Who receives the results?* It might make a difference. In the past, and I think I can speak for my colleagues, none has ever received any evaluation findings. It might be a good idea to share your results with the people you are interviewing so they can see the fruit of your work. You will probably get more cooperation from them in the future if they saw that you did not mistreat them in the evaluation, because that is what people are afraid of. And if they saw that the findings are actually beneficial to their work in some way.
16	*Who receives the results?* This is very relevant in creating barriers --- who is the target group for the evaluation findings? One example: Some parents gathered information at a school. Not everyone knew how the results would be used. It was printed and presented to the school board. It created some serious racial issues. We are talking again about the issue of who benefits and how the results will be used. Another example: Superintendent and union leadership collected anonymous data on the effectiveness of principals. In many cases, principals were called in to talk about the aggregated data because it was very negative. When a new superintendent arrived, the negative statements were considered to describe reality, and the goals of the year were based on these statements. So the honesty of the principals in the survey was used against them.

APPENDIX B6 cont'd

Subject	**Amount of money dedicated to evaluation**
1	If people feel their program is under-funded and they see large amounts of money being spent on the evaluation, they might question the value of the evaluation. Usually it is not a factor but occasionally it might be.
2	That only matters if it affects the quality of the evaluation and the ways in which it is approached. In general, if the quality is good and the people doing it are sensitive and aware, then I don't think the money would matter.
12	I have yet to see a project that was well funded in terms of evaluation. Generally, projects themselves are not well funded, and putting aside some money for an evaluation means that something else is not happening. As we discussed earlier, even though people might generally think it is a good thing, it is hardly ever high on the priority list. Evaluation is often seen as competition for programmatic elements. That is if somebody remembered to mention evaluation in the first place.

Subject	**Qualitative vs. quantitative methods**
1	We have a fixation on quantitative methods. It seems that quantitative methods sometimes oversimplify the complexities. But on the other hand, it gives the results a scientific aura when you provide numbers. They are frequently used without everyone understanding what those numbers really mean. Qualitative results can be rich and detailed. A combination of both can sometimes provide really interesting information. But the old notion is that qualitative is soft, and quantitative more scientific – to me that is just a lack of understanding.
2	It depends on the situation. Quantitative methods could create barriers because people feel their work is not being captured adequately by the instrument, but qualitative methods could create barriers if people feel their privacy is being invaded by one-on-one interviews or observations. The improper choice of methods could create barriers, it is critical to choose the method that is least intrusive yet gathers the most information.
3	It depends on the nature of what ever it is you are evaluating. Some lends itself to qualitative methods, some to quantitative methods.
5	I think most people are more comfortable with qualitative methods, quantitative is more numbers and statistics. But both are important. The best evaluation would be one that includes both and that pays careful attention how the quantitative data is presented. It is always good to hear stories or interviews, but it is also important to get quantitative information, it adds weight to the evaluation.
6	It does back to the understanding issue. People trust numbers, they see them as objective, as verifiable, they can go back and check them. Qualitative data can be interpreted differently. You can do that with statistics too, of course. In our case, if we really had that partnership in terms of evaluation design, that would be really important for us. They are both powerful, it depends on what you use the methods for.
9	In education, the first thing program people will say is that numbers don't tell the whole story, the whole picture. But it goes the other way, too. If all we do is telling stories in a qualitative way, then we are not getting the whole picture either. People have to perceive the process as fair and that lots of issues are being studied, and not just in one way.
10	You need both. The numbers cannot explain it all, so you need the qualitative data to give you what the numbers do not show, especially with a program like ours.
12	People still like numbers. It seems more compelling to say "75% of participants had a ten-point gain". That is compelling to certain kinds of audiences, funders, external audiences. Internal audiences usually find more compelling the story about an individual that was in dire straits and can read or hold a job now. I think both are necessary. They seem to have different valence with different audiences. Evaluation should include both to attract the attention of both audiences.

APPENDIX B6 cont’d

Subject	**Participation of program staff in evaluation process**
2	I think it can create barriers if the program people don’t participate in the process. Without their input you are missing an important perspective that can help ensure that the design of the evaluation is comprehensive and sensitive to the culture of the institution or the program. On the flipside, it could create problems if there are power issues, depending on who the stakeholders are. This ties back to the question of the sponsor of the evaluation.
3	Whether it is evaluation or starting a new program, involving all stakeholders is a good thing. The answer is yes.
4	In parts of it the program staff could help with the evaluation but not in others. For example, for the student-centered part or if you need to talk to the counselors I could help. It is not just about mailing something; I said earlier, if you had a lunch you could introduce what you intend to do with the evaluation.
5	That is another important feature of an evaluation: having different voices in it, getting different perspectives, staff, different levels of staff, students, parents. I am glad you mentioned this. It is really important to get different perspective. If I read an evaluation that only used UCLA staff as sources – it is important to also hear from the recipient side, the students, the parents.
6	Yes, not that we did not try.
7	For me, it would be good to know what the goals, the direction of the evaluation are. Sometimes we are interviewed but we don’t know the purpose of the interview or the evaluation. If we knew what the information was used for, we would have input on the evaluation, we could say “You are missing this component or that”. But only the people higher in the hierarchy could help you with that because everyone is just so busy. It is difficult to get everyone together even for us.
8	It would make the evaluation easier on the school side if the evaluation turns out to have positive results. But you cannot assure that because you are reporting the data you are getting, you have to be unbiased.
9	Absolutely. They should be involved to see themselves as part of it, that makes a huge difference, in all the work we do in schools. It is all about informing practice, it has to be seen as part of our daily work.
10	Should happen on a regular basis. At least in the beginning of an academic year, so we know what you are doing and you know what our needs are.
11	The evaluator might have to find a way that his work can be done with a minimum impact at the site. Sometimes you may need information that cannot be gathered. The staff usually go complain to their superiors: “You are killing me.” So that means, you have to be very, very, very adaptive. There are evaluators who create a barrier for themselves by their inability to understand the problems of the people they are dealing with, but focusing only on themselves and what they are trying to do.
12	Sometimes it makes people feel like they are just participating in their own demise. I do think it is a good thing to do but it might not do away with people’s fears because I have not seen an evaluation where the participants actually participate in the interpretation. Usually they participate in identification and collection of the data. The evaluators usually interpret the data in order to write up the final report. People are smart enough to know that participation only goes so far. So I think that it would help, it would make the process seem less mysterious and it would help in terms of dealing with the uncertainty that people feel during an evaluation process. But ultimately, they know they will not write their own report.

13	Yes, this would eliminate a lot of barriers for the evaluator. Many times we do not even know we are being evaluated. This could easily be resolved in a retreat, just half a day would be enough. We have not received the results of the previous evaluation but we are being asked to participate in another interview. None comes in and tells us in one big meeting what they are going to do. I would like to see a bigger picture. That relates to what I said earlier about the professor. They are really smart people but they do not seem to be able to communicate what they are doing to other people. We don’t even know who exactly is part of your evaluation team versus other professors and their students who interact with us. If we are lucky we are told what will happen in a staff meeting, but sometimes it is just a quick email. And then we have to live with it. I would like to get more information ahead of time from the people who will be doing the evaluation. They could come into our staff meetings, tell us what they are planning to do, who they will need to talk to, and what product they intend to have by what date.
16	The greater the pool of participants, the better the results of the evaluation. Regarding the participation in the evaluation process: an evaluation benefits from it. When everyone comes together to ask questions and determine the purpose of the evaluation and the way in which it will be done, then the program people own the evaluation process. It will be more useful to them.

Subject	**Communication with program staff in evaluation process**
2	It depends on the role the stakeholders have. If the stakeholders are supposed to give feedback on the design of the evaluation, then not enough communication might create problems. On the other hand, if the stakeholders are giving feedback clouding the issues and biasing the results then it creates barriers. You need to find a balance – involving them without letting them influence.
4	Last year, we were communicating with the evaluator at the site. It is just so we know who comes in. One time, someone just came in and sat in the back and we did not know who it was. That should not happen.
6	Yes, not that we did not try.
7	Yes, this is important.
10	Should happen on a regular basis. At least in the beginning of an academic year, so we know what you are doing and you know what our needs are.
12	It is participation, it is explaining how, in the long run, it could be useful. In other situations, the lower down the program staff, the less information they usually have about the evaluation, but they also lack a framework for understanding evaluation. They don’t actually understand the processes, the data collection, etc. They are not used to thinking across cases, for example, across other teachers. They do not have those cognitive structures in their heads to understand. So the more information we provide, the better, as long as they really help them understand, to get the bigger picture. This would really help people feel more positive about it.

APPENDIX B7

Advice for Evaluation Team

Subjects	Advice
1	I feel there has not been enough conversation between the evaluation people and the program people. Talking about what we are trying to accomplish, how we are trying to do it, we could inform each other. Both our work would be better if we engaged in more conversations up front, early. I often do not know what the evaluation people have in mind and what they are doing until I hear later down the line. Sometimes there are things we should have better spent our time on to evaluate than other things. So this is my main advice: I would like to see more conversations up front, before we develop the evaluation plan, about the program, what we are trying to accomplish, about possibilities for evaluation design. The program people would give their time for that. The people working in our schools should be involved in these conversations. I do not think it is ever too late to change. There is a certain path we have got to keep going on, the college student part, the course patterns. But there are other aspects of the program where we have more latitude. In fact, I think it is essential because a good evaluation could help us make better use of our resources. I know the Occasional Reports are being printed. But we never really have conversations about them. If the purpose of the evaluation is to learn more about our work, then we should have planned opportunities to talk about what the evaluation has found and what it means.
3	All the factors we talked about need to be taken into account. The evaluation is going very well right now, it should continue that way.
4	The program staff should know the evaluators, the goals of the evaluation, what and when they will collect data etc. Communicating with each other is the key, I think.
5	Maybe the first step would be to find out from staff what they think should be measured in their line of work. Go to the front lines, ask them what areas of their work we should look at in the evaluation. And then you can try to reconcile that with what you believe to be important. You cannot measure everything, but that way, they feel they are heard and their voice is incorporated.
6	There is some frustration on the evaluation side, also about the partnerships. We have not recently sat down and had some informal conversations over a cup of coffee about what is going on and what are we trying to get. On the programmatic level, what do you guys see as frustrating, and where do we share these perceptions and where they are different. We could help you, you could help us with the frustrations. This is difficult work. We are dealing with the most resistant organization to change in our society, the schools. The context in which they work is extremely high pressure. The number of variables is so great, too. We have not had the conversations in an arranged, formal sense that would make this a truly formative evaluation. We missed some opportunities in that regard. For example, we need to tighten our budget for next year. What has the evaluation team identified in terms of what might work and what we might need to get rid of. We should ask the same questions. What contributions could the evaluation make for programming?
7	Gain more knowledge about the program. If the person who hired you to do the evaluation gives you information about the program, a lot of details about the program will be missing from the evaluation. Always know about the particular high schools where the program components are being implemented. And involve the program people involved in the particular component you are evaluating, keep everyone who is affected well-informed. We are asked questions in the schools and we need to be able to answer them. I think better communication is the key.
8	Be professional, be tenacious, be polite. Hang in there. It might take a long time to get your data, but keep at it.
9	The relationships you have with the program people are important. One of the Occasional Reports was about the Parent Component, and the evaluators built relationships. I think it makes a difference. The other thing you do well is to meet with people and include them in the process. I have never felt that the evaluation team is doing something I do not know about and then all of a sudden a report would appear, but there was always a lot of conversation about it. That is really important too.

APPENDIX B7 cont'd

10	Get to know the staff, occasionally attend the staff meetings. If the staff are aware of what you are doing and see you as part of the Outreach effort, they will be more supportive of your work. They can help you with some data problems. We should work as a team. And communication is very important.
11	The problems, the barriers have always been there, and it has not changed, the fear is still there. The one problem that is overriding all this is that those who control the state want immediate returns, and it transcends to the university. The people in the field see that immediate returns on a social problem are impossible. The challenges are enormous. It is hard to convey that. But we will keep at it.
12	I find the task that you are undertaking unimaginable because you got so many different kinds of projects. Many of your audiences are not going to believe what you have to say anyway, for example, the legislature. It depends on what they want to do, if they want to fund outreach this year, they will listen, if not, they will dismiss your information. You have got so many different objectives, when they are defined in the first place. It is a huge beast to trying to get a handle on, everyone has been going along their merry ways for all these years, that I would imagine that some people see this as a nuisance. The closer you get to people who are experienced with evaluation, the closer you get to cooperation. But even cooperation now is not going to help with baseline data from previous years.
13	To me it is important how much time is spent on understanding the program. It is not enough to know about the goals, it is important to see how the program is being implemented.
14	I do not know enough of your work to be able to say anything. It might be a good idea to sit down with the evaluation team and find out what you are doing.
15	I just met you today. I would have liked to meet you before, have lunch or coffee, and develop a more personal relationship so I would be more comfortable in the interview. It would also be nice to know what is coming up with regard to the evaluation, who you will need to talk to and why. Maybe a general meeting about evaluation should be held where it is clarified what is planned, how it is pertinent to Outreach, and why evaluation should be a bigger priority than we make it right now. Because it is definitely not a top priority right now, and if nothing changes it will remain that way. Communication should be improved and maintained.
16	I have no advice but a possible evaluation question: For the School-University Partnership schools, what evidence is there that the work has made a difference in enhancing leadership, teaching practices, and student achievement. How has the district benefited from SUP?

APPENDIX C

Outreach Evaluation Project Information Form

Project Title:	Principal Investigator: Email:
Start Date:	Projected Completion Date:

<u>Abstract:</u>

EVALUATOR TASKS	Outreach Staff Contact Person	**About when will you contact them?**	**Anticipated staff time involvement?**	**Dear Outreach staff!** Please indicate comments, questions, concerns, ideas, etc., below.
Do a task analysis by breaking your project into as many steps as it will take to complete it, from the initial step to the final product	Write here whose support or collaboration you will need, specifically related to your tasks			Check below and write your respective comments in the space provided on the back of this sheet
Evaluation Project Planning Table				

EVALUATOR TASKS	Outreach Staff Contact Person	About when will you contact them?	Anticipated staff time involvement?	Dear Outreach staff! Please indicate comments, questions, concerns, ideas, etc., below.
Do a task analysis by breaking your project into as many steps as it will take to complete it, from the initial step to the final product	Write here whose support or collaboration you will need, specifically related to your tasks			Check below and write your respective comments in the space provided on the bottom of this sheet
Evaluation Project Planning Table (cont.)				

Outreach Staff comments, questions, concerns, ideas, etc.: