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Program evaluation does not take place in a vacuum. Its context is the interaction of political, economic, and technological developments that influenced the formation of federal policies for mandated evaluation requirements. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 established policies to provide “financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational program” (Public Law 89-10—Apr. 11, 1965). This legislation also had another consequence: it helped drive the establishment of educational program evaluation and the field of evaluation as a profession.

The purpose of this study is to examine the interaction of national political, economic, and technological factors as they influenced the concurrent evolution of federally mandated evaluation requirements. More specifically, the study focuses on Title 1 of ESEA and it examines the growth of the field of evaluation as a practice over four decades, eight administrations, and nine reauthorizations to the ESEA legislation.

Two methods of data collection provide the findings for the study: (1) an extensive examination of historical documents and, (2) interviews with key informants. Nine key informants were interviewed, of whom six are considered pioneers of the field
of program evaluation. The conceptual framework that guides this study is an ecological model based on four unique spheres or groups of factors: (1) international and global factors, (2) national political, economic, and technological factors, (3) federal policies, regulations, and legislation, and (4) Title I evaluation requirements. The influence of national factors on evaluation requirements was found to be both direct and indirect.

The 1960s civil rights movement helped spark the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which included a mandate to evaluate federally funded programs and thus launched the specialty of program evaluation. Over the subsequent four decades, shifting political climates, the ebb and flow of economic forces, and the rapid emergence of new technologies all contributed to changing goals, standards and methods and values underlying program evaluation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The Emergence of Educational Program Evaluation

Educational program evaluation does not take place in a vacuum. Its context is the interaction of political, economic, and technological developments that influenced the formation of federal policies for mandated educational evaluation requirements. These interactions create shifts in political ideologies, promote new educational reform movements, influence changes in political leadership, and foster new coalitions. The major event that led to the establishment of educational program evaluation requirements and the field of evaluation as a profession was the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 (Fitzpatrick, Sanders & Worthen, 2004; House, 1979). This legislation established policies for the provision of “financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational program” (Public Law 89-10—Apr. 11, 1965). Between 1965 and 2005 there have been nine major reauthorizations to this legislation.

Madaus, Scriven & Stufflebeam (1983) explained that “accompanying this massive effort to help the needy came concern in some quarters that the money invested
might be wasted if appropriate accountability requirements were not imposed” (p.13). In Senate hearings for ESEA, Senator Robert Kennedy from New York, raised the question, if you are placing or putting money into a school system which itself creates this problem or helps create it, or does nothing, or little to alleviate it, are we not just in fact wasting the money of the Federal Government… investing money where it really is going to accomplish very little, if any good? (89th Congress, 1st Session, 1965, Senate, p. 511)

In response to the concern raised over accountability of funds invested in education, Congress amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964 (ESEA) to include specific evaluation requirements. Hence, the requirements to evaluate federally funded education projects were established by Congress with its attendant politics under Title I of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Financial assistance was provided to local education agencies “serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families” (P.L. 89-10—Apr. 11, 1965). The evaluation requirements for education agencies receiving federal funds were as follows:

1. Local education agencies were expected to present an evaluation plan for their proposed programs; and
2. State education agencies were required to promise to provide a summary report to the Commissioner of Education.

Cronbach et al. (1980) contended that the legislative mandate was significant. He pointed out that the reports to the Commissioner of Education should show the following outcomes:

- The effectiveness of payments under Title I,
- The effectiveness of particular programs assisted under it, and
The improvement of the educational attainment of educationally deprived children.

Moreover, the evaluations of Title I projects were to include “appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement” (P.L. 89-10, Apr., 11, 1965). According to Cronbach (1980), the legislative mandate demanded factual data rather than reassuring testimonials.

This study examines the Interaction of Evaluation Requirements and Political, Economic, and Technological Developments through a historical study of the evolution of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This historical study provides the opportunity to understand and appreciate those elements of the past that have had an influence on current educational events. Block (1968) stated that there exists in man a certain curiosity about the past and that this curiosity gives birth to the concept that perhaps hidden within the accomplishments and mistakes of the past is the key to a better future. A historical examination of evaluation requirements is important because it provides educators with a time perspective that cannot typically be acquired through direct experience. Moreover, in the search for how things happened, we are provided with information about how to better understand the present status of educational program evaluation and to make new and innovative contributions to the growth and development of evaluation theory and practice.

Gall, Gall & Borg, (2007), explained that historical research helps educators understand the present condition of education through analysis of the past. It also helps educators imagine and judge the likelihood of alternative future scenarios in education.
Further, historical inquiry provides a way for policy analysts to answer questions raised in context evaluation such as:

1. What conditions influenced the adoption of a given policy; and

2. What has been the policy’s impact on educational program evaluation over time?

Answering these questions helps evaluation researchers and policymakers understand the political, economic and technological factors influencing evaluation requirements of federally funded education projects. In pursuing these questions historians use a variety of sources including written, oral, and sometimes physical artifacts.

**Politics and Educational Program Evaluation**

The national thrust against poverty and discrimination in the 1960s introduced a new phenomenon with which evaluators had to contend: large-scale programs of social action in education. At this point in history, social action programs were aimed at improving education for disadvantaged children. This went beyond the narrow focus of in-service training for teachers or improving a science curriculum, which were prevalent prior to 1965 (Weiss, 1972; Cohen, 1970). When leaders in the educational evaluation community responded to the call for evaluation of Title I, it became apparent to them that their work and their results were not responsive to the questions being raised by those who wanted to know about the program’s effectiveness. The new evaluation requirements “forced educators to shift their concern for educational evaluation from the realm of theory and supposition into the realm of practice and implementation” (Madaus, Scriven, & Stufflebeam, 1983, p. 13). Moreover, the new educational reform efforts had
influenced the field of educational program evaluation which at the time “had little stature and no political clout” (Madaus, Scriven, & Stufflebeam, 1983, p. 15).

Chelimsky (2008) proposed that the training evaluators receive assumes an unthreatened evaluative independence:

- It concentrates on methodology, not milieu,
- Emphasis is placed on the technical merits of one evaluation design versus another, and
- The training is without reference to the origins of the political question posed or to the reigning political environment.

In order to recognize and deal with ordinary issues in the world of government and bureaucratic maneuvering, evaluators need proper training in the politics of evaluation research (Chelimsky, 2008). Cohen (1970), contended that

There is one sense in which any educational evaluation ought to be regarded as political…they were established by a political institution (the Congress) as part of an effort to change the operating priorities of state and local governments and thus to change not only the balance of power within American education but also the relative status of economic and racial groups within the society. (p. 215)

Scriven (1991) stated that to evaluate or evaluation “refers to the process of determining the merit, worth, or value of something, or the product of that process” (p. 139).

Evaluation is not only a technical and methodological exercise but also a political act. When professionals engaged in the process of evaluating social action programs they were making statements on the merit or worth of these new programs, which could have
political consequences for the future of those programs. Weiss (1991) stated that when evaluators “interpreted their data and chose which findings to highlight and which recommendations to make, they were intervening in affairs that had generally been the province of bureaucratic and political decision makers” (p. 211). The consequences of evaluation would have political influence on new policies for the new social action programs. Further, Patton (1997) explained that “failing to recognize that an issue involves power and politics reduces an evaluator’s strategic options and increases the likelihood that the evaluator will be used unwittingly as some stakeholder’s political puppet” (p. 345).

Chelimsky (1998), who has contributed extensively to an understanding of the political nature of evaluation of programs and policies, identified two problems in the way evaluators have traditionally thought about “the fit of evaluation into the real world, and in particular, into the world of politics.” First, as stated earlier, the intertwining of politics and evaluation is not foremost in the mind of evaluators, and secondly, when evaluators think about politics and evaluation, they examine them separately (p. 37). If indeed, we as evaluators want to influence policy, it is imperative that we pay a lot more attention to how politics influence our work.

Chelimsky (1995) stated, “our ability to develop sound evaluations to serve policy depends as much on what we understand about how politics works as it does on the quality and appropriateness of our methods” (p. 217). Once evaluators become more sensitive to the impact of politics on their work, then they can be more strategic in their approach to evaluation research and are better able to influence policy and legislative actions.
How then can we as evaluators be the best that we can be? According to Weiss (1993), “only with sensitivity to the politics of evaluation research… can the evaluator be as creative and strategically useful as he should be” (p. 94). As evaluators who wish to have an influence on the policies that impact our work, it is essential that we integrate the study of evaluation and politics. Cronbach (1980) explained that

The evaluator has a political influence even when he does not aspire to it.
He can be an arm of those in power, but he loses most of his value in that role if he does not think independently and critically. (p. 67)

Many professionals are not aware of the interaction of political, economic, and technological factors as they influence federally funded evaluation requirements. Moreover, many are not even aware of the influence of these factors on their daily work. Thus, a lack of awareness of these elements has implications for the theoretical formulations made about the practice of evaluation and the credibility of the evaluator’s work.

**Background to the Study**

Since the legislative requirements for the evaluation of Title I projects of the ESEA of 1965 were first enacted, many of the procedures used to determine program effectiveness have undergone both theoretical and technical changes.

- In the Johnson era, evaluators studied the results of expanded government programs seeking to help the disadvantaged.
- Under President Reagan evaluators studied the outcome of cutting or dissolving those same programs.
During the Clinton administration (1993-2001), evaluators studied the dismantling of assistance to families with dependent children and reductive changes in Medicare.

The Bush administration (2001-2009), focused on “closing the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind” (PL. 107-110).

Chelimsky (2007) argued that “evaluation requirements are shaped by the governmental structure, policy and political climate” (p.13). Cohen (2009) explained that Title I of ESEA of 1965 is a creature of government and thus open to the political influences that operate there. Consequently, evaluation requirements as stated in the legislation are influenced by the political milieu. These influences include the movement from divided to unified government, changes in executive and legislative branch leadership, new political coalitions that included more conservatives or liberals, and shifts in ideology, especially about the role of government (Cohen, 2009).

In a report submitted to the Committee on Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate, Westin & Shipman (1998) stated that “increased interest in learning the results of federal programs and activities is reflected in government reforms, such as the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA)” (p. 1). The George W. Bush administration Budget and Performance Integration Initiative “extended GPRA’s efforts to improve government performance and accountability by bringing performance information more directly into the budgeting process” (GAO Congressional Report, 2003, p. 3).
On January 25, 2005, the Secretary of Education announced a Final Priority for programs funded through the department. The announcement focused on expanding the number of programs and projects department-wide that are evaluated under rigorous scientifically based research methods in accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, (NCLB). (Federal Register, v. 70, no. 15, p. 3586)

The Final Priority further states that “the Secretary considers random assignment and quasi-experimental designs to be the most rigorous methods to address the question of project effectiveness” (Federal Register, v. 70, no. 15, p. 3586).

The Value of Historical Analysis

A historical study of evaluation requirements in Title I projects of the ESEA is important to examine because:

1. It illuminates the circumstances that influenced actions of the past,
2. It reveals the political climate, economic conditions and technological circumstances in which evaluation requirements emerged,
3. It contributes to lessons learned about the political and economic influences on evaluation requirements (Chelimsky, 2007), and
4. It brings to light the reality that whether to evaluate and how to evaluate are political decisions.

Chelimsky (1998) argued that the problem for public policy is that “no clash of values ever seems to die, but goes on forever, concealed within the recesses of historical debate” (p. 42). A historical review of evaluation requirements and their current status
illuminates disagreements among competing values. Chelimsky (1995) stated, “our future meaningfulness depends heavily on how well we understand our past and the lessons it contains” (p. 216).

According to House (1997), it is important to understand that “the conditions under which evaluations are produced are as important as how evaluation results are used” (p. 37). Chelimsky (1998) contended “the entire climate for evaluation can be altered by presidential elections (like those of Lyndon Johnson 1963-1969 or Ronald Reagan 1981-1989, for example), or legislative elections (like that of 1994 which changed the balance of power between the parties in the Congress)” (p. 38). The foregoing statements provide a perspective to the evolution of the evaluation of federally funded education projects.

**Conceptual Framework of the Study**

The conceptual framework that guides this study recognizes the influences and relationships of the ecological system on evaluation requirements in federally funded education projects. This framework builds on Bronfenbrenner’s (1977) Ecological Systems Theory for research of human development. Figure 1 illustrates the conceptual-ecological guide that frames the study contextually into four unique nested structures that include:

1. International and global influences,
2. National, political, economic and technological influences,
3. Federal policies, regulations, legislations and funding priorities emanating from levels one and two, and
4. Evaluation requirements for federally funded education projects.
Chapter II provides a review of the theoretical and conceptual framework that guides this study. It provides the background of the political, economic, and technological factors that have influenced the evolution of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

**Aims and Objectives of the Study**

The aim of this study is to examine *the Interaction of Evaluation Requirements and Political, Economic, and Technological Developments* through the historical evolution of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This study is a historical inquiry aimed at answering the following questions:

- What national political or economic conditions influenced a given policy adoption?
What national political, economic, or technological developments, influenced evaluation requirements in Title I projects of ESEA of 1965?

What are the future political implications for Title I and program evaluation requirements?

Answering these questions helps evaluation researchers and policymakers understand the influences of external factors. In pursuing these questions historians use a variety of sources such as written and official documents, personal diaries, and artifacts (Stakenas & Mock, 1985, Esterberg, 2002).

A historical examination of Title I evaluation requirements provides insights on the complexities and inter-relatedness of national political, economic, and technological influences. It also sheds light on new legislation, policy changes, regulations, and the choice of evaluation methods engendered by the ecological context in which these occur. It raises questions about national politics, economic development and education, and technological influences.

Levitan & Taggart (1976), argued that the concern for program performance and effectiveness is a recent development. According to the authors, “before the 1960s there was very little interest in and very little basis for, assessing the impact of government activities. New techniques of evaluation and decision making were developed and applied during President Johnson’s ‘Great Society’ years” (p. 4-5). As stated earlier, the key event that was most responsible for the creation of contemporary program evaluation was the passage of ESEA of 1965. Hence, the requirement to evaluate Title I projects of ESEA of 1965 was established (Fitzpatrick, Sanders & Worthens, 2004, p. 36).

These are the three focal points of this study:
1. The political context in which evaluation requirements for Title I projects of ESEA of 1965 emerged;

2. The policy changes associated with the political context; and,

3. The impact of those changes on evaluation requirements.

A more detailed exposition of these points will be discussed in Chapter II where the historical focal points of this study will be reviewed.

**Research Questions**

In the context of conducting a historical examination of evaluation requirements in Title I projects of ESEA from 1965 to 2005, the following research questions will be posed:

1. How have evaluation requirements of Title I of ESEA changed?

2. How has the national political context related to the evaluation requirements?

3. How have technological changes or advancements related to the evaluation requirements?

4. How has the national economic context related to the evaluation requirements?

**Significance of the Study**

This study builds a historical context for understanding the symbiotic relationship between federally mandated evaluation requirements and national political, economic, and technological factors. Further value is achieved by its contribution to the knowledge of lessons learned from the past as well as raising evaluators’ consciousness about the historical interaction of evaluation requirements and political, economic and technological developments.
Title I of the ESEA of 1965 is central to this study. The passage of this Act occurred only after the legislators, and education professionals agreed to accept the mandate that made professional program evaluation an integral and necessary part of the legislation. It was the cornerstone of President Lyndon Johnson’s “Great Society” programs and provided the single largest federal financial support for K-12 education in the 1960s. It had great influence on educational practices and policies during the 1960s and extending into the 1970s with the slogan of equity reform movement. In the 1980s, as administrations’ ideologies, politics, and policies changed the drive toward equity in education then took on the face of the excellence reform movement. The standards based reform movement along with Goals 2000 was the expression of this movement in the 1990s. Most recently, under the administration of President George W. Bush, the equity in education movement was reborn under the label “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB). Tracing this metamorphosis of the equity movement provides us with a historical perspective and the context for understanding today’s program evaluation requirements. Ultimately, the value of this study lies in its contribution to the development of program evaluation theory and practice.

Definition of Terms

Gall, Gall & Borg (2007) defined historical research “as a process of systematically searching for data to answer questions about a phenomenon from the past to gain a better understanding of the foundation of present institutions, practices, trends, beliefs, and issues in education” (p. 529).

Congress defines program evaluation as “an assessment, through objective measurement and systematic analysis, of the manner and extent to which federal
programs achieve intended objectives” (Government Performance and Results Act of 1993; Brass, Nunez-Neto & Williams, 2006). Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen (2004) define (program) evaluation “as the identification, clarification, and application of defensible criteria to determine an evaluation’s object value (worth or merit) in relation to those criteria” (p. 5).

In the context of public accountability and “a program’s own claims of success, program evaluation is commissioned as a process dedicated to making, generating, or feeding judgments about the worth or significance of a program” (Mathison, 2005, p. 334). While these stated definitions have their merit, this investigation will focus on the definition of program evaluation employed by Congress.

For the purposes of this study, evaluation requirements are defined as the design and methodology needed to show program effectiveness and outcomes. This definition is based on the legislative requirements for the evaluation of Title I projects. The legislation states that

Effective procedures, including provisions for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the program in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.” (P.L. 89-10—April 11, 1965)

As stated earlier, Cronbach et al. (1980) argued that this requirement reached far beyond the traditional report as to where funds were spent. It demanded supporting data rather than reassuring testimonials (p. 32).
Methods and Data Source

This study employs the historical method of research to gain a greater understanding of the issues that have served to shape the foundation of evaluation requirements of federally funded education projects. The study sheds light on the evolution of evaluation requirements of federally funded education projects. Data collection includes an extensive document review and interviews with key professionals.


Educational leaders who were present in the 1960s and who helped to shape the field of professional program evaluation were identified and nine were interviewed. The focal points of this study are illustrated in a historical matrix that maps the political, economic, and technological influences over 40 years.

Structure and Overview of the Dissertation

Chapter I introduced the topic on the Political, Economic and Technological factors that influence evaluation requirements through a historical study of the evolution of Title I of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Chapter II creates the historical context for the development of the study. Chapter III explains the process for the development of the study and data collection procedures. Chapter IV provides a discussion of the results of the study. Chapter V presents findings of the study, discusses the implications and offers suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter sets the historical context for an in-depth study of the evaluation requirements of federally funded education projects as they stand today. It examines the changes in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 over a 40 year period and traces the concurrent growth and development of evaluation requirements and evaluation as a specialty in education. What follows is a discussion of the conceptual framework within which this study has been developed.

The Conceptual Framework

The ecological-conceptual framework that guides this study is built on the ecological systems theory proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1977). This theory proposes that development occurs within a complex system of relationships affected by multiple levels of the surrounding environment each nested within the next. Bronfenbrenner’s (1977) Ecological Systems Theory uses the terms (1) macrosystem, (2) nexosystem, (3) mesosystem, and (4) microsystem to refer to the different spheres of influencing factors. As applied to this study this concept yields four nested structures as follows:

1. A macrosystem – International and global influences
2. A nexosystem – National political, economic and ideological influences; and
3. A mesosystem – Federal policies, regulations and legislation; and
The evaluation requirement for Title I projects is the center sphere of this framework and aligns with the conceptual ecological model proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1977). It is the focus of this investigation and is nested within spheres two, three, and four. This framework recognizes the complexities and interaction of the environment that shape federal policies, regulations, priorities, and legislation. These are influenced by multiple levels of the surrounding environment each nested within the next. Fundamentally, this framework is designed to facilitate the examination and interpretation of data gathered within its historical milieu, and leads to a greater understanding of the evolution of evaluation requirements in Title I projects.

The international and global sphere refers to the overarching factors that influence (and continue to influence) the nested spheres. Although a detailed examination of international and global factors occurring over the 40-year period of the study are beyond the scope of this study, it would serve us well to note historical events of that era that directly or indirectly had an impact on American society and government. Consequently, these historical events also influenced the legislation on research and evaluation in education. Following is a discussion of each sphere and the interdependent relationships among them.

**International and Global Influences**

As America emerged as a super power after World War II, American presidents became aware of national and international pressures that influence educational policies for America. Historically, American presidents have responded in varying fashions, some more education minded than others. Examples of presidential responses to national and international influences are:
“Roosevelt’s G.I. Bill of Rights for veterans of World War II;
Eisenhower’s push for the National Defense Education Act in response to the Soviet Union’s launch of Sputnik I into space;
Johnson’s federal aid to address the issue of poverty in America;
Reagan’s excellence reform movement influenced by foreign economic competition (Berube 1991).

Two international and global events of that era that are worth noting are (a) the Soviet Union’s launch of Sputnik I into space, and (b) the United States involvement in Southeast Asia or the Vietnam War.

**Sputnik I**

On October 4, 1957, the *Soviets launched Sputnik I* into space. This event heightened concern in the minds of the American public that the Russians, the major Cold War enemy, had gained superiority in the race for space, and hence threatened our national security. This event created a national emergency in American politics and education. The national debate centered on the failure of public schools to prepare students who were competent in science, engineering, and mathematics (Cronbach, 1981; Madaus, Scriven & Stufflebeam, 1983; Berube 1991). Thus, Congress responded by passing legislation that provided greater access to post secondary education and educational opportunities in science, engineering, and mathematics. Accordingly, vast sums of money were poured into education, science, and the space program. These actions “reasserted American leadership a decade later by putting a man on the moon” (Geiger, 1997, p. 351).
On September 2, 1958 President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) into law (P.L. 85-864) (Bracken, Van Atta, et al., 2006). Title I of the law states:

…the present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. (P.L.85-864, HeinOnline—72 Stat. 1581)

The heart of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 was federal loans for students interested in science, engineering, and mathematics.

Following the passage of this legislation the National Science Foundation began to support the development of new national curricula in the area of science and mathematics. Educational evaluation had also burgeoned as a side effect of curriculum reform. These efforts called for evaluations of large-scale curriculum development projects funded by federal monies (Madaus, Scriven, & Stufflebeam, 1983; Cronbach et al., 1980). The authors state that this event “marked the end of an era in evaluation and the beginning of profound changes that would see evaluation expand as an industry and into a profession dependent on taxpayer monies for support” (Madaus, Scriven, & Stufflebeam 1983, p. 11). Cronbach et al. (1980) report that, while these early evaluation studies were often simple and rather informal, a few were extensive and met the rigors of experimental design. Despite these limitations, “educators came increasingly to see evaluation as central to curriculum development” (Cronbach et al., 1980, p. 32). Another historical event that influenced American politics, policy, and education was the Vietnam War.
Vietnam War

President Johnson’s Great Society programs and the War in Vietnam are examples of American domestic and international affairs intersecting in terms of policy and politics. Andrew (1998) explained that “disentangling Great Society reforms from the impact of the war in Vietnam, rising anti-Americanism at home and abroad, the counterculture, the emerging women’s movement, and the broad challenge to traditional values were not possible” (p. 7). According to Andrew (1998), although they cannot be totally divorced, President Johnson’s belief was that “the system was fundamentally sound but required mild reforms and technical adjustments so that it might provide opportunity for everyone” (p. 8).

While Sputnik I propelled the Federal Government into approving billions of dollars for scientific research, this was hindered by the Vietnam War and the Nixon presidency (Geiger, 1997). Before his assassination, President Kennedy had proposed a tax cut which promised to increase federal revenues and fund the “Great Society.” As it turned out, the war in Vietnam depleted those additional funds and more (Andrew, 1998). Cohen (2009) stated that “a growing war in Vietnam consumed both the expected budget surpluses and much of the president’s extraordinary influence” (p. 46). President Johnson’s approach was to sweep aside the concerns of Vietnam “through secrecy, devious rhetoric, and fraudulent budget projections for the conduct of the war” (Andrew 1998, p. 17). He was challenged in foreign policy with “a war he inherited which he could not win and one he would not lose” (Milkis & Mileur, 2005, p. xiii). Cohen (2009) argued that Title I was left with its original appropriation and little capability in practice, government or the environment—it was left to fend for itself. This is the context in
which educational evaluation requirements emerged. The remainder of this chapter provides the detailed analysis of findings on how when and why evaluation requirements developed and were transformed over 40 years to become what they are today.

**The National Political and Economic Influences**

The 1960s was a time of intense polarization which had an impact on economic and political affairs. While the Cold War focused attention on enemies abroad, in the wake of President John F. Kennedy’s assassination Americans’ attention turned to the domestic arena.

The national leadership was now in the hands of President Lyndon B. Johnson (Andrew, 1998). In 1964, in his commencement address at the University of Michigan, the president expressed his deepest thoughts about a “Great Society.” As he outlined his expansive hopes, he acknowledged that they rested “on abundance and liberty for all”. If economic growth was sufficient to bring prosperity to all, the United States now must address problems of poverty and racial injustice as well as obstacles to opportunity and a higher quality of life for all its citizens (Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States Book I, 1964). The civil rights movement had stimulated an awareness of the inequality in education of poor children, and the book *The Other America*, served to fuel a national war on poverty (Milkis & Mileur, 2005; Berube, 1991).

Andrew (1998) argued that the “Great Society” emerged during a time when the middle class was experiencing affluence. The nation’s real Gross Domestic Product growth rate was at its highest since the Great Depression—8.6 percent in 1930 compared to 6.4 percent in 1965—and unemployment was at a low 4 percent (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2009). Amidst a strong economic growth and a sense of affluence among the
middle class, the nation faced three major national challenges: 1) the civil rights movement, 2) poverty, and 3) education of the poor. President Johnson introduced a comprehensive set of innovative programs that addressed the problem of poverty and the concerns of the civil rights movement (Berube, 1991). By the time the Eighty-ninth Congress adjourned in October 1966, Congress had approved 181 pieces of legislation. Among the 181 pieces of legislation signed were: the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Higher Education Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendment of 1966. Consequently, the politics of optimism had coincided with a flourishing economy and the solution was in the passage of legislation to address issues of poverty and education of the poor.

Throughout 1964 and after, President Johnson gathered groups of scholars and experts to develop public policy alternatives. According to Berube (1991), the Johnson task forces illustrated the core ideology of managerial liberalism. They used intellectual and technological experts to analyze problems and propose solutions to public problems and rested on a faith that government then had only to provide sufficient resources to resolve the problem (Andrew, 1998).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was signed into law on April 11, 1965. The centerpiece of the legislation was Title I. Congress authorized over one billion dollars for ESEA projects, which contained five titles, and the majority of funding was directed toward Title I (Milkis & Mileur, 2005). For the first time in the course of American public education, federal financial support was distributed broadly to elementary and secondary schools across the country (Kosters & Mast, 2003). Hence, the
requirement to evaluate federally funded projects was established under Title I of the ESEA of 1965. This mandate required state educational agencies to submit reports to the commissioner that demonstrated “effective procedures, including provisions for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement were adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of deprived children” (P.L. 89-10, Apr. 11, 1965).

Fitzpatrick, Sanders & Worthen (2004) stated that the ESEA mandate of 1965 “deserves its historical designation as the birth of contemporary program evaluation;” however, this beginning was “marked by great travail” (p. 37). The authors contend that “educators and other social scientists lacked the expertise to evaluate the programs effectively as the evaluation field was in its infancy” (Fitzpatrick et al. 2004, p. 37). The need for trained specialists in evaluation was sudden and acute and Congress responded by providing funding for universities to “launch new graduate training programs in educational research and evaluation including fellowship stipends for graduate study in those specializations” (p. 38).

A theoretical and methodological basis for evaluating the new programs did not exist during the emergence of the field of evaluation. Thus, professional who were called upon to evaluate the new projects drew from theories in cognate disciplines and gleaned “what they could from better-developed methodologies, such as experimental design, psychometrics, survey research, and ethnography” (Fitzpatrick, et al., 2004, p. 37).

By the 1970s the field of evaluation began to expand through the development of new approaches, and evaluation models. Fitzpatrick et al. (2004) argued that “evaluation moved beyond simply measuring whether objectives were attained” to considering the

**Technological Influences**

An examination of historical documents reveals that the field of evaluation and the field of testing are closely linked (Madaus, Scriven, & Stufflebeam, 1983). During this decade of “Great Society” programs, innovations in technology drove assessment and testing emerged as the cornerstone to the new evaluation mandate for Title I projects. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) also known as the Nation’s Report Card, was created in 1969 to be an educational barometer of the academic achievement of the nation’s elementary and secondary schools. Title I evaluation requirements became its driving influence (U.S. Department of Education Office of Technology Assessment, 1992). Tyler (1969) pointed out that the new technology strengthened the interest of evaluation professionals in the emergence of large-scale studies of individual performance. These studies involved large numbers of variables, new theories, new procedures, and new instruments.

Coleman and Karweit (1970) stated that standardized tests, designed to measure individual student performance, were being used increasingly to evaluate the functioning of schools and school districts, the impact of special programs, the comparative effects of home and school on achievement and other aspects of school performance. Two major innovations in technology influenced the evaluation of funded projects: (1) the rapid development of the electronic computer, and (2) the electronic test scoring machine. This
new technology facilitated the process of testing and the efficiency of test scoring (Lindquist, 1969). Innovations in technology influenced the evaluation of funded projects by improving the quantity and quality of data being collected, the type and speed of the data collection, and the analyses of the data.

The 1980s ushered in an era of continued technological developments in computerization. Personal computers and the technology of the Internet became the new innovations that revolutionized the field of educational evaluation. Personal computers automated the processing of evaluation reports, and the analyses of statistical data. The Internet automated the process of conducting large scale web-based surveys and influenced the efficiency and effectiveness of these processes (Goldin & Katz, 2008).

**Federal Policies, Regulations, and Legislation**

Since the signing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) on April 11, 1965, the objectives of program evaluation have changed radically (Cohen, 1970; Tyler, 1969). New knowledge about education has influenced evaluation. Over the four decades of this study there have been nine major re-authorizations which include legislative changes to the evaluation requirements of Title I projects, the largest of all compensatory education programs in American society.

Cohen (1970) argued that “although program evaluation is no novelty in education, its objects have changed radically” (p. 213). Further, he explained that “a particularly important influence on Title I was a dramatic change in ideas about the problem that it was to solve” (2009, p. 183). Title I was designed to address the educational needs of children of low-income families by expanding and improving their educational program by various means. Meeting the educational needs of educationally
deprived children was the objective of this legislation (Public Law 89-10). However, a change in the objectives occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s, when cross-national studies showed that students in the United States were not performing as well as those in Japan and other nations. Hence, it became evident at that time that the poor performance of Title I students seemed to be only a part of a larger problem. Researchers and evaluators were contending with “a school system that did poorly for most Americans” (Cohen 2009, p. 183).

What follows is a summary of Title I evaluation requirements as it is stated in ESEA of 1965 and its subsequent nine reauthorizations, the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) and a notice issued by the United States Department of Education on Scientifically Based Evaluation Methods.

**Summary of ESEA Title I Evaluation Requirements: 1965 - 2005**

Public Law 89-10—Apr. 11, 1965 Sec.205. (a) (5)—that effective procedures, including objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating...annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children;

**Reauthorization (1).—**Public Law 89-750—Nov. 3, 1966—Education of Handicapped Children—that effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating...annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of...services for, handicapped children.
Reauthorization (2).—Public Law 90-247—Jan. 2, 1968—the Council shall report specifically on which of the various compensatory education programs funded in whole or in part under the provisions of this title...hold the highest promise for raising the educational attainment of these educationally deprived children.

Reauthorization (3).—Public Law 91-230—Apr. 13, 1970—Sec. (134 (a)
National Advisory Council—There shall be a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children—herein after referred to as the ‘National Council’—The National Council shall review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title—including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, including the effectiveness of programs to meet their occupational and career needs, and make recommendations for the improvement of this title...

Reauthorization (4). Public Law 93-380—Aug.21, 1974—Title I Evaluation and Reporting System is established (TIERS)—Sec. 151. (a) The Commissioner shall provide for independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects...evaluations shall be made by competent and independent persons...and shall include whenever possible, opinions obtained from program or project participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the project---the Commissioner shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program or project effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title---the Commissioner shall provide to State educational agencies, models for evaluations of all programs for their use in carrying out their functions---the models developed by the Commissioner shall specify objective criteria which shall be utilized in the evaluation of all programs and shall outline techniques such as longitudinal
studies of children involved in such programs and methodology such as the use of tests which yield comparable results for producing data which are comparable on a statewide and nationwide basis—the Commissioner shall also develop a system for gathering and dissemination of results of evaluations and for identification of exemplary programs—

**Reauthorization (5).** Public Law 95-561—Nov. 1, 1978—Sec. 183 (a)

**Reauthorization (6).** Public Law 97-35—Aug. 13, 1981—the “Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act of 1981.” Policy—The Congress finds that Federal assistance for this purpose will be more effective if education officials, principals, teachers, and supporting personnel are freed from overly prescriptive regulations and administrative burdens which are not necessary for fiscal accountability and make no contribution to the instructional program. Sec. 556 (b) (4) that program will be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in achieving the goals set for them, and that such evaluations shall include objective measurements of educational achievement in basic skills and a determination of whether improved performance is sustained over a period of more than one year--.

**Reauthorization (7).** Public Law 100-297—Apr. 28, 1988—the “Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988.”—Sec. 1019 (a)(1) evaluate the effectiveness of programs assisted under this part, in accordance with national standards according to section 1435—using
objective measurement of individual student achievement in basic skills, aggregated for the local educational agency as a whole as an indicator of the impact of the program;—(3) collect data on the race, age, gender, and number of children with handicapping conditions served by the program...and on the number of children served by grade level—Sec. 1435(a) National Standards—the Secretary shall develop national standards for local evaluation of programs under this chapter—the Secretary may use the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System designed and implemented under title I of this Act as in effect prior to the date of the enactment of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvements Amendments of 1988 as the model.

**Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).** Public Law 103-62, Aug. 3, 1993—“An Act to provide for the establishment of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. Congress finds that—(1) waste and inefficiency in Federal programs undermine the confidence of the American people in the Government and reduces the Federal Government’s ability to address adequately vital public needs; GPRA required agencies to set goals, measure performance, and report on their accomplishments. (7) Performance Plans include program evaluation—program evaluation means an assessment, through objective measurement and systematic analysis, of the manner and extent to which Federal programs achieve intended objectives.

**Reauthorization (8).** Public Law 103-382—Oct. 20, 1994—“Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994”. Each state or local educational agency shall evaluate the program disaggregating data on participation by sex, race, ethnicity, and age, once
every three years to determine the program’s impact on the ability of participant to maintain and improve educational achievement.

Reauthorization (9). Public Law 107-110---Jan. 8, 2002---“No Child Left Behind Act of 2001”. Conduct an annual evaluation with the involvement of parents on the content and effectiveness of the parental involvement policy on the academic quality of the schools served; The Secretary shall contract with an independent organization for a 5-year rigorous, scientifically valid quantitative evaluation; National assessment of Title I—The Secretary shall examine the implementation and the impact of increasing student academic achievement in schools with high concentrations of children living in poverty, relative to the goal of all students reaching the proficient level of achievement based on State academic assessments.

Office of Management and Budget’s Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) – July 2002. “The Program Assessment Rating Tool is a diagnostic tool used to assess the performance of federal programs and to drive improvements in program performance. These efforts presents an opportunity to inform and improve agency GPRA plans and reports, and establish a meaningful systematic link between GPRA and the budget process.

Department of Education Scientifically Based Evaluation Methods—January 25, 2005—The Secretary of Education announced a priority that may be used for any appropriate programs in the Department of Education in funding year 2005 and in later years…action on expanding federal financial assistance on expanding the number of programs and projects that are evaluated under rigorous scientifically based research methods in accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
Evaluation Requirements

Figure 2 (p. 33) introduces the concept of social cartography as explained by Paulston & Liebman (1994). Social cartography provides a visual representation of how we see social changes developing in the world around us. Figure 2 is a visual illustration of the political, economic and technological factors occurring in the social milieu over the four decades covered by this study. It also provides a visual presentation of the location and duration of events and findings of this study. This figure will be utilized throughout the study to illustrate key historical developments occurring over the four decades covered by the study.

Following the concept of social cartography, a brief summary of the legislation and evaluation requirements occurring over the four decades covered by this study is illustrated across the horizontal bar on the lower level of the chart. The eight presidential administrations are also illustrated on a horizontal bar on the upper level of the chart. National political, economic, and technological factors are represented on the left vertical bar and events occurring over four decades will be illustrated horizontally and vertically according to the decade in which they occur.

Summary of the Historical Context

Chapter II has provided a review of the literature on the political, economic, and technological factors that have influenced the evolution of federally funded evaluation requirements over a 40 year span (1965-2005). It has provided the background for an assessment of these factors and their implications for the historical development of evaluation requirements as stated in Title I of ESEA. Chapter III presents the discussion of the design and methodology used to collect the data.
**Figure 2.** Historical study of Title I of the ESEA from 1965 to 2005.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a detailed description of the methodology, including the rationale for its use and questions that guide the study. The historical method of research was chosen as the research methodology for this investigation. Historical research employs the methods and insights of multiple disciplines in the study of past times to bring a perspective to the topic under investigation. Gall, Gall & Borg (2007) define historical research as “a process of systematically searching for data to answer questions about a phenomenon from the past” (p. 529). The information gathered provides a better understanding of the foundation of present institutions, practices, trends, beliefs, and issues in educational evaluation.

Patton (1990) acknowledged that the “history of a program, community, or organization, is an important part of the context for research” (p. 284). A historical examination of the evolution of program evaluation requirements is important because it provides educators with a time perspective that cannot typically be acquired through direct experience. Moreover, it sheds light on the complexities and inter-relatedness of national political, economic, and technological influences on educational program evaluation requirements.

Thomas & Brubaker (2000) described four kinds of historical methods: (1) descriptive chronicles, (2) interpretive histories, (3) biographies, and (4) autobiographies.
This study employs descriptive chronicles as the methodology to address the research questions. Descriptive chronicles are designed to trace events over a period of years describing what events took place, showing which conditions changed and which conditions remained the same. Descriptive chronicles will also illustrate ecological influences and relationships. According to Thomas & Brubaker (2000), “authors of descriptive chronicles attempt objectively to depict what occurred, sticking to the facts without speculating about why events happened as they did” (p. 93). Chronicles of the events will be illustrated in a historical matrix.

By delving into the history of a program one is able to document and understand the context within which it evolved. According to Patton (1990), historical analysis gives answers to the following questions: a) how the program was created and initially funded; b) who were the original people targeted for program services; c) how have targeted populations changed over time; and d) to what extent and in what ways have goals and intended outcomes changed over time.

**Research Questions**

This study is guided by the following five research questions:

1. How have evaluation requirements of Title I projects of ESEA changed?
2. How has the national political context related to the evaluation requirements?
3. How have technological changes or advancements related to the evaluation requirements?
4. How has the national economic context related to the evaluation requirement
Data Collection

Data collection was carried out in two phases using two different methodologies. The first phase included an extensive examination of government documents obtained from archived official public records, professional journals, and books written by professionals who personally witnessed and participated in the development of the evaluation of Title I projects and the development of the field of program evaluation. Public records are defined as “those materials produced for official purposes by social institutions like governments, schools, and hospitals” (Esterberg 2001, p. 121). The second phase included interviews with key informants, many whom were part of establishing the foundations of educational program evaluation. Thus interviews served to confirm or explain information gathered from the data collected in the first phase of the data collection.

Multiple sources and types of information are used in this study to increase the validity, as the strength of one approach compensates for the weaknesses of another. Patton (1990) explained that “no single source of information can be trusted to provide a comprehensive perspective on a program” (p. 306). Esterberg (2002) contended that “research designs that include multiple strategies tend to be the strongest ones” (p. 37). The use of a combination of document review and interviews allowed for validating and cross checking findings (Patton, 1990; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Creswell, 2003). Thus, the use of multiple methods or triangulation in the data collection of this study is an attempt to secure an in-depth understanding of the historical development of Title I and the growth of the field of evaluation.
Phase I

Documents examined in the first phase of this investigation included federal registers, passed legislation and acts, policies, and speeches. The following databases served to provide the information needed for this study: (1) HeinOnline: The Modern Link to Legal History, (2) The Government Accountability Office Historical Documents, (3) The Office of Management and Budget, (4) The U.S. Department of Education Library, (5) The Library of Congress, (6) The Government Printing Office, (7) ERIC, (8) Historical documents series, (9) Historical abstracts, (10) Historical newspapers, and (11) Google Scholar. The Education and Waldo libraries at Western Michigan University, the Government Documents Section at Waldo Library and Kalamazoo College Library also to provided key information for this investigation. Key words, themes, and phrases, extracted from the topic of this study, were used to conduct an exhaustive literature search through the databases. Utilizing key words, themes, and phrases was also employed to search for documents that were not accessible online but available at the library or through the university interlibrary loan program.

Phase II

In the second phase of data collection, interviews with key informants served to confirm or explain findings from an in-depth examination of documents. Interviews aimed to capture the perspective of key leaders who were present during the historical emergence of the evaluation of federally funded education projects and who also helped to shape the field of professional program evaluation. Interviews provide a broader understanding and meaning to the historical period as seen through the perceptions of key
informants. Fourteen key leaders were invited to participate in a semi-structured telephone interview; nine participated.

**Sample of Key Informants**

Purposeful sampling was the methodology employed to select participants for this study. The intent of purposeful sampling is to achieve an in-depth understanding from selected individuals with demonstrable experience and expertise in the subject of the history of educational program evaluation and its political implications (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Patton (2002), stated that “purposeful sampling focuses on selecting information-rich cases whose study will illuminate the questions under study” (p. 230).

Among the list of invited informants are: (a) key leaders in the field of professional program evaluation, (b) professionals who have published on the history of program evaluation, and (c) professionals who have published on the historical development of Title I and its implications for evaluation requirements. Royse, Thyer, Padgett and Logan (2006) explained that interviews allow for the examination of complex phenomena without relying on structured data collection. Further, Miles and Hubberman (1994) stated that with qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, see precisely which events led to specific consequences, and derive fruitful explanations. Nine key informants participated in the interviews. An open-ended questionnaire served as the primary instrument to capture participants views on the development of evaluation requirements of Title I projects of ESEA of 1965. This primary instrument covered five broad research questions. Information related to key informants research areas and professional affiliation are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

*Key Informants’ Professional Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informants</th>
<th>Research Areas</th>
<th>Professional Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Boruch</td>
<td>Statistical Research &amp; Policy; Program Evaluation</td>
<td>University Trustee Chair Professor, Graduate School of Education &amp; Statistics University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cohen</td>
<td>Educational Policy; The Relationship Between Policy &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>John Dewey Collegiate Professor of Education and Professor of Public Policy the University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Ellin-Datta</td>
<td>Physiological Psychology</td>
<td>Datta Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest House</td>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Policy Analysis</td>
<td>Emeritus Professor School of Education The University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Quinn-Patton</td>
<td>Utilization-Focused Evaluation; Qualitative Research &amp; Evaluation Methods</td>
<td>Professor Union Institute and University Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephaney Shipman</td>
<td>Measurement and Evaluation</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Center for Evaluation Methods and Issues U.S. Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Stake</td>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Stufflebeam</td>
<td>Program Evaluation, Program Evaluation Standards</td>
<td>Distinguished University Professor Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Wholey</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Professor Public Administration University of Southern California School of Policy, Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments

The instruments designed for this study included a) the development of an open-ended questionnaire, and b) a social map that shows the location of events in the social milieu. The open-ended questionnaire allows for probing and posing of follow-up questions as well as clarification of questions that the respondent may not at first understand. An email was sent to evaluation professionals inviting them to participate in the study. Interviews were tape-recorded. Participants could request that the tape recorder be turned off at any time during the course of the interview. This investigation received an exempt status from HSIRB. Letters of consent were not required.

Utilizing social cartography, a social map was developed to illustrate the historical events occurring in the social milieu. A social map is a “visual dialogue used as a way of communicating how we see the social changes developing in the world around us” (Paulston & Liebman, 1994, p. 215).

Analyses

As stated earlier, this study utilized descriptive chronicles to trace major events occurring over 40 years, describing which conditions changed and which conditions remained the same. The use of themes and concepts served to organize and analyze the data. In this study concepts are defined as, “terms that can be used to group individuals, events, or objects that share a common set of attributes” (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007, p. 544). The data were grouped into four decades over 40 years and according to emergent educational reform movements. Interview data were also examined and coded according to common concepts or themes.
Limitations

One limitation of this study lies in the limited attention given to the specific influence of the international and global events of the era. While a detailed examination of these influences has its merits, it was considered to be beyond the scope of this study. Therefore, the focus of this study was on the examination of the interaction of national political, economic, and technological factors as they related to the concurrent evolution of federally mandated evaluation requirements and the growth of the field of evaluation.

Although international and global events have been given cursory attention, their impact on national affairs and on evaluation is not minor. As developments in national political, economic, and technological factors and evaluation evolve, it will do so within the context of the far reaching impact of what happens worldwide.

In retrospect, another limitation to this study is the absence of the voice of today’s graduate students and young professionals in the field of evaluation. Input from these informants could further add the perspective of those who emerged after the turbulent concurrent development of Title I evaluation requirements and the field of evaluation. It is recommended that future research on Title I evaluation requirements and the concurrent growth of the field of evaluation include the contemporary voices of young professionals and graduate students.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the examination of *The Interaction of Evaluation Requirements and Political, Economic, and Technological Developments* from 1965 to 2005. The focus of the study is on the evolution of evaluation requirements for Title I projects of the ESEA of 1965.

Two methods of data collection provided the findings for this investigation: (1) extensive examination of historical documents and (2) interviews with key informants. Historical documents and interview transcripts were examined and coded according to emergent themes. Interviews from key informants were tape recorded and transcribed. It is important to note that six of the nine key informants were the first to be called upon to evaluate the newly funded Title I projects of the ESEA of 1965. These key informants are also credited with helping to shape the field of evaluation as a profession.

The findings of this chapter are guided by an ecological-conceptual framework as shown originally in Figure 1 but represented with the studies research questions included in Figure 3. The conceptual framework is based on three unique spheres:

1. National political, economic, and technological influences,
2. Federal policies, regulations, legislations, and funding priorities and,
3. The evolution of evaluation requirements in Title I projects.
Figure 3. Spheres of influence and research questions.

The evolution of evaluation requirements in Title I projects is the center sphere of this framework and represents the focus of this investigation. It is nested within levels two and three. The research questions that guide this study fit into one or more of these spheres.

This framework recognizes the complexities and interaction of the environment that shapes federal policies, regulations, priorities, and legislation. These are influenced by multiple levels of the surrounding environment, each nested within the next. The interactions of the environment influence the development of evaluation requirements in Title I projects. Thus, this structure is designed to facilitate the examination, and interpretation of data gathered within its historical milieu, and leads to a greater understanding of the evolution of evaluation requirements for Title I projects.
**Organization of the Chapter**

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section directly addresses research question one and chronicles the development of the ESEA Title I legislation and the evaluation mandate from 1965 to 2005. The second section addresses research questions two through four following a social cartography context. This section concludes with a summary and quotes from interview with key informants.

In the first section research question one (RQ1) is longitudinally framed and presents the evaluation requirements and their changes from 1965 to 2005. This longitudinal progression is divided into four decades with one or more reauthorization occurring in each decade. Reauthorization of the ESEA is the process by which Congress prescribes changes, additions, extensions or deletions to the legislation. Through this process, legislation is developed that adjusts the current programs to meet the changing needs in education (Federal Issues, 2010; http://www.masfaaweb.org).

Tables are included to illustrate the development of the nine reauthorizations to Title I policy and the evaluation mandate occurring over the four decades of this study. The first decade of this study, 1965 to 1975, is identified as the Equity Reform Movement, the second decade, 1975 to 1985, the Excellence Reform Movement, the third decade, 1985 to 1995, Standard-Based Reform Movement, and the final decade of this study, 1995 to 2005, No Child Left Behind.

The second section of the chapter addresses research question two through four (RQ2 – RQ4). These questions will then be presented in their entirety against the timeline in a social cartography context within each decade. Thus for each decade research questions two through four will be developed and addressed.
RQ1: Development and Changes in Evaluation Requirements

The Equity Reform Movement: 1965 to 1975. Evaluation requirements for federally funded education projects were established in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The legislation funded projects aimed at providing educational opportunities for the poor. These educational programs are known as the equity educational reform movement. The equity movement sought for strategies to educate the poor, and President Johnson’s “Great Society” programs were its response. It is within this framework that educational program evaluation as a profession emanates. The decade culminates with the influence of critical, political, and economic crises—a presidential impeachment and a United States oil crisis. Despite these strong political and economic factors, the policy to educate the poor prevailed.

Chelimsky (2008) stated, “evaluation in the public domain needs to have two components: (1) one that answers a particular policy, program, or knowledge question, and (2) another that informs the public of what’s been learned” (p. 401). In 1965, the Title I policy of the ESEA was designed to:

…provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means… (P.L. 89-10, Apr. 11, 1965)

The evaluation requirement under this new policy was:

…that effective procedures, including provisions for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special
educational needs of educationally deprived children; that the local 
educational agency will make an annual report and such other reports to 
the state educational agency in such form and containing such 
information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the state 
educational agency to perform its duties under this title. (P.L. 89-10, 
Sec.205(5), Apr. 11, 1965)

As shown in Table 2, reauthorizations one through three showed no changes in 
the requirements to evaluate funded projects. However, in 1974 a new evaluation system 
was introduced. The new approach included a comprehensive evaluation requirement 
system known as the “Title I Evaluation and Reporting System” (TIERS).

The new evaluation system called for evaluations which went beyond the required 
reports from local educational agencies to contracting with “competent and independent 
persons” who could provide descriptive measurements of the impact of the program and 
opinions from project participants of the “strengths and weaknesses” of the project. The 
new procedures also called for the provision of evaluation models and longitudinal 
studies of project participants (P.L. 93-380, Aug. 21, 1974, HeinOnline).

By the end of the first decade, the evaluation requirement for projects funded 
under Title I of the ESEA of 1965 had developed from the simple mandate that required 
only “effective procedures and appropriate objective measurements” to a new 
comprehensive approach that required contracting with “competent” professionals to 
evaluate the program.
Table 2

*Title I Reauthorizations from 1965 to 1975*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I of the ESEA of 1965 Reauthorizations</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 89-750, Nov. 3, 1966</td>
<td>Same as stated in the original policy</td>
<td>Same as in the original legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 90-247, Jan. 2, 1968</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 91-230, Apr. 13, 1970</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 93-380, Aug. 21, 1974</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>(NEW) Independent evaluations, measure impact, obtain opinions from project participants, longitudinal studies of children involved evaluation models provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation requirements for Title I projects were established within Congress and its attendant politics under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). They emerged out of a concern for accountability for funds invested in programs designed to serve areas with concentrations of children from low income families. In the beginning the legislation simply called for projects to use “effective procedures” and “appropriate measurements of educational achievement” (P.L. 89-10, Apr. 11, 1965).

The context of the evaluation mandate is dynamic. It emerges out of an environment of changing political ideologies, national economic influences, and technological development. As documented within this study, by the end of the first
decade Title I evaluation requirements had changed. Title I evaluation requirements had evolved from a simple requirement to evaluate the outcomes of projects to a comprehensive evaluation system known as Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) (P.L. 93-380, Aug. 21, 1974). Key informants who were present at the beginning of the Title I evaluation requirements observed the following changes:

- The government had gone to more contracted targeted evaluations as opposed to depending on each individual school and each individual project to address the questions of Congress (Stufflebeam, 2010);
- The evaluation mandate included “greater sophistication and demands for measurement” (Ellin-Datta, 2009); and
- “The unit of analysis changed from the project or the program to the school as the focus of accountability in evaluation” (Patton, 2009).

While changes were evolving in the evaluation mandate, critical developments were taking place in the field of evaluation. New evaluation approaches were introduced and evaluation had developed “beyond simply measuring whether objectives were attained, as evaluators began to consider the information needs of stakeholders and unintended outcomes” (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004, p. 39).

**Excellence Reform Movement: 1975 to 1985**

As outlined in Table 3, two reauthorizations were completed during this decade. The policy stated that projects would:

Do so in a manner which will eliminate burdensome, unnecessary, and unproductive paperwork and free the schools of unnecessary federal supervision, direction and control….The Congress also finds that federal
assistance for this purpose will be more effective if education
officials...are freed from overly prescriptive regulations and
administrative burdens which are not necessary for fiscal accountability
and make no contribution to the instructional program. (P.L. 97-35, Aug.
13, 1981, HeinOnline)

Table 3

*Title I Reauthorizations from 1975 to 1985*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I of the ESEA of 1965 Reauthorizations</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 95-561, Nov. 1, 1978</td>
<td>Same as stated in the original policy</td>
<td>Results of evaluations utilized in planning for and improving projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 97-35, Aug. 13, 1981</td>
<td>“the Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act of 1981”</td>
<td>TIERs is repealed. A return to original evaluation requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1981 evaluation requirement stated the following:

Projects will be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in achieving the
goals set for them, and that such evaluations shall include objective
measurements of educational achievement in basic skills and a
determination of whether improved performance is sustained over a period
of more than one year. (P.L. 97-35, Aug. 13, 1981, HeinOnline)

This decade began with the aftermath of a presidential impeachment and the
lingering effects of an oil crisis. Critical events of this decade were: (a) the creation of a
new United States Department of Education; (b) President Reagan’s “Economic
Recovery Tax Act of 1981,” a package of tax and budget reductions that changed the
course of government spending; and (c) publication of the report “A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform.”

The United States Department of Education was created in 1979 as an agency in the executive branch that could fully devote its attention to and advocate for the needs of the education community. However, in 1981, the new president sought to eliminate that support by recommending the elimination of this new agency. As President Reagan made budget reductions, tax cuts and recommendations for the elimination of the newly formed Department of Education, he also made changes in Title I Policy of ESEA of 1965.

Changes in Title I policy called for the elimination of burdensome, unnecessary, and unproductive paperwork and relieving the schools of unnecessary federal supervision. As shown in Table 3, the three-tiered Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) established in 1974 was repealed. Under the new Reauthorization of Title I policy, projects would continue to receive federal assistance to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children on the basis of the policy established in 1965, and the three-tiered evaluation system was not required. With the publication of “A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform” in 1983, education once again became the primary focus and the Excellence Education Reform Movement was born.
Standard-Based Reform Movement: 1985 to 1995

Table 4

*Title I Reauthorization from 1985 to 1995*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I of the ESEA of 1965 Reauthorizations</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L. 100-297, Apr. 28, 1988</strong></td>
<td>“...to—provide financial assistance to state and local educational agencies to meet ...the special educational needs of children of migrant parents, of Indian children, and of handicapped, neglected, and delinquent children,...to expand the program authorized by this chapter over the next five years by increasing funding for this chapter...thereby increasing the percentage of eligible children served in each fiscal year;”</td>
<td>Evaluate the effectiveness of the programs in accordance with national standards using objective measurement of individual student achievement in basic skills and more advanced skills, and for formerly migratory children who have been served; Collect data on: race, age, gender, and number of children with handicapping conditions served and, the number of children served by grade-levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L. (103-62, Aug. 3, 1993 the “Government Performance and Results Act of 1993”</strong></td>
<td>Purpose of the Act—to improve the confidence of the American people in the capability of the Federal Government, by systematically holding federal agencies accountable for achieving program results;...</td>
<td>Evaluate performance plan for the current fiscal year relative to the performance achieved...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L. 103-227, Mar. 31, 1994 “GOALS 2000: Educate America Act”</strong></td>
<td>“To improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform;...to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certification</td>
<td>Evaluate the process the National Education Goals Council uses to certify voluntary national standards and assessments submitted by states...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I of the ESEA of 1965 Reauthorizations</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 103-382, Oct. 20, 1994</td>
<td>“Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994”</td>
<td>Each state plan shall demonstrate that the state has developed or adopted challenging content standards and challenging student performance standards…;”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Table 4 shows four legislative Acts, only two are reauthorizations to the ESEA of 1965. In 1988 the ESEA was reauthorized under P.L. 100-297, and in 1994 under P.L. 103-382. However, it is important to examine the influence of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act” the interrelation of these acts, and the evolution of Title I policy and the evaluation mandate.

In the 1988 reauthorization, the new policy included provisions for the special educational needs of (a) children of migrant parents, (b) Native American children, (c) handicapped children, (d) neglected children, and (e) delinquent children.

The revised evaluation mandate required projects to evaluate in accordance with national standards in terms of their effectiveness in achieving the goals set for them, “using objective measurement of individual student achievement in basic skills and more
advanced skills, aggregated for the local educational agency as a whole as an indicator of 
the impact of the program” (P.L.100-297—Apr. 28, 1988).

On August 3, 1993, the Government Performance and Results Act held federal 
agencies accountable for achieving program results. The new legislation required federal 
agencies to do the following:

- establish strategic plans and annual goals for programs,
- express goals in objective, quantifiable, and measurable forms,
- describe the means to be used to verify and validate measured values,
- measure the performance of the programs in achieving those goals, and
- submit an evaluation report for the current fiscal year on the performance 
  achieved in the fiscal year covered by the report (P.L. 103-62, 1115 (a). Aug. 3, 
  1993).

This legislation defines evaluation as “an assessment, through objective 
measurement and systematic analysis, of the manner and extent to which federal 
programs achieve intended objectives” (P.L. 103-62, 1115. f, 7, Aug. 3, 1993).

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1994) introduced a new educational 
reform movement, Standard-Based Reform. This legislation established a framework for 
high educational achievement for all students. According to the New York Times (1994), 
for the first time the federal government staked out a role over what happened within the 
classrooms. Which until then, “the federal role in public schools largely involved the 
education of poor and disabled children and the protection of civil rights” (The New York 
Times, 1994, March 30, pp. B10),
One of the national goals of this legislation included “supporting initiatives at the federal, state, local, and school levels to provide equal educational opportunity for all students to meet high academic and occupational skill standards and to succeed in the world of employment and civic participation” (P.L. 103-227—Mar. 31, 1994. Sec. 2, 5).

On October 20th, 1994, the ESEA of 1965 was reauthorized under P.L. 103-382, Improving America’s Schools Act (IASA). This policy supported the framework provided by the Goals 2000 policy. The ESEA policy under this reauthorization stated that:

In order for all students to master challenging standards in core academic subjects as described in the third National Education Goal described in section 102(3) of Goals 2000; Educate America, students and schools will need to maximize the time spent on teaching and learning the core academic subjects. (P.L. 103-382, Oct. 20, 1994, sec. 101,5)

According to the evaluation requirement,

Each state or local educational agency shall evaluate the program, disaggregating data on participation by sex, and if feasible, by race, ethnicity, and age…to determine the program’s impact on the ability of participants to-- maintain and improve educational achievement; accrue school credits that meet state requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation;... each state or local educational agency shall use multiple and appropriate measure of student progress. (P.L.103-382, Oct. 20, 1994, sec. 1431, 1-2)
Under this legislation, evaluation requirements also included an examination of “how well schools, local educational agencies, and states were progressing toward the goal of all children served …reaching the state’s challenging state content standards and challenging state student performance standards” (P.L. 103-382, Oct. 20, 1994, sec. 1501, 2).

No Child Left Behind: 1995 to 2005

Table 5

Title I Reauthorizations from 1995 to 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I of the ESEA of 1965 Reauthorizations</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 107-110, Jan. 8, 2002</td>
<td>The “No Child Left Behind Act of 2001” Closing the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.</td>
<td>Implementation, impact, and challenging academic standards and achievement;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title I policy and its evaluation requirement that was born in 1965 over four decades had evolved from serving “poor children and low-income families” to a policy in 2002 (NCLB) that addressed the needs of “all children.” The evaluation requirement in its inception simply required effective procedures and appropriate objective measurements. Four decades later, the evaluation requirement included: (a) evaluation of program implementation, (b) evaluation of program impact, and (c) evaluation of challenging academic standards, and academic achievement. The evaluation mandate four decades later called for more rigorous evaluation of federally funded projects.

The purpose of the ESEA reauthorization under “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) was as follows:

To ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity
to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. (P.L. 107-110, Jan. 8, 2002, sec. 1001)

The evaluations under this reauthorization were to examine:

The implementation of programs assisted under this title and the impact of such implementation on increasing student academic achievement (particularly in schools with high concentrations of children living in poverty), relative to the goal of all students reaching assessments, challenging state academic content standards, and challenging state student academic achievement standards. (P.L. 107-110, Jan. 8, 2002, sec. 1501, A)

Over 40 years much has changed. The ESEA evaluation mandate of 1965 was straightforward but lacked the sophistication of its successor, NCLB of 2002. The original legislation simply required programs to adopt “effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement” to evaluate the effectiveness of programs. By 2002, when the new ESEA legislation was reauthorized under NCLB, the evaluation mandate included implementation, impact requirements, students meeting challenging academic standards, and schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

**Summary of RQ1 findings.** Title I policy frames the structure for the development of Title I evaluation requirements. Thus, in an environment of changing political ideologies, as the policy for Title I changes, so do its evaluation requirements. Title I evaluation requirements emanates from its Title I policy. This historical study
illuminates the interrelatedness of policy and evaluation requirements. However, the focus this research is on the evolution of the Title I evaluation mandate. Moreover, this political interrelatedness and its influences have critical implications for the training of new professionals in the field of evaluation and the ongoing development of policy and evaluation requirements. Key informants who were interviewed for this study provided the following observations: “The original requirement basically called for the schools to evaluate

…the outcomes of their Title I projects for the most part against established objectives for those projects. That proved to be a very naïve requirement, and I think there was a lot of frustration in the early years with the thousands of reports that came to Washington. No one had time to read them and they…couldn’t synthesize them because the were all keyed to different objectives, and the schools were frustrated because they were being asked to report on outcomes before they even had a chance to get organized and to use evaluation to evolve successful projects…One of the major changes is that the government has gone to more contracted targeted evaluations as opposed to depending on each individual school and each individual project to address the questions of the Congress. (Stufflebeam, 2010)

…The first change has to do with the cost and the duration of the national evaluations of programs over time. The second, again in very broad brush tremendously greater sophistication and demands for measurement. In the
early days, the measures were relatively few and they were often focused on results, and then came a middle period where there was a greater awareness of implementation and the evaluations had to study processes implementation in order to answer the question how well implemented were these programs if well implemented… Third very broad brush change I’ve seen is analytic sophistication. (Ellin-Datta, 2010)

As historical developments in the evaluation mandate emerged, they also influenced changes in the approaches to evaluation and the field of evaluation as a profession. Four of the nine key informants provided the following observations:

Originally the evaluations were more focused at the project level, and they were looking at the intervention models of education. There was a lot of interest in different kinds of models and different kinds of curricula, and so there was focus primarily on project and program evaluation, and what’s involved up into the things like No Child Left Behind is that entire schools become the focus of evaluation instead of the project or the program. It’s now entire schools and entire school districts. So the unit of analysis has changed from the project or the program to the school as the focus of accountability in evaluation. (Patton, 2009)

My sense of the evaluation field is that it developed very rapidly after the mid-1960s. It grew in size, in part because evaluation requirements grew, it diversified as evaluators and commentators saw the limitations of very simple approaches to program evaluation and invented alternative ways to
manage those problems, and it deepened, as theoretical and methodological matters were explored. The evaluation of Title I quite likely was affected by growing methodological sophistication in evaluators’ use of pretty straightforward input-output studies of program effects, but I don’t see any effects of the other developments in the evaluation field. (Cohen, 2010)

Evaluation has become much more professionalized, and it’s developed into kind of a professional profession of its own and a professional force of its own as far as the federal government is concerned…the general direction is towards a much greater professionalization, and now this year our last year for the first time AEA is now employing its own lobbyist in Washington…they are now employing their own people and they’ve got an organized lobbying effort to lobby their positions out…when I started there was no evaluation profession. (House, 2010)

Evaluation data came through administrative records…it may have been some survey data, but it was all passive observational data, and people used regression models at the time to try to estimate the effects of the programs…Conventional regression models were used, and there were so many imperfections in the data and so many problems intended by conventional regressionalities that I don’t think we gave it more than a B+ or a B-. At the time, it may have been the best that could be done, but certainly things changed very gradually over that period of time…Probably 1975 to about 1980s, early 80s, there was a distinct shift
toward—in the Education Department---and generally toward higher quality and more useful evaluations. (Boruch, 2010)

In the next section, I will present the findings for RQ2 – RQ4 in their entirety by decade.

**Examination of RQ2 – RQ4: National Political, Economic, and Technological Factors and How They Relate to Evaluation Requirements**

**The “Great Society” Programs and the Equity Reform Movement (1965-1975)**

**RQ2: National political factors.** National political factors occurring during this decade included a “War on Poverty” and a movement for civil rights, social justice, and educational opportunities for the poor. The country experienced a period of civil unrest. There were sit-ins, marches, demonstrations, and protests (Salmond, 1997; Davis, 1998). It is within this context that President Johnson’s “Great Society” programs emerged. Results from interviews with key informants on national political factors and how they influenced evaluation requirements indicate that before the ESEA of 1965 education and evaluation requirements were not political or federal issues but state and local issues. While the purpose of the act was to provide equity and accountability in education, it became a part of presidential politics. Key informants observed the following:

Before the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, education was not really a federal issue. It was a local and state issue and so while part of the purpose of that act was to create national standards, and especially around issues of equity, it made it a federal political issue and so that it became part of presidential politics and it gave more power to the Department of Education in the federal government and made education in the United States much more top down and much more politicized at the federal
level. Things are much more politicized when the federal government gets involved and that trend has continued. It has been a major trend for more and more money and more and more of the politics to flow from the federal level and No Child Left Behind epitomized that and really concentrated the power at the federal level. (Patton, 2009)

I don’t feel that the legislation itself had much influence. There was enormous political pressure from agencies that were contracting with the government to do both programming and evaluation...In the Johnson years...there was considerable association of the ESEA with civil rights democratic policies toward education in general but surprising support from Republican congressmen, senators who thought that evaluation would be a control of the war on poverty and the new educational programs. So, there was a considerable, political encouragement of strong evaluation requirements from the political sources in Washington at the time. (Stake, 2009)

Cronback et al. (1980) contended that following the passage of the ESEA of 1965, evaluation activities developed rapidly. These activities created an atmosphere that leaders in the field referred to as a “boom town of excitement in the evaluation community” (p. 40). Program evaluation requirements were embedded in Title I of ESEA and professionals who were called upon to evaluate the new social action programs initiated under this legislation were ill-prepared for the challenges they would face (Coleman, 1968; Cohen, 1970; McLaughlin, 1974; Cronbach et al, 1980). Madaus,
Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983) observed that “they faced an identity crisis…they were not sure whether they should try to be researchers, testers, administrators, teachers, or philosophers” (p. 15). The need for trained specialists in evaluation was evident.

During the first decade of the ESEA of 1965, a number of major evaluation studies were advanced in an effort to gather useful information about Title I of ESEA projects. The first of those major studies is the *Equality of Educational Opportunity* or the Coleman Report. The study was led by James Coleman, Professor of Social Relations at Johns Hopkins. The report was conducted in response to one of the first specific requests made by Congress for social research that might provide a basis for policy (Coleman, 1968). The study was released in 1966, and proved to be one of the most extensive surveys ever made on American education having major implications for educational policy. Coleman (1968) reported that the study raised new problems of design and analysis on evaluation studies. Consequently, the evaluation reports produced during this period failed to meet the expectations of the Congress. McGlaughlin (1974) argued that the evaluation strategies failed chiefly because professionals ignored the conceptual complexity and approaches needed to evaluate a program with multiple goals and treatments for the more than 30,000 Title I projects across the country.

According to Cohen (2009), the civil rights movement influenced the formation of policy by “changing many Americans’ ideas about racial justice…and racial inequality into a problem that politicians might solve” (p. 40). These new ideas helped to shape policy and change the politics of education, which fundamentally changed Title I and evaluation requirements. In the next decade, the newly formulated version of Title I and its attendant new evaluation requirements became the key instrument for Presidents
William J. Clinton and George W. Bush in their efforts to impose standards-based reform on the nation’s schools with the aim of closing the achievement gap. The requirements to evaluate federally funded education projects reflected these changing ideologies and influenced the legislative mandate and reauthorizations of Title I projects as shown later.

**RQ3: National economic factors (1965 – 1975).** National economic factors and educational evaluation requirements are closely intertwined. The landmark ESEA of 1965 was developed in response to economic and educational factors affecting the poor. This legislation provided funds for educational projects designed to meet the needs of children from low-income families (P.L. 89-10, Apr. 11, 1965). The issue of accountability for funds invested in educational projects emerged as a requirement for the passage of this legislation.

The first decade of this study, 1965-1975, signaled a period of American economic boom. The Gross Domestic Product Growth Rate was at its highest since the Great Depression; 6.4 percent in 1965 (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2009). Central to President Johnson’s legislative agenda was his “War on Poverty,” and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was its centerpiece. This legislation sought “to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States” (P.L. 88-452, Aug. 20, 1964).

In 1965, the mood of the country was marked by civil unrest, civil disobedience, and civil rights. While draftees burned draft cards in protest of a war they did not support, Blacks fought for equal opportunities with marches, sit-ins and demonstrations, and women contended for equal pay for equal labor, the women’s rights movement was afoot. This period of civil unrest continued throughout the mid-1970s.
While the nation faced civil unrest, and economic woes, the field of evaluation and demands for program evaluation prospered. In 1967, under a reduced funding proposal, the federal government funded what is considered the largest educational experiment under Project Follow Through (Grossen, 1996; House, 1979). Project Follow Through was designed to provide educational services to disadvantaged students in the early years of schooling but due to funding difficulties, it was converted into a “planned-variation experiment to find out what works” (House, 1979, p. 29).

Beginning in 1969 through 1975, America experienced the following changes:

- A new Republican administration, 1969
- The peak of the War in South East Asia, 1969
- The space program, which placed a man on the moon, 1969
- A Mid East Oil Crisis from 1973 to 1974, and

By the end of the first decade of this study, the American economic boom of 1965 had developed to the economic down turn of 1974 (Berube, 1991; Andrew, 1998; Milkis & Mileur, 2005). The Bureau of Economic Analysis reported a Gross Domestic Product Growth Rate of -.06 in 1974 (see Figure 5).

**RQ4: National technological factors (1965 – 1975).** The development of new technologies has had a profound impact on educational evaluation, measurement and research. The innovation of the high-speed electronic computer is ubiquitous and undeniable. From the monstrous IBM computers with their cards to the desktop and the laptop, new technology has been critical for the processing, recording, and storage of complex data of many types that permits instantaneous retrieval and processing. Title I
of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act gave birth to new evaluation requirements for federally funded education projects. The emergence of these new technologies strongly influenced the quality of evaluations, the development of the field of evaluation, and the evaluation requirements for Title I projects (Tyler & Lindquist, 1969).

During this decade of “Great Society” programs, innovations in technology drove testing and testing emerged as the cornerstone to the new evaluation mandate for Title I projects. The innovation of the electronic computer made it possible to record and store complex data in a way that permitted instantaneous retrieval and processing (Tyler, 1969). Another technological development during this period includes the development of the electronic test-scoring machine. Lindquist (1969) pointed out that these machines relieved school administrators of an almost impossible clerical burden that would have been imposed upon them by the comprehensive testing practices of the period. According to Lindquist (1969) these machines “provided the school with far more adequate, more readily interpretable and prompt reports of tests results than they would have otherwise” (p. 352).

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) also known as the Nation’s Report Card, was created in 1969 to be an educational barometer of the academic achievement of the nation’s elementary and secondary schools. Title I evaluation requirements became its driving influence (U.S. Department of Education Office of Technology Assessment, 1992). Tyler (1969) pointed out that the new technology strengthened the interest of evaluation professionals in the emergence of large-scale studies of individual performance. According to Tyler (1969) these large-
scale evaluation studies involved large numbers of variables, new theories, new
procedures, and new instruments. The quantity and quality of data, type of data, and
speed of collection and analysis have also contributed to the growth and depth of
evaluation projects.

Coleman and Karweit (1970) stated that standardized tests, designed to measure
individual student performance, were being used increasingly to evaluate the functioning
of schools and school districts, the impact of special programs, the comparative effects of
home and school on achievement, and other aspects of school performance. Two major
innovations in technology influenced the evaluation of funded projects: (1) the rapid
development of the electronic computer; and (2) the electronic test scoring machine. This
new technology facilitated the process of testing and the efficiency of test scoring
(Lindquist, 1969).

Beginning with the 1974 reauthorization of Title I (P.L. 93-380, Aug. 21, 1974),
the U.S. Department of Education began to rely on standardized test scores as a
straightforward and economical way of depicting Title I effectiveness (U.S. Department
of Education Office of Technology Assessment, 1992). As researchers sought to fulfill
the evaluation mandate for reporting objective measurements of educational achievement
(P.L. 89-10, Apr. 11, 1965), they relied on educational tests. Reformers have used tests to
evaluate curriculum, overall system performance, and individual student achievement.
The Equality of Educational Opportunity study (i.e., the Coleman report), published in
1966, emerged as the major social science study of this decade (Gamoran, Secada &
Marrett, 2000). To answer the research question researchers relied on student
achievement tests and questionnaires. As stated earlier, testing became the cornerstone to
the new Title I evaluation requirements. Figure 4 (p. 68) illustrates the major political, economic, technological factors and Title I ESEA legislation occurring during the first decade of this study.

The Excellence Reform Movement (1975 – 1985)

**RQ2: National Political Factors.** The national political influences of this decade revolved around economic and educational factors. The Republican administration that began in 1969 ended in 1977 when the American public elected a Democratic president. One major influence that emerged during the presidential campaign of 1976 came from the National Education Association (NEA), and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). During the presidential campaign, the NEA broke from its 118 years of conservative roots and joined with the AFT to endorse a political candidate. Maeroff (1976) reported that the active involvement of the NEA and the AFT in the presidential election marked “the end of an era in which teachers shunned political partisanship” (p. 15).

The two groups campaigned on behalf of Jimmy Carter. The NEA was the largest teacher’s union and the party’s chief supporter (Berube, 1991). The Democratic Party presidential candidate won the national election in 1976 and Jimmy Carter was sworn in as the 39th President of the United States on January 20th, 1977.

The new democratic administration was influenced by the NEA into creating the Department of Education, signed into law on October 17, 1979, which until then was an office in the Department of Health Education and Welfare.
Figure 4. Historical study of Title I of the ESEA from 1965 to 1975.
During the 1976 campaign, According to Berube (1991), “NEA made the Department of Education a condition of its presidential support… thus, the leadership was merely following the wishes of one of the chief presidential supporters” (p. 50). This administration which began in 1977 ended its tenure in 1981 with its greatest accomplishment being the creation of the Department of Education in 1979. Maeroff (1979) stated, “the very existence of a Department of Education, however effectual it turns out to be, is a testimony to a change in attitude toward federal involvement in education” (p. C1).

In 1981, the leadership of the country was back in the hands of a Republican administration. National politics for the new administration revolved around economic and educational factors. The new Republican administration, under the leadership of President Ronald Reagan, was noted for making major overhauls and reductions in the federal budget, which included a proposal to eliminate the newly created Department of Education. These efforts led to tensions and conflicts among policy makers and politicians over the administration’s philosophies and ideologies on education.

On August 13, 1981 President Reagan signed into law the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, a package of tax and budget reductions that changed the course of government spending. On September 24, 1981, in a speech delivered from the Oval Office of the White House, the president further proposed to dismantle two cabinet departments, Energy and Education. The president stated:

Education is the principal responsibility of local school systems, teachers, parents, citizen boards, and state governments. By eliminating the Department of Education less than 2 years after it was created, we cannot
only reduce the budget but ensure that local needs and preferences, rather than the wishes of Washington, determine the education of our children. (Historic Documents, 1981).

On December 13, 1981, Fiske, the New York Times education correspondent noted that previous administrations tended to view education policy as a means to achieve important national objectives such as student preparation in science, math, and foreign language instruction. According to Fiske, “the Reagan administration seems to view the educational system less as a tool and more as a target of its economic and political philosophies—that is, as another arena in which federal expenditures can be decreased” (p. E14).

By 1983 the national political and economic influence for the Republican administration was not anti-poverty programs, or the civil rights movement and affirmative action, but foreign economic competition. The publication of the report, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform on April 26, 1983, created serious concerns among educators, policy makers and politicians. Once again, it was feared that the United States, once the world leader in education, science, and technology, had fallen behind in its competitiveness against foreign competitors; mainly Japan, Germany, and South Korea. This report officially launched the excellence reform movement (Berube, 1991). The report states that:

Our nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged pre-eminence in commerce, industry, science and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world…while we can take great pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to
the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and as a people…what was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments… (New York Times, Apr 27, 1983)

The equity reform movement of the 1960s and the 1970s was replaced in the 1980s by the excellence reform movement. The liberal educational view up until then was that if the educational attainment and achievement of students from underrepresented and poor backgrounds were increased, they would eventually secure better jobs, advance themselves socially, and help the economy. According to House (1998), “education of the individual was the major driving force behind general economic improvement…During the 1980s, the argument for education was transformed…to an argument over an education system that was broken” (p. 13). The excellence reform movement became the dominant influence of the 1980s.

RQ3: National economic factors (1975 – 1985). While the equity educational reform movement continued to be a major thrust, the nation faced major economic woes, unemployment and an ever increasing energy crisis. President Nixon was impeached in 1974, and his vice president, Gerald R. Ford, was now serving as president of the nation. In his first state of the union address, the president made the following remarks:

The state of the union is not good…millions of Americans are out of work. Recession and inflation are eroding the money of millions more. Prices are too high and sales are too slow…the economic disruption we and
others are experiencing stems in part from the fact that the world price of petroleum has quadrupled in the last year. …Our growing dependence upon foreign sources has been adding to our vulnerability for years and years and we did nothing to prepare ourselves for an event such as the embargo of 1973. (Historic documents, 1975)

President Ford ended his short tenure in office on January 20th, 1977. One year after the democratic President Jimmy Carter was sworn in, his state of the union address included the following remarks:

Militarily, politically, economically and in spirit, the state of our union is sound. We are a great country, a strong country, a vital and a dynamic country — and so we will remain. We are a confident people and a hard-working people, a decent and a compassionate people — and so we will remain. (Historic Documents, 1978)

The president’s message in 1978 was optimistic; the economy was showing signs of growth with a gross domestic product growth rate of 5.6 up from -0.6 in 1974 (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2009). On November 1, 1978, the ESEA was reauthorized under Public Law 95-561 with minor modifications to the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) established under the 1974 reauthorization. In his outgoing speech President Carter declared, “Our economy is recovering from a recession. A national energy plan is in place and our dependence on foreign oil is decreasing, we have been at peace for four uninterrupted years” (Historic Documents, 1981).

However, by 1981 the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System were repealed under President Reagan’s Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act. The Omnibus
Education Reconciliation Act was part of a broader economic policy that was aimed at reducing spending and taxes in the Federal Government. The far-reaching act was known as the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 signed on August 13, 1981 (P.L. 97-34, HeinOnline); The Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act was also signed on August 13, 1981 (P.L. 97-35, HeinOnline). Under this reauthorization, evaluation requirements (TIERS) established in 1974 and revised in 1978 were repealed and the requirements to evaluate federally funded education projects were the same as stated in the original legislation in 1965.

The economic climate was beginning to show signs of a recession. The gross domestic product growth rate in 1981 was 2.5, down from 5.6 in 1978 as shown in Figure 5.
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*Figure 5. Gross domestic product growth rate 1966 to 2002.*

On February 18, 1981, less than one month after his inaugural address, President Reagan addressed the nation to propose a four-point economic recovery plan “to get the economy moving again” (Historic Documents, 1981). His plan called for a reduction in
the growth of government spending and taxing, “reforming and eliminating regulations which are unnecessary and unproductive and encouraging a consistent monetary policy aimed at maintaining the value of the American currency” (Historic Documents, 1981).

**RQ4: National technological factors (1975 – 1985).** The 1980s represented a decade of irreversible changes in educational measurement. These changes have been quantitative in character. The innovation of the personal computer revolutionized the field of evaluation, measurement, and research by facilitating the method for processing large-scale studies of individual student performance and stimulated the testing movement (Lindquist, 1969; Fitzpatrick, et al., 2004). This technological development influenced improvements in the approaches to evaluation and the level of sophistication with which evaluation reports were produced (Goldin & Katz, 2008). According to one key informant who was interviewed for this study, technology is not only driving “the level of sophistication… in descriptive studies, but also in estimating the effects of programs” (Boruch, 2010). Younger generations with their advanced knowledge, apps, and powerful mathematical, logical and digital approaches, are the power behind the advancement of the field of evaluation today. “My students now know more than I do about how to design trials.” Another key informant who was interviewed for this study stated,

It’s possible to do much larger data sets to compare in short time periods and in real-time, school districts and states. It used to be that states and districts were fairly autonomous and were looked at on their own merits and evaluated according to their goals, but now all the data is comparative and that’s part of the politics of it, and the technology that has made those
comparisons easier to do and to do more quickly with very large data
sets…that has increased the pressure on evaluation to use standardized
measures and to make comparisons. (Patton, 2009)

Computer aided mapping for demographic information is another innovation of
the modern technology of the 1980s. This advanced technology was critical for busing,
redistricting, funding, and evaluation (Cronbach, 1980). Following the concept of social
cartography, Figure 6 (p. 76) illustrates national political, economic, technological
factors, and Title I of ESEA legislation enacted during the first 20 years of this study.


RQ2: National political factors. In 1985 the economic health of the nation
continued to dominate national politics. President Reagan, who had made sweeping
changes in tax reforms with the Economic Tax Recovery Act of 1981 and budget
reductions, was now basking in the glory of his success. On January 23, 1985, Hershey,
reporting for the New York Times stated that “the American economy expanded at a 3.9
percent annual rate in the fourth quarter, giving it a 6.8 percent gain for the year, its best
performance since 1951. According to Hershey “a buoyant President Reagan promptly
seized on the figures to assert that his economic policies had been entirely vindicated” (p.
A1).

On December 13, 1988, in one of his closing remarks to administration officials
on domestic policy, the outgoing president of eight years asserted that the American
economy after eight years of his administration was now stronger than ever and that
America had regained their economic leadership over Japan. He stated the following:
Figure 6. Historical study of Title I of the ESEA from 1965 to 1985.
History records a few significant turning points in this epic struggle, and surely in years to come it will tell that one of those turning points came when, after a generation of gestation, a revolution of ideas became a revolution of governance on January 20, 1981…. We cut the top tax rate in the 1981 tax act, and then we cut it again in the 1986 tax reform. Our cuts in needless regulations have been at least significant; and as with tax cuts, other countries, including Japan, are rushing to catch up. (Public Papers of the President)

On January 20, 1989, the Republican administration began a third term under the leadership of a newly elected president, George H. W. Bush, who served as vice president to Reagan. Regaining and maintaining American economic competitive strength was still the major impetus for the continuation of the *excellence reform movement* under this new Republican administration (Berube, 1991).

The challenges for this administration were homelessness, drug addiction, crime, and an ever increasing budget deficit. The president’s inaugural address included the following statement:

> We have a deficit to bring down. We have more will than wallet; but will is what we need. We will make the hard choices…We must bring the federal budget into balance. And we must ensure that America stands before the world united, strong, at peace, and fiscally sound. (Library of Congress Historic Documents)

The *1989 Education Summit* with the nation’s governors was one of the highlights of this administration and a major influence on American education politics and policy.
Once again, the president issued a call for reforming American education. On September 28, 1989, President Bush’s statement to the nation’s governors included the following remarks:

…after two centuries of progress, we are stagnant. While millions of Americans read for pleasure, millions of others don’t read at all. And while millions go to college, millions may never graduate from high school…No modern nation can long afford to allow so many of its sons and daughters to emerge into adulthood ignorant and unskilled… Six years ago, the Committee on Excellence in Education issued its powerful report; and yet today, our nation is still at risk…Now it is time to define goals.

The president charged the governors with building “broad-based consensus around a defined set of national education goals.” According to the president the stakes had changed; the nation’s competitors were working hard to educate their people and as they improve, “they make the future a moving target.” The president also called for the establishment of clear national performance goals that would make America internationally competitive. He proposed new ideas and strategies for restructuring American education which included the following:

- Greater choice for parents and students,
- Greater authority and accountability for teachers and principals,
- Alternative certification programs for teachers, and
- Programs that systematically reward excellence and performance.
In his historic Education Summit speech, the president continued to admonish the nation’s governors that: “from this day forward, let us be an America of tougher standards, of higher goals, and a land of bigger dreams” (Statements at the Education Summit, Historic Document Series Online Edition, May 16, 2010).

Prior to the Education Summit on September 3, 1989, The New York Times reported the results of a recent Gallup education poll sponsored by the professional educational fraternity Phi Delta Kappa (Finn, p. E13).. The report showed that 70% of its respondents were in favor of achievement standards and goals. Respondents to the poll stated that they wanted national education standards, a national curriculum, and national tests (Frymier & Gansneder, 1989).

Three months following the Education Summit, the New York Times reported that Gallup polls indicated that most Americans wanted national standards, national tests, and a national curriculum. However, the drive toward national standards raised many politically charged issues such as: a) How to improve teaching? b) How would the imposed standards improve achievement? and c) How would standards be tested? According to the Times, many educators argued that any national standards developed had to be linked to the adoption of emerging forms of testing (Chira, Dec. 26, 1989, p.A1).

After three terms under the leadership of a Republican administration, on November 3, 1992, the American public elected a Democratic president, William Jefferson Clinton. President Clinton faced many of the same challenges as his predecessor: the federal deficit, unemployment, and crime. In his inaugural address on January 20, 1993, the president pledged to renew America by “investing more in our own people in their jobs, and in their future and at the same time cut the massive debt”
While standards and testing were initiated under the previous Republican administration, it became the centerpiece of this administration (House, 1998). Education prevailed as the major national economic concern. In his state of the union address on January 25, 1994, the president stated the following:

> We must set tough world-class academic and occupational standards for all our children. And give our teachers and students the tools they need to meet them. Our Goals 2000 proposal will empower individual school districts to experiment with ideas like chartering their schools to be run by private corporations or having more public school choice, to do whatever they wish to do as long as we measure every school by one high standard; Are our children learning what they need to know to compete and win in the global economy? (New York Times, p. A16)

On March 31, 1994, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act became law (Public Law 103-227—Mar. 31, 1994). The Legislation established eight national goals and standards to be achieved by the year 2000. The purpose of this act was to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for systemic education reform (HeinOnline – Stat. 125 1994). Among the eight goals of the legislation were:

1. School Readiness—By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn.
2. School Completion—By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.
3. Student Achievement and Citizenship—By the year 2000, all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages…and

4. Mathematics and Science—By the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.

According to the New York Times (1994), establishing this legislation represented a sweeping school measure that would mark the first time that the nation provided “a federal blueprint to educate its children.” Up until then, “the federal role in public schools largely involved the education of poor and disabled children and the protection of civil rights” (New York Times, March 30, 1994, p. B10).

**RQ3 National economic factors (1985 – 1995).** On April 24, 1985, President Ronald Reagan, who was in his second term in office declared success in his economic policies. He stated the following:

Just four years ago this week, I asked your support for our bipartisan recovery program. That was the program the spenders said wouldn’t work, and they called it Reagonomics….You turned America around -- turned around her confidence, turned around her economy, turned around over a decade of one national nightmare after another. We’re into our 29th straight month of economic growth, with inflation staying down and more of us working than ever before—that’s eight million new jobs…Once again, the United States is the flagship economy for the world. (Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, National Archives and Records Administration, May 4, 2010)
The president who had made sweeping changes during his first term in office with tax reforms and budget reductions was now basking in the glory of his accomplishment. The federal education budget showed signs of an increase (see Figure 7, Department of Education; and Education for the Disadvantaged Title I).

By 1988, the gross domestic product growth rate had increased from 2.5 in 1981 to 4.1 (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2009). Title I policy was once again reauthorized under President Ronald Reagan. This reauthorization was known as the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments (P.L. 100-297). Within the context of improved economic conditions, the new Title I policy provided for increased funding for Title I projects, an increase in the number of eligible students served, and introduced an evaluation mandate that required programs to “evaluate in accordance with national standards.” House (1998), stated that “economic policies and conditions directly affect education policies” (p. 39). Moreover, these changes in economic policies influenced changes in the evaluation requirements for federally funded education projects.

On January 20, 1989, the Republican administration began a third term under the leadership of a newly elected President, George H. W. Bush, who served as vice president to the outgoing president. Under this new Republican president regaining and maintaining American economic competitive strength was still the major impetus for the continuation of the excellence reform movement. While the president continued to be challenged by an ever increasing budget deficit, the highlight of this administration was the 1989 Education Summit with the nation’s governors.
After three Republican administrations totaling 12 years, on November 3, 1992, the American public elected a Democratic president, William Jefferson Clinton. Historic documents state that the country was experiencing a recession (Historic Documents Series, 2010). Thus, on February 17, 1993, almost one month after taking the oath of office, President Clinton delivered to the nation his Five-Year Economic Plan. The president stated the following:

…The conditions which brought us as a Nation to this point are well-known: two decades of low productivity, growth, and stagnant wages; persistent unemployment and underemployment; years of huge Government deficits and declining investment in our future; exploding

Figure 7. Federal education budget by program.
health care costs and lack of coverage for millions of Americans; legions of poor children; education and job training opportunities inadequate to the demands of this tough, global economy. (Historic Document Series, 2011)

The major thrust of the plan was to reduce the federal budget deficit. The plan also included the need to reduce waste and inefficiency in federal programs and a plan to promote public accountability by promoting a new focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction. These were part of the mandates included in the Government Performance and Results Act (P.L. 103-62), signed on August 3, 1993. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, signed on August 6, 1993, called for cuts in government spending (Historic document series, 2011).

One year later after taking the oath of office, President Clinton declared that his five-year economic plan had began to show promising signs of an improved American economy over the previous administration. On January 25, 1994, the president made the following remarks in his state of the union address:

A year ago I asked all of you to join me in accepting responsibility for the future of our country. Well, we did. We replaced drift and deadlock with renewal and reform. And I want to thank every one of you here who heard the American people, who broke gridlock, who gave them the most successful teamwork between a president and a congress in 30 years…Our economic program has helped to produce the lowest core inflation rate and the lowest interest rates in 20 years. (Historical Document Series, 2011)
Later in his speech President Clinton turned his attention to education. According to the president, the economic strategy he proposed a year earlier could not work unless attention was also given to our people and the “education, training and skill they need to seize the opportunities of tomorrow.” As stated earlier, national economic factors, education, and educational evaluation are intertwined; efforts to improve in one area calls for efforts to improve in the other. Further, the president address included the need to establish world class academic standards. He stated the following:

We must set tough, world-class academic and occupational standards for all our children and give our teachers and students the tools they need to meet them. Our Goals 2000 proposal will empower individual school districts to experiment with ideas like chartering their schools to be run by private corporations, or having more public school choice—to do whatever they wish to do as long as we measure every school by one high standard: Are our children learning what they need to know to compete and win in the global economy?” Goals 2000 links world-class standards to grass-roots reforms. And I hope Congress will pass it without delay.

(Historical Document Series, 2011)

Moreover, it is within the framework of improving economic conditions that Congress passed the legislation and President Clinton, on March 31, 1994, signed P.L. 103-227, the GOALS 2000: Educate America Act. The New York Times cited this legislation as the first federal blueprint to educate the nation’s children (Celis, March 30, 1994). According to the Times, the impetus for this legislation came from a perception that Japan and Germany did a better job of training their citizens, and that made those
countries more competitive economically (Celis, March 30, 1994). Evaluation requirements under this legislation was to evaluate the process the National Education Goals Council used to certify voluntary national standards and assessments submitted by the States on what students should know and be able to do (P.L. 103-227).

On October 20, 1994, just under seven months after Goals 2000, the ESEA was reauthorized under P.L. 102-382. The new policy called for expanding the program by increasing funding for Title I, “thereby increasing the percentage of eligible students served in each fiscal year with the intent of serving all eligible students by fiscal year 2004.” Under this legislation, programs were required to evaluate effectiveness by “disaggregating data on participation by sex, race, ethnicity, and age, to determine the program’s impact on the ability of participants to maintain and improve educational achievement.”

RQ4: National technological factors (1985 – 1995). As America entered the era of a global economy under standard-based reform, researchers needed to determine what students should know in order to compete in the global economy; thus, innovations in technology facilitated the process of measurement and testing. Bunderson et al. (1988) argued that educational measurement at the time was undergoing “a revolution due to the rapid dissemination of information-processing technology” (p. 1). The new technology proved to be increasingly sophisticated and powerful. Thus, this modern technology influenced the development of sophisticated testing instruments, and for the first time conventional tests were computerized with its contents tailored to item difficulty based on the response of the examinee. Once again, Title I reauthorization—repealed in 1981, under P.L 97-35, Aug. 13, 1981—was reinstated under P.L 100-297, Apr. 28, 1988.
With Title I Evaluation and Reporting System reinstated (TIERS), the U.S. Department of Education then continued to rely on standardized test scores as a straightforward way of depicting Title I effectiveness.

During this decade, new methodological approaches in the field of statistical measurement also influenced how educational programs were evaluated. The development of hierarchal linear model theory allowed researchers to “provide explicit representation of the multiple organizational levels typically encountered in educational research” (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1988, p. 68). Thus, the rapid growth of the technology of the personal computer and the Internet facilitated this new approach to educational measurement and research, expanded the quantity and quality of the analysis of data, and influenced developments in the field of evaluation.

The development of the Internet in the early 1990s facilitated the access of information, and it revolutionized the mode of communication among federal agencies, state, and local governments. Thus, new developments in technology also influenced the way information was disseminated. Researchers involved in the evaluation of funded projects were now equipped with new and improved mechanisms for collecting data. This modern technology transformed survey methodology and provided multiple modes for data collection (Dillman et al., 2009). With the innovation of modern technology, researchers were provided with new and more efficient modes for conducting mail survey, computer assisted interviewing, and web-based surveys. One key informant who was interviewed for this study reported the following: “In an effort to implement standard-based education, innovation in technology has served to break down services to
students by race and ethnicity, and so we have a much greater capability to push each school district to do better” (Wholey, 2010).

Figure 8 (p. 89) illustrates the political, economic, and technological factors and the concurrent Title I of the ESEA legislation enacted during the three decades of this study.

No Child Left Behind (1995 – 2005)


On November 6, 1996, President Clinton was elected to a second term in office. In his state of the union address on February 4, 1997, the president expressed confidence in the strength of the American economy. His address to the nation included the following comments:

We have much to be thankful for. With four years of growth, we have won back the basic strength of our economy. With crime and welfare rolls declining, we are winning back our optimism, the enduring faith that we can master any difficulty”…”Over the last four years, we have brought new economic growth by investing in our people, expanding our exports, cutting our deficits, creating over 11 million new jobs, a four-year record (State of the Union Address, CQ Electronic Library, Historic Document Series Online Edition)
Figure 8. National, political, economic, and technological factors from 1965 to 1995.
When President Clinton began his first term in office on January 20, 1993, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was 3.4. By the beginning of his second term in office, the GDP had risen to 4.5 (Bureau of Economic Analysis).

Education prevailed as a major economic and political influence throughout this decade. The president continued with a strong appeal to the nation’s governors, teachers, parents and all citizens for “a new nonpartisan commitment to education,” he asserted that “education was the critical national security issue for the future, and that politics stopped at the schoolhouse door” (State of the Union Address, Feb. 4, 1997, CQ Electronic Library, Historic Document Series Online Edition).

On January 19, 1999, in his state of the union address, once again, the president expressed confidence in the strength of the American economy and stated the evidence of a balanced budget. His address to the American public included the following comments:

For the first time in three decades, the budget is balanced. From a deficit of $290 billion in 1992, we had a surplus of $70 billion last year, and now we are in course for budget surpluses for the next 25 years…I stand before you tonight to report that the state of our union is strong. America is working again. (Historic Documents Series Online Edition)

President Clinton continued in his address to the nation with the introduction of a proposed Education Accountability Act. The proposed act would require all school districts receiving federal assistance to take the following five steps:

1. All schools must end social promotion—that is, no child should graduate from high school with a diploma he or she cannot read.
2. All state and school districts must turn around their worst-performing schools, or shut them down.

3. All states and school districts must be held responsible for the quality of their teachers.

4. All parents must be empowered with more information and more choices.

5. All states and school districts must both adopt and implement sensible discipline policies.

The president stated that if these steps were accomplished, “then we will begin to meet our generation’s historic responsibility to create 21st century schools” (State of the Union Address and Republican Response; Historic Documents Series Online Edition).

The New York Times (2000) reported that with only eight months left in office, the president took a two-day tour to visit public schools in Kentucky, Iowa, Minnesota, and Ohio. This trip was meant to “hold failing schools more accountable, increase school construction, open more charter schools and improve teacher quality” (May 4, pp. A18).

On January 18, 2001, in his farewell address to the nation and his cabinet members, the president expressed confidence in the American economic improvement under the two terms of his administration. His remarks were as follows:

You have made our social fabric stronger, our families healthier and safer, our people more prosperous…Working together, America has done well.

Our economy is breaking records, with more than 22 million new jobs.

The lowest unemployment in 30 years,…the longest expansion in history….Through our last four budgets we’ve turned record deficits to record surpluses, and we’ve been able to pay down $600 billion of our
national debt, on track to be debt-free by the end of the decade for the first time since 1835. (Bill Clinton's farewell to the presidency, *Historic documents of 2001*, Washington: CQ Press)


January 20, 2001, marked the beginning of a new Republican administration. After taking the oath of office, the new president, George W. Bush, delivered his inaugural address. In the first part of his address he expressed concerns over the issue of failing schools. The president promised to “reclaim America’s schools before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives.” He continued to affirm a strong economy and admonished the nation to “show courage in a time of blessing by confronting problems instead of passing them on to future generations” (George W. Bush’s Inaugural Address, Historic Documents of 2001).

Title I of ESEA and its evaluation requirement emerged from national political influences of the civil rights movement of the 1960s. This movement demanded equality and social justice, and President Johnson responded with the creation of his “Great Society” programs. Title I of ESEA was one of these programs. After four decades and eight presidential administrations, Title I policy and its evaluation requirement has been transformed to what is known today as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Standard-Based Reform movement.

From equity educational reform in 1965, to NCLB and standard-based reform in 2002, ESEA has been transformed. In 1965, the Title I ESEA evaluation mandate required programs to adopt “effective procedures, including provision for appropriate
objective measurements of educational achievement” to evaluate the effectiveness of programs. On January 8, 2002, when the new ESEA legislation was reauthorized under NCLB, the evaluation mandate included requirements on program implementation, impact, students meeting challenging academic standards, and schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress. NCLB attached more demands in its evaluation mandate for federal aid.

Four national political and educational reform movements influenced the transformation of Title I of ESEA and its evaluation mandate: (1) the equity reform movement, influenced by the civil rights movement, demanded equality of educational opportunity and social justice; (2) the excellence reform movement, influenced by the report entitled A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, examined the quality of American education and concluded that American students were at risk compared to foreign unfriendly competitors; (3) Goals 2000 and standard-based reform, influenced by its predecessors, sought to provide a framework for meeting national educational goals and the needs of the nation’s at risk students; and (4) No Child Left Behind (NCLB), also developed on the theory of its predecessor, focused on holding schools accountable for what students should know and meeting Adequate Yearly Progress.

As the national politics of education and changing ideologies evolved, so did the policies for Title I and its evaluation requirements. This study provides a perspective on those elements of the past that have had an influence on current educational events, evaluation approaches and practices, and the ongoing development of evaluation theory.

**RQ3: National economic factors (1995 – 2005).** In 2001, while Presidents Clinton and Bush expressed confidence in a strong economy, reports surfaced about signs
of a slowing down of the economic growth and threats of a possible recession. The President’s Economic Report (2001) stated that, “by the time Republican George W. Bush was sworn in as president on January 20, 2001, the longest expansion in U.S. history was drawing to a close and economic growth was slowing in much of the rest of the world as well.” Historic documents state that “the economy might well have escaped recession in 2001 had it not been for the September 11 terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center” (The President’s Economic Report, A Historic Document from February 5, 2002). According to historic documents, this tragic attack on America influenced much of its future economic policies.

The interaction of economic factors and their influence on evaluation requirements over four decades have been a continuous process of ebb and flow. This ebb and flow are influenced by powerful national economic and political forces, undercurrents, and foreign competition. The following statements summarize this ebb and flow of the interaction of national economic factors and Title I of ESEA evaluation requirements:

- **1965**: The American economy experienced an economic boom while Congress passed the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) in response to national economic and educational factors affecting the poor, contemporary program evaluation was born.

- **1974**: The American economic boom became the American economic downturn influenced by the Mid East oil crisis and oil embargo of 1973, Title I evaluation requirements of ESEA of 1965 was reauthorized under P.L. 93-380, Aug.21,
1974, and the U.S. Department of Education continued to commission large evaluation studies.

- **1978:** The American economy began to show signs of economic growth and Title I of ESEA was reauthorized under P.L. 95-561, Nov. 1, 1978, with minor modifications to Title I evaluation requirements.

- **1981:** The American economy began to show signs of a recession, Title I Evaluation and Reporting System established in 1974 was repealed, and evaluation reports and evaluation studies were curtailed.

- **1988:** The American economy began to show signs of improved economic conditions and Title I of ESEA was reauthorized under P.L. 100-297, Apr. 28, 1988; the new policy provided for increased Title I evaluation funding.

- **1993:** The American economy emerged from a recession (1994), Congress passed “GOALS 2000: Educate America Act” P.L. 103-227, influenced by the perception that Japan and Germany did a better job of training their citizens. Title I ESEA evaluation requirements were based on voluntary national standards and assessments submitted on what students should know and be able to do.

- **1994:** With continued growth in the American economy, Title I was reauthorized under P.L. 102-382, Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994; the new policy expanded the program and provided increased funding.

- **2001:** The American economy was once again threatened by a recession; Title I of ESEA was reauthorized under P.L. 107-110, Jan. 8, 2002, No Child Left Behind (NCLB).
This interaction of economic factors and their influence on Title I of ESEA evaluation requirements has critical implications for the practice of evaluation and the training of new evaluators. Economic factors and evaluation requirements have shown to be in a continuous process of ebb and flow. In order for professionals in the field of evaluation to provide competent evaluation services, they need to understand the forces in their environment that influence their work.

**RQ4: National technological factors (1995 – 2005).** In 1965 educational testing emerged as the cornerstone to the evaluation requirements for Title I projects. Four decades later, testing continues to hold the central role in educational evaluation and standard-based educational reform movement. Under the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (IASA), effective July 1, 1995, the evaluation mandate required Title I projects to include “information gathered from a variety of sources, including the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)” (P.L. 103-382, Oct. 20, 1994).

Evaluation requirements and educational testing are closely linked. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), also known as the Nation’s Report Card, “has been an exemplary model of careful and innovative test design” (Testing in American Schools: Asking the Right Questions, U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, 1992, p. 37). Linn (1993) affirmed that evaluation and testing have become the engine for implementing educational policy” (p. 1)

Under the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 reauthorization, researchers also learned that technology plays a key role in professional development and improved teaching and learning (P.L. 103-382, Oct. 20, 1994). The report Transforming American Education: Learning Powered by Technology (Office of Educational Technology, U.S.
Department of Education, 2010) states that “technology-based learning and assessment systems will be pivotal in improving student learning and generating data that can be used to continuously improve the education system at all levels” (p. v).

By the year 2002, Title I was reauthorized under Public Law 107-110, known as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, on January 8, 2002. Part D of the Enhancing Education Through Technology Act of 2001 was designed to “assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade” (P.L. 107-110).

This technology requirement that called for bridging the digital divide also influenced the evaluation requirement for Title I projects. Programs funded under this legislation were required to provide rigorous evaluations reports “regarding the impact of such programs on student academic achievement” (P.L. 107-110, Jan. 8, 2002). The following statement summarizes the historical emergence of technological factors that influence evaluation requirements over the 40 years of this study.

**Technological Factors by Era**

**1965–1975: The Equity Education Reform Movement**

- 1965: Technological requirements did not exist in the new evaluation mandate (P.L. 89-10, Apr. 11, 1965).
- 1974: Standardized testing emerged as a cornerstone to the evaluation mandate and an indicator for depicting the effectiveness of Title I projects (P.L. 93-380, Aug. 21, 1974)
The rapid technological development of the electronic computer and the electronic test scoring machine facilitated the process of testing and the efficiency of testing.

1975–1985: From Equity Reform to Excellence Reform

- Technological innovation of the personal computer became the major force influencing improvements in approaches to evaluation and the level of sophistication with which evaluation reports were produced,
- Evaluators were equipped with a new technology that gave the power to analyze larger data sets in shorter period of time.

1985-1995: From Excellence Reform to Standard-Based Reform

- Innovations in technology influenced the development of sophisticated testing instruments and for the first time conventional tests were computerized with its contents tailored to item difficulty based on the response of the examinee.
- Hierarchical linear model theory was introduced and allowed researchers to “provide explicit representation of the multiple organizational levels typically encountered in research” (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1988, p. 68).
- The development of the Internet in the early 1990s facilitated the access of information and revolutionized the mode of communication among federal agencies, state, and local governments.
- Modern technology transformed survey methodology and provided multiple modes of data collection (Dillman et al., 2009).
1995–2005: From Standard-Based Reform to No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

- Testing continued to hold the central role for Title I projects; the evaluation mandate required information gathered from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) (P.L. 103-382, Oct. 20, 1994).

- No Child Left Behind Part D, the Enhancing Education Through Technology Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-10 Jan. 8, 2002) was introduced, designed to “assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes eighth grade.”

- Title I projects were required to provide rigorous evaluation reports “regarding the impact of such programs on student academic achievement” (P.L. 107-110, Jan. 8, 2002).

From the emergence of the monstrous mainframe room-size computers to desktop personal computers to today’s hand-held computers, these technological developments have revolutionized the field of evaluation. They have influenced:

- The quality and quantity of data produced,
- The speed of data collection and,
- The analysis of the data.

Innovations in technology have been the driving force influencing every aspect of evaluation and will continue to do so in the years to come.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided the results of an examination of the interaction of political, economic, and technological factors that influence evaluation requirements through a historical study of the evolution of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education
Act (ESEA) of 1965. The study covered four decades, four major educational reform
movements, and eight presidential administrations. The information included in this
chapter is the result of an extensive document examination and interviews with nine key
informants. Of these nine, six were present at the inception of Title I of ESEA and the
emergence of the first educational reform movement.

This study utilized the concept of social cartography introduced by Paulston and
Liebman (1994) as a way of illustrating the influences and interactions occurring in the
social milieu as discussed in this study. Paulston and Liebman (1993) explained that
social cartography is concerned with “developing in our comparative discourse a visual
dialogue as a way of communicating how we see the social changes developing in the
world around us” (p.5).

**A Visual Illustration of the ESEA Title I Legislation and National Political, Economic,
and Technological Factors**

Following the concept of social cartography discussed, Figure 9 (p. 103) is a
social map and was created as a visual display to illustrate key events occurring in the
social environment as discussed in this study. This map illustrates the national political,
economic, and technological factors influencing evaluation requirements over four
decades, eight administrations, and nine reauthorizations to the ESEA Title I projects.
These factors represent spheres of influence and are illustrated along a vertical bar.
Developments occurring across four decades are illustrated on the horizontal bar
corresponding with each factor.

The vertical bar on the left of the map was created to show the following spheres of influences:
- International and global influences—though not part of this study,
- National political, economic, and ideological influences,
- Technological influences,
- Nine major reauthorizations to the ESEA of 1965 and,
- Evaluation requirements.

Arrows are placed on the far right of this map representing the interactions and influences occurring in both directions among and between the levels of influences. These vertical levels of influences are also aligned horizontally with key developments occurring in the environment. The horizontal illustrations align with each level of influence across four decades.

International and global influences are illustrated on the horizontal bar across the top of this social map. While these influences are not a part of this study, it is important to note that the Vietnam War, the Mid-East Oil Embargo, the Iran Contra crisis, the Gulf War, and the War in the Middle East all played a critical role in American domestic politics, and influenced national economic conditions.

Eight administrations over four decades are displayed across the horizontal bar and align with key national political, economic and ideological influences on the vertical bar. A Gross Domestic Product Growth Bar extending four decades is also included to illustrate the economic climate of the nation. Each color represents a three month period or quarter. Red is symbolic of when the nation is operating at a deficit, green shows a period of economic growth and yellow represents a stagnant economy.

Critical developments—already examined in this study-- occurring across four decades are illustrated on the horizontal bar. At the national level economic factors were
also found to be interconnected with the political agenda and social programs. The prominent activities at the national level were the equity movement and the excellence reform movement. Major evaluation studies shown are the Coleman Study and the Follow Through Evaluation Project. Figure 8 also highlights a number of technological advances that made possible changes in evaluation requirements.

Major reauthorizations to the ESEA of 1965 and one priority are shown across a chronological bar. A brief description is shown with each reauthorization. These highlight changes in evaluation requirements over time.

The evaluation of federally funded education programs today is governed by the interaction of national political, economic and technological factors fueled by the strength of the political ideologies dominant during any given period. These factors are constantly working together, interacting with each other, and influencing the emergence of new policies that legislate the evaluation requirements for Title I projects.
Figure 9. National, political, economic, and technological factors from 1965 to 2005.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study is to examine the interaction of national political, economic, and technological factors as they relate to the concurrent development of evaluation requirements and the growth of the field of evaluation as a profession. This concluding chapter summarizes the results of the dissertation and discusses implications and possibilities for future research. Key findings for this study are guided by the four research questions as delineated in the conceptual framework shown in Figure 3 in chapter IV.

National Political, Economic, and Technological Factors Are Closely Related To Evaluation Requirements for Title I Projects

Evaluation requirements for Title I projects of the ESEA of 1965 have changed significantly over the four decades of this study. These changes are seen in the nine major reauthorizations to the legislation. In 1965 the evaluation requirement was vague. The requirement simply called for programs to use “effective procedures, including appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement” when evaluating the academic achievement of educationally deprived children (P.L. 89-10, Apr. 11, 1965). By 1974, the evaluation mandate was more specific. It called for reports that were conducted by competent and independent persons and that the reports describe and measure the impact of funded projects (P.L. 93-380, Aug. 21, 1974). The implication of
this mandate for professionals in the field of evaluation was clear. This signaled a critical moment in the emergence of evaluation as a distinct field of study and a bona fide profession. The 1970s represented a period of professional development for the field of evaluation.

When studies published in the 1980s showed that American students were not performing as well as students in Japan, Germany, and other nations, the objectives of the evaluation mandate once again changed to address not the educational achievement of poor students but to focus on the educational achievement of all students.

For the first time American public education focused its attention on addressing the educational needs of poor children in the 1960s, then evolved to a policy that called for the academic excellence of all students in the 1980s, and in 2001 to a policy that required “holding schools, local educational agencies, and states accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students so that “No Child is Left behind.”

Moreover, the evaluation requirement for Title I projects introduced a new phenomenon for professionals in the field of evaluation—the evaluation of social action programs. The focus of evaluation activity was no longer on curriculum, testing, or small programs, but on large scale programs serving millions of educationally deprived students in school districts across America. This change in focus of evaluation activity carried critical implications for evaluation professionals.

When leaders in the educational evaluation community responded to the call to evaluate Title I projects, they became aware that their work and their results were not responsive to the questions being raised in the ESEA evaluation mandate. Thus, professionals were challenged to re-conceptualize their approaches to the evaluation of
the new programs. During the 1970s and 1980s the field of evaluation began to emerge as a profession. New instruments were developed, new evaluation models created, and a flood of new evaluation journals emerged, such as Evaluation Review, Evaluation Quarterly, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. The American Evaluation Association was formed in 1985 (Fitzpatrick, Sanders & Worthen, 2004). These activities served to establish the field of evaluation as a distinct profession.

Strong political, economic, and technological connections are seen throughout the four decades of this study. In 1981, when the American economy began to show signs of a recession, Congress signed the Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act of 1981, the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) was repealed, and evaluation reports and evaluation studies were curtailed. The poor economic climate of the late 1970s and early 1980s signaled a change in the booming evaluation industry of the mid 1960s and 1970s. Evaluation contracts dwindled for lack of funding, and evaluation professionals then turned their focus to research and publication (Stufflebeam, 2010; Fitzpatrick, Sanders & Worthen, 2004). Advancements in technology also influenced improvements in approaches to evaluation and the level of sophistication with which evaluation reports were produced.

A more recent example of this interaction of political, economic, and technological factors is also seen in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) reauthorization of ESEA in 2001 (P.L.107-110, Jan. 8, 2002). While this period began with the new Republican administration affirming a strong economy, national politics revolved around the issue of failing schools. The interaction of these three factors influenced the
development of the new NCLB Title I policy and evaluation requirements, which included challenging academic standards, more testing, and bridging the digital divide.

**The Strength and Relevance of the Factors Varies Over Time**

The strength and relevance of national political, economic, and technological factors varies over time. These factors are fueled by the strength of the political ideologies driving any given period. For example, the *Equity Educational Reform Movement* of the 1960s was spurred by the civil rights movement, a liberal movement that sought for equality of educational opportunities for the poor. This movement lasted almost 20 years. By the 1980s a new movement emerged; the *Excellence Educational Reform Movement*. This movement was guided by the publication of an influential report, *A Nation at Risk*, and a conservative agenda that called for the education of the best and the brightest in order to compete with foreign competitors. The pendulum had swung from a liberal agenda that supported the equity reform movement to a conservative agenda that spurred the excellence reform movement. This new reform movement required an educational agenda that not only addressed the needs of *poor students* but also the needs of *all students*.

From its inception Title I of the ESEA of 1965 and its evaluation mandate became a political instrument subject to the prevailing ideological influences and the national political and economic context in which it develops. Evaluation requirements were implemented by Congress and were designed to establish accountability measures for funds provided to federally funded education projects, and to determine whether these programs had met program objectives. However, the result of evaluation yields conclusions about the merit or worth of programs, and produces information that can be
used for the re-allocation of resources, the creation of new policies, or even the loss of funding.

These consequences of evaluation have enormous economic implications for the survivability of programs, agencies, budgets, and politicians (Madaus, Scriven, Stufflebeam, 1983). Weiss (1972) states that “once evaluation studies are seen as likely to have important political consequences, they become fair game for people whose views are contradicted by the data” (p. 329). Thus, the evaluation of federally funded education projects then becomes a political instrument, an instrument that produces information that can potentially change the operating priorities of federally funded projects. These changes in operating priorities have profound influence on the development of new evaluation policies, evaluation requirements, and the practice of evaluation.

**Future Research**

The study introduced a topic that could be expanded in several ways. By drawing from the body of evidence, topics for future research could include a historical study of:

- How international and global factors relate to the policies that guide evaluation requirements for federally funded education projects?
- How has the evaluation requirements for ESEA Title I projects influenced the development of the field of evaluation?

**Concluding Thoughts**

As I close this phase of the study, my thoughts are centered on what might be happening today that will determine the next reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in 2014. This study has shown that educational program evaluation requirements for Title I projects of the ESEA of 1965 were born
within the political context of Congress. Further, national political, economic, and technological factors continued to influence changes in the evaluation mandate over the four decades of this study. As changes in the evaluation requirements of Title I projects evolved over time, developments in the field of educational evaluation were also occurring. The context of educational program requirements and the development of the field of evaluation are political. Given these facts and the extreme polarization that has emerged on the political scene, we can anticipate significant reverberations not only on No Child Left Behind but also on the new policies that will emerge in the reauthorization in 2014. As changes in technology grow exponentially, we can be assured that these will have a huge impact on the technological requirements for the evaluation of education projects.

Similarly the nation is facing an economic crisis as never seen before. The budget deficit and the nation’s unemployment are major issues. Currently, cuts are being proposed in education and social services programs. These issues have major implications for the practice of evaluation. How will these conditions influence the current evaluation requirements in practice? What will be the nature and scope of the impact of this economic crisis on the thinking of those creating policy for the ESEA Title I reauthorization for 2014? We may be looking at the kinds of cuts experienced during the early Reagan years or the influx of support triggered by foreign competition during the excellence reform movement.

In order for evaluators to work in an environment that is driven and influenced by political factors, it is not only necessary to have an understanding of their craft but also to have a wide perspective of the politics and underpinnings of the social milieu.
Educational program evaluation does not take place in a vacuum. Instead, educational evaluation was born in the political context of Congress and is influenced by national political, economic, and technological factors. What we do today will influence our practice of tomorrow.
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Appendix B

Historical Overview of Title I of ESEA Legislation, Policy, and Evaluation Requirements from 1965 to 2005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Description and Declaration of Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L. 89-10 Apr. 11, 1965.</strong> Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA).</td>
<td>An Act To strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the nation’s elementary and secondary schools. …Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.</td>
<td>Sec. 205 (5) That effective procedures, for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. (6) that the local educational agency will make an annual report and such other reports to the State educational agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this title, including information relating to the educational achievement of students participating in programs carried out under this title; …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 206 (a) (3) that the State educational agency will make to the Commissioner (A) periodic reports including the results of objective measurements required by section 205(a) (5) evaluating the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 212. (a) The President shall, within ninety days after the enactment of this title, appoint a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and making recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Description and Declaration of Policy</td>
<td>Evaluation Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L. 89-750 Nov. 3, 1966</strong> the “Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966”</td>
<td>An Act to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes.</td>
<td><strong>Education of Handicapped Children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 602  the term “handicapped children includes mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education and related services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 604. Any Stated which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner through its State educational agency a State plan in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e) The plan must provide that effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of, and providing related services for, handicapped children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(g) The plan must provide for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, including reports of the objective measurements required by paragraph (e) of this section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the “Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1967”

An Act to strengthen, improve and extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes.

Sec. 113. The Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Commerce, shall prepare and submit to the Senate and House of Representatives, on or before May 1, 1968, a report setting forth a method of determining the information necessary to establish entitlements within each of the several States under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 on the basis of data later than 1960. Such report shall include recommendations for legislation necessary to permit the adoption of such method.

Sec. 114 (e) Addition To National Advisory Council Report----In its annual report to the President and the Congress to be made not later than January 31, 1969, the Council shall report specifically on which of the various compensatory education programs funded in whole or in part under the provisions of this title, and of other public and private educational programs for educationally deprived children, hold the highest promise for raising the educational attainment of these educationally deprived children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Description and Declaration of Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **P.L.91-230-APR.13, 1970** Amendments To Title I Of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 | An Act to extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education and for other purposes. | Sec. 134 (a) There shall be a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children…  
(b) The National Council shall review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, |

**Comprehensive Planning and Evaluation Grants**  
Sec. 532. (a) Any state desiring to receive a grant under this part for any fiscal year shall designate or establish within its State educational agency a single office or unit referred to as the State planning and evaluation agency as the sole agency for administering a comprehensive planning and evaluation of elementary and secondary education in the State.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Description and Declaration of Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L. 93-380 Aug., 21, 1974 Education Amendments of 1974.</strong></td>
<td>An Act To extend and amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>Sec. 151 (a) The Commissioner shall provide for independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects assisted under this title. (b) The Commissioner <strong>shall develop and publish standards</strong> for evaluation of program or project effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. (c) The Commissioner shall, where appropriate, consult with State agencies in order to provide for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies of programs and projects assisted under this title within a State. (d) The Commissioner shall provide to State educational agencies, <strong>models for evaluations</strong> of all programs conducted under this title…which shall include uniform procedures and criteria to be utilized by local educational agencies, as well as by State agency in the evaluation of such programs. (e) Technical assistance for systematic evaluation of programs (f) Models developed by the Commissioner shall <strong>specify objective criteria</strong> …and shall outline: longitudinal studies of children involved and methodology (such as the use of tests which yield comparable results) for producing data which are comparable on a statewide and nationwide basis. (g) The Commissioner shall make a report to respective committees in Congress (h) The Commissioner shall also develop a system for gathering and dissemination of results of evaluations and for the identification of exemplary programs and projects or effective elements of programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Description and Declaration of Policy</td>
<td>Evaluation Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L.95-561, Nov. 1, 1978</strong>, the Education Amendments of 1978</td>
<td>To extend and amend expiring elementary and secondary education programs, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>Sec. 183. (a) Independent Evaluation Standards.—The Commissioner shall provide for independent evaluations which describe and measure the impact of programs and projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L.97-35, Aug. 13, 1981</strong> the &quot;Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act of 1981&quot;.</td>
<td>Sec. 552 The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue to provide financial assistance to State and Local educational agencies to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children on the basis of entitlements calculated under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, but to do so in a manner that will eliminate burdensome, unnecessary, and unproductive paperwork and free the schools of unnecessary, federal supervision, direction and control.</td>
<td>Sec. 556 (b) (4) programs and projects described…will be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in achieving the goals set for them, and that such evaluations shall include objective measurements of educational achievement in basic skills and determination of whether improved performance is sustained over a period of more than one year;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Description and Declaration of Policy</td>
<td>Evaluation Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 100-297, Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary Improvement Amendments of 1988. Apr. 28, 1988</td>
<td>An Act To improve elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes</td>
<td>Subpart 2-- Basic Program Requirements Sec. 1019. (a) Local Evaluations—each local educational agency shall (1) evaluate the effectiveness of programs assisted under this part, in accordance with national standards developed according to section 1435, at least once every 3 years (using objective measurement of individual student achievement in basic skills and more advanced skills, aggregated for the local educational agency as a whole) as an indicator of the impact of the program; Part B—Even Start Programs operated by Local Educational Agencies Sec. 1058. (a) Independent Annual Evaluation.—The Secretary shall provide for the annual independent evaluation of programs under this part to determine their effectiveness in providing— (b) (1) Criteria—Each evaluation shall be conducted by individuals not directly involved in the administration of the program or project operated under this part. Such independent evaluators and the program administrators shall jointly develop evaluation criteria which provide for appropriate analysis of the factors under subsection (a). When possible, each evaluation shall include comparisons with appropriate control groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Description and Declaration of Policy</td>
<td>Evaluation Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P.L. 100-297, Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary Improvement Amendments of 1988. Apr. 28, 1988 (Continued) | An Act To improve elementary and secondary education, and for other purposes                          | (2) In order to determine a program’s effectiveness……each evaluation shall contain objective measures..whenever feasible, shall obtain the specific views of program participants about such programs.  
Sec. 1435 (a) National Standards—in consultation with State and local educational agencies (including members of State and local boards of education and parent representatives), the Secretary shall develop national standards for local evaluation of programs under this chapter. In developing such standards, the Secretary may use the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System designed and implemented under title I of this Act, as in effect prior to the date of the enactment of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary Improvement Amendments of 1988 as the model….National Standards of Evaluation |
<p>| P.L. 103-62 Aug. 3, 1993 “Government Performance and Results Act of 1993”  | To provide for the establishment of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. | 1115. Performance Plans (f) (7) program evaluation—an assessment through objective measurement and systematic analysis of which Federal programs achieve intended objectives—performance indicators, goals, program activity |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Description and Declaration of Policy</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L. 103-382</strong></td>
<td>An Act to extend for five years the authorizations of appropriations for the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for certain other purposes.</td>
<td>Subpart 3—General Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994”. Oct. 20, 1994</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 1431 (a) Scope of Evaluation—Each State agency or local educational agency that conducts a program under subpart 1 or 2 shall evaluate the program, disaggregating data on participation by sex, and if feasible, by race, ethnicity, and age, not less than once every three years to determine the program’s impact on the ability of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) In conducting each evaluation under subsection (a), a State agency or local educational agency shall use multiple and appropriate measures of student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part E—Federal Evaluations, Demonstrations, and Transition Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Evaluation of Part A of Title I (1) In general—the Secretary shall...have a longitudinal design that tracks cohorts of students within schools of differing poverty concentrations for at least three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)—The Secretary shall evaluate the demonstration projects supported under this title, using rigorous methodological designs and techniques, including control groups and random assignment, to the extent feasible, to produce reliable evidence of effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Description and Declaration of Policy</td>
<td>Evaluation Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.L.107-110 No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Jan. 8, 2002</strong></td>
<td>An act to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform; to promote research, consensus building, and systematic changes needed to ensure equitable educational opportunities and high levels of educational achievement for all students; to provide a framework for reauthorization of all federal education programs; to promote the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skills standards and certifications; and for other purposes.</td>
<td>Sec. 1431. Program Evaluations. (a)...shall evaluate the program disaggregating data on participation by gender, race, ethnicity, and age, not less than once every 3 years to determine the program’s impact on the ability of participants—(c) shall use multiple and appropriate measure of student progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Federal Register v. 70, January 25, 2005, no. 15, p. 3586. Notice of Final Priority Funding Year 2005 and later years.** | Scientifically Based Evaluation Methods                                                                                                                                                                                                  | An action to focus federal financial assistance on expanding the number of programs and projects department-wide that are evaluated under rigorous scientifically based research methods in accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). |
Appendix C

Title I of ESEA Political, Economic, and Technological Influences from 1965 to 2005
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Political, Economic, Technological Influences</th>
<th>Evaluation Requirements Title I Legislation of ESEA of 1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R) Richard M. Nixon 1969-1974</td>
<td>Space program places first man to walk on the moon Mid East Oil Crisis/American Gas Prices Soar Presidential Impeachment</td>
<td>P.L. 91-230, Apr. 13, 1970, Reauthorization (3) National Council will “review and evaluate the administration and operation of this title”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) Gerald R. Ford 1974-1977</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product -.06 (Economic down turn)</td>
<td>P.L. 93-380, Aug. 21, 1974. Reauthorization (4)Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) is established—Independent evaluations, measure impact, obtain opinions from program participants, develop and publish standards, models for evaluation, develop longitudinal studies…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Political, Economic, Technological Influences</td>
<td>Evaluation Requirements Title I Legislation of ESEA of 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) Ronald Reagan 1981-1989</td>
<td>“Economic Tax Act of 1981” budget reductions that changed the course of government spending--Publication of “A Nation at Risk” foreign economic competition and the “Excellence Reform Movement”—Technological influences of personal computers and the Internet</td>
<td><strong>P.L. 97-35, Aug. 13, 1981, Reauthorization (6)</strong> “Omnibus Education Reconciliation Act of 1981” The Congress finds TIERS overly prescriptive and burdensome—“programs will be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in achieving the goals set for them, and that such evaluations shall include objective measurements of educational achievement…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>P.L. 100-297, Apr. 28, 1988, Reauthorization (7)</strong> the “Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary Improvement Amendments of 1988” evaluate according to national standards, using indicators of the impact of the program, collect data on race, age, gender and number of children with handicapping conditions served,—use TIERS in effect prior to this Act as the model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Political, Economic, Technological Influences</td>
<td>Evaluation Requirements Title I Legislation of ESEA of 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) George H. W. Bush</td>
<td>Homelessness, drug addiction, budget deficit, National Education Summit of 1989, national education goals introduced</td>
<td>No reauthorizations passed under this administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) William J. Clinton</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.L. 103-382, Oct. 20, 1994, Reauthorization (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-2001</td>
<td>Federal deficit, unemployment, and crime, Standard-Based Reform Movement becomes the center piece for this administration—Goals 2000 Educate America Act—longest expansion in U.S. economic history, GDP increases from 3.4 in 1993 to 4.8 in 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R) George W. Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td>P.L. 107-110, Jan. 8, 2002, Reauthorization (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>